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HAVING thus shewed, first, what are the powers of the Church; and then, in whose hands they rest; and having said before, that the determining and limiting of all circumstances for the exercise of those offices of God’s service, for the communion whereof the Church stands, and also of those qualities which render men capable to communicate in the same, is totally reserved to the Church, so far as God’s law hath not prevented the determination of it: we are now to consider the time, the place, the manner and form, the ceremonies and solemnities, whereby the celebration of Church-offices is either already determined by God’s law, or remains determinable by the law of the Church. And this I cannot do better, than beginning with the times of Divine service, and considering what laws of God, what laws of the Church, all Christians ought to be tied to in that point; whence it may appear, what may be the subject of reformation in it.

§ 2. Where I find it requisite in the first place to debate, by what right the first day of the week, called Sunday, is set apart for the service of God under Christianity.

§ 3. There is an opinion too well known amongst us, that the first day of the week is kept by Christians in virtue of the fourth commandment, which obliged the Jews to keep the

---

* Above, cc. i.—xv.: and Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vii., xv., &c.

b Above, cc. xvi.—xx.: and Bk. I. cc. viii., sq.

c Above, c. i. § 1, 2: and Rt. of Ch.

Thorndike.
seventh day of the week. Which opinion if it be true, they have some ground for confining the service of God to it. But it cannot be maintained without two assumptions: the first,—that the seventh day in the fourth commandment signifies, not the seventh day of the week, on which God rested from creating any more, but one of the seven days;—the second,—that the resurrection of Christ upon the first day of

"As it is of the law of nature, that in general a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God: so in His word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath to be kept holy unto Him: which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ was the last day of the week; and from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath." Westm. Confession of Faith, c. xxi. art. 7. pp. 45, 46. 8vo. Lond. 1650. —Dr. Nicholas Bound or Bownd (Sabbathum Vet. et Nov. Testam., first ed. 1595, second, 4to. Lond. 1606) first promulgated Sabbathian doctrines in England in a formal treatise (see in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxi. § 20. note 1). His doctrine was carried to its legitimate consequence by Thraske and Brabourne (see below, § 17. note r), who substituted the Saturday for the Lord's day. Among the writers who followed Bound in his Sabbathian tenet, were, in England (besides Zanchy, Rivet, Ames, &c., abroad), Greenham in 1601, Byfield in 1631, Henry Burton (Pryme's compeer) in 1636, Cawdrey and Palmer in 1645, and in a more moderate way John Ley (in his Sunday a Sabbath, &c., dedicated to Archbishop Ussher, between whom and the writer some letters passed on the subject, in Ussher's Works, vols. xii. pp. 587, sq. xvii. pp. 364, sq.) in 1641; and Hamon L'Estrange (God's Sabbath before and under the Law and under the Gospel briefly Vindicated from Novell and Heterodox Assertions, Camb. 4to.), also in 1641. It occasioned also the 15th canon of the Canons of 1603; and the famous Book of Sports in 1618 and 1619. But was the general doctrine of the Puritans (see Fuller's Ch. Hist., Cent. xvii. Bk. xi. § 32, 33). It was answered by Rogers (On the XXXIX Articles, Pref. Lond. 1633): Robert Loe or Leus (Effigiati Veri Sabbatianismi, 4to. Lond. 1605), Dr. John Prideaux (XIII. Orationes Inaugurales, Orat. vii. habit. anno 1622, pp. 60, sq. fol. Oxf. 1648), Thomas Brodr or Brodus (Tractatus de Sabbato, 4to. 1627), Sdw. Brewood (two Treatises of the Sabbath, 4to. Oxf. 1630 and 1632), F. White, bishop of Ely (Treatise of the Sabbath Day, containing a Defence of the Orthodoxall Doctrine of the Church of England against Sabbatarian Novelty, third ed. 4to. Oxf. 1636, against Brabourne), C. Dow (Discourse of Sabbath and Lord's Day, second ed. 4to. Lond. 1636), David Primerose (Of the Sabbath and Lord's Day, 4to. Lond. 1630), Dr. John Pocklington (Sunday no Sabbath, 4to. Lond. 1630), Gilbert Ironside, afterwards bishop of Bristol (Seven Questions of the Sabbath briefly Disputed, 4to. Oxf. 1637), and Heylin (Hist. of Sabbath, second ed. 4to. Lond. 1636). The last named carried his anti-Sabbatarianism so far as to deny even an apostolical origin to the Lord's day (see below, § 20. note s). See also Hooker, E. P., V. lxx. 8, lxxi. 8: a letter of Bishop Cosin to Dr. Collins (first publ. in the Bibliotheca Literaria, num. v. paper iv. Lond. 1722, since in Cosin's Works, vol. iv. pp. 451, sq.): some letters of Archbishop Ussher to Dr. Twisse and others (first publ. by Dr. Bernard in 1657 and 8, in his Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh, &c., since in Ussher's Works, vol. xlii. pp. 573, sq.): and a set treatise by Archbishop Bramhall (Disc. of Sabb. and Lord's Day, Works, vol. v. pp. 9, sq., also first published after the writer's death). The Polemical Dissertation of the Inchoation and Determination of the Lord's Day Sabbath, by the well-known W. Pryme, Lond. 4to. 1655, was written to prove that the Lord's day begins on Saturday evenings.

"Notandum est in mandato ipso, quod hoc v. 8. continetur, . . . non sine causa non dixisse, Memento ut diem
the week is a reason, that necessarily determines all Christians to do that, which they are bound to do on one day of the seven, upon the first and none else. Neither of which is true, though the latter have far the more appearance of truth in it.

§ 4. For it is manifest, that the will of God may be, having obliged the Jews to keep one day in seven, to oblige Christians to keep one day in six, or less; unless it be otherwise determined by some commandment of God's. Now it appeareth, that the first day of the week was kept in the times of the apostles, our Saviour having appeared unto them after His resurrection upon that day: Joh. xx. 36; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Apoc. i. 10. But of any precept to make this a law to all Christians, nothing appears in the Scriptures of the New Testament.


"Quamobrem cum dies Dominicus Christi facto, exemplo institutoque apostolorum, et Ecclesiæ veteris observatio ne constantissima, et Scriptura testes, fuerit observatus et subditus in locum sabbathi Judaicæ; inepte faciunt, qui observationem diem Dominici ex traditione non ex Scriptura sacra in Ecclesia perdurare asservant, ut hominum traditio nes his administratur (at Deo placet) statuiminent." Franc. Juxius, Praelect. in Genes. ii. v. 3, Op., tom. i. p. 28. Genev. 1613. — "Ut apparent, quantum præceptum de septimo quoque die sanctificando, quod ad sabbathi quidem diem et ritus legales, ceremoniale, quod ad cultum autem Dei attinet, esse legis moralis innotet in hac vita perpetuum præceptum: et stetisse quidem illum sabbathi diem a creatione mundi ad Dominii resurrectionem, quæ quum sit alterius spiritualis mundi velut altera creatio, ... tunc, Spiritu Sancto procul- dubio iustud apostolis dictantes, pro proriis sequenti Sabbato, sive septimo die, assumptus sit novi hujus mundi pri mus ... Dominicumigitur diei coetus ... apostolosque in vere Divinæ sum traditionis, sic tamen ut Judæica cessatio ab omni opera minime observaretur." Beza, ad Apoc. i. 10.— And from them and others, but in terms more unqualified, Bound, Bk. i. pp. 86, sq. and pp. 100, 101, "Therefore this day was appointed, and none but this could be ordained, ... because on the last Jewish sabbath ended the old world, and with the first day of the week the Lord's day was brought in, and the new world, by vertue of Christ's resurrection."— "Immediately, when Christ Himself was but newly up, from that very day whereon He arose, doth S. Augustine derive the primum esse of the Lord's Day. 'The Lord's Day was by the resurrection of Christ declared to be the Christian's day,'" &c. L'Estrange, God's Sabbath, &c. pp. 71, 72. And again (p. 73), "So the fathers agree, 'It is necessary that that day should be the Lord's Day,' saith Cyril; and he thence deriveth the equity of assemblies upon that day."
Testament. Again, it may be said, that the Gospel requireth
more plentiful fruits of obedience than the Law; and there-
fore, if the Law required one day of seven for the service of
God, that the Gospel requires more. Nor will it concern
me here to prove, that this opinion is true. It is more than
enough that I can say, that, before this novelty came into
England, it cannot appear that ever any Christian thought
otherwise. For I argue no more in this place, but that the
rising of our Lord upon the first day of the week doth not ne-
cessarily determine the Church to keep one day of the seven;
as the command of God doth. For, had God commanded one
day of seven to be kept under the Gospel, as under the Law,
there had been no room for further consideration. But so long
as there is only a reason on the one side,—that the resurrec-
tion to Christians is as the creation to Jews;—and a reason on
the other side,—that it becomes Christians, in this as in all, to
do more than Jews:—I cannot deny, that there is a sufficient
reason for him, that hath power of determining that which God
hath not determined, to appoint the first day of the week; but I utterly deny, that there is any law of God be-
fore the act of this power to determine it. And the reason
is plain. For in matters of this nature there may be suffi-
cient reason for several determinations, because it is not the
substance but the circumstance of that, which is by nature
necessarily good, and God's service.

§ 5. Again, supposing that Christians are bound to keep
one day of seven for God's service; may I not ask, why the
passion of Christ should not determine them to keep the
sixth, as well as the resurrection the first day of the week?
Especially in the sense of them, who think they have reason
to feast on Good-Friday, and to celebrate their fasts on the
Lord's day. For if the resurrection of Christ be no reason

---

b E. g. "God had from the Creation to the Law, from the Law to Christ, a
day appropriated (and that by Him-
self) to His worship: what hath He
lesse reason to require it under the
Gospel? hath He left the Christian
Church to that liberty, that every man
may serve Him as the toy taketh
him?" &c. L'Estrange, p. 60.—See
also Cosin's letter to Collins, Works,

1 "Quod ad diem Dominicum in
quem sabbatum translatum est et mu-
tatum a Christo sabbati Domino, et cui
analogice respondet, non est propri fes-
tum ceceni festivatis, et improprie lo-
quuntur theologorum diem Dominicum
fes tum vocant. Nam die Dominico aequi
licentiam est Christianis jejunare ac fuit
Judaeis sabbato; quod aspissime in ec-
clesias nostra Scotiae factum. Nihil
nos movet vestus illa consuetudo non
jejunandi die Dominico," &c. Calder-
wood, altare Damascenum, c. x. p. 669.
to make the day thereof festival; nor His passion, why we should rather fast on the day of it: certainly, where both cannot be kept, the one concerns us as much as the other [can] do; and therefore there is as much reason to keep this as that.

§ 6. This to the latter of the two assumptions. But in the former there is no colour of truth. Nor do I see, how any thing can be more strange than this:—that so many men, professing learning, and zeal to the Scriptures alone, should read in the commandment, that God rested the seventh day from making the world, and therefore commanded the seventh day to be kept holy; and understand by all this, only that God would have one day of seven, not that day of the seven on which Himself rested\(^k\). Unless it be still more strange, that men of common sense should believe, that the Jews were not tied by God's law to keep the day on which God rested, but only one of seven; so that the keeping of the seventh was not by God's law, but by man's\(^l\). For if it be once granted, that God commanded them to keep, not only one day of seven, but in particular the seventh; how can any common sense understand, that Christians by the same command should be tied to keep the first day of the week? If prejudice and faction went not under the colour of zeal

---

\(4to. 1623.\)—A fast on "the second and third sabbaths" of September, 1652, is mentioned in "Diurnal of Occurrences in Scotland," publ. in the Spottiswoode Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 82. Edinb. 1845. And the Treatise of Fasting (set forth by the General Assembly A.D. 1565) at the end of Knox's Scotch Liturgy, pp. 227, 228, as reprinted by Dr. Cumming, Lond. 1840, expressly selects Sundays for days of public fasting.—That the English Presbyterians actually did keep one Christmas Day as a fast, see in 1646, see Nasl, Hist. of Puritans, vol. ii. c. 8. p. 287.  

\(4to.\) Lond. 1754. And in their tracts, as e.g. in "The Abolishing of the Booke of Common Prayer by reason of about fifty grosse Corruptions," &c. &c., "being the substance of a Booke which the Ministers of Lincoln Diocese delivered to King James the first of December 1605," reprinted in 1641 for the "consideration of the High Court of Parliament," the keeping Good Friday is noted (pp. 6, 7) as a "Popish error, tending strongly to the maintenance of Popish superstition."—Calderwood (ibid. p. 664) lays down broadly, that, unless extraordinary days of fasting or thanksgiving, "Excepto die Dominico nullum alium agnoscimus sacram aut sanctum." (And so also, and as expressly, the Westminster Directory for Public Worship, Appendix touching Days and Places for Publ. Worship.) And ibid. pp. 707, sq., he equally renounces all the stated annual fasts of the Church. See also below, § 46, note l.

---

\(1\) Added from MS.  

\(k\) See above, § 3. note f.  

\(l\) "I would gladly know where in express terms the Saturday-sabbath or seventh from the Creation is command-ed in this precept" (the fourth commandment): "Examine and dissect it throughly; 'Remember thou sanctifie the sabbath day:'—the sabbath day it is you see, not the seventh from the Creation." L'Estrange, God's Sabbath &c., p. 42.
to the Scriptures, it would appear to be zeal towards ourselves and [friends of our party], that offers such violence to our own sense in seeking to impose this sense upon the Scriptures.

§ 7. In plain terms, there can be nothing more manifest to Christians in the law of Moses, than it is manifest, that the precept of the sabbath is a ceremonial precept; figuring the rest of Christians from the bondage of sin, by doing for the future good works here in the Church militant, and from the bondage of pain, when that rest is become perfect in the triumphant Church of the world to come: and all this, by the work of this precept; that is, by resting from bodily labour in the land of promise, in remembrance of the bondage of Egypt, which the Israelites had escaped. For in Deuteronomy, v. 15, this is the reason alleged, why they were to rest. Ezek. xx. 12, Ex. xxxi. 13; "I gave them My sabbaths to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know, that it is I the Lord their God that sanctifieth them." And therefore the apostle, Hebr. iv. 4, 5, 9, 10, sheweth the seventh day to signify the rest of the land of promise. For, saith he, "in one place it is said, God rested on the seventh day from all His works; and here" (Psalm xcvi. 11), "If they shall enter into My rest: . . . . for he, that is entered into his rest, hath ceased from his own works, as God from His: therefore there remaineth another rest to the people of God" (as the apostle argueth); by the same reason, as the carnal rest of the Jews is a figure of the spiritual rest of Christians, in grace here, in glory in the world to come. And therefore, when he is "afraid" lest he should have "laboured in vain" upon the Galatians, iv. 10, because they "observed days and months [and] years;" when he teacheth the Colossians, ii. 16, not to be over-ruled in the matter of "new moons or sabbaths;" when he sheweth the Romans, xiv. 5, that they who "esteemed one day before another" were weak Christians: he did not mean to remove the obligation of the seventh day

* Substituted in MS.; "ours," in orig. text.


* Added in MS.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

upon the first; but to shew, that Christians may as well think themselves bound in conscience to be circumcised, as to be under the precept of the sabbath.

§ 8. And let me understand, how we can be bound by the How the precept of the sabbath, and not be bound to that measure of rest which the precept of the sabbath limiteth. For the constitution, which the Jews go by this day, is so grounded in the text, that it is not possible to imagine that ever it was practised otherwise: the letter of the Law manifestly distinguishing between "work" and "servile work," and permitting the dressing of meat upon the first and last days of the passover, pentecost, and the feast of tabernacles, but forbidding "servile work," that is to say, such work as slaves were employed about for their master's advantage; but upon the sabbath, and day of atonement, forbidding all work, that is, not only "servile work" but the dressing of meat upon those days; whereupon comes the express prohibition of "kindling fire" on the sabbath, not for the time that they lived in the wilderness, but (as the Law expresseth) in all their habitations: Ex. xii. 16, xvi. 23, xxxv. 3; Levit. xxiii. 3, 7, 8, 21, 25, 28; Numb. xxix. 1, 7. And therefore, Deut. xvi. 8, where for brevity's sake he saith of the passover, "No work shall be done in it;" the Greek adds out of Exodus and Leviticus, "Πλήν δόσα ποιηθήσεται τῇ ψυχῇ"—"Besides what shall be dressed for meat."

§ 9. And, therefore, when our Lord goes to dine with a Pharisee, Luke xiv. 1, it is no marvel that He is invited upon a festival; on which they hold themselves still bound to eat the best meat, and drink the best wine, and put on the [best] clothes they have: but He knew His entertainment must be upon meats dressed the day before. And, therefore, He [Luke xiv. 2—5.]

merely the distinction between "work" and "servile work."

[See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. ii. § 2; and Aben Ezra upon Exod. xiii. 16. there quoted.

§ Deut. xvi. 8. ap. LXX.

Scil. Exod. xii. 16: but in Levit. (xxiii.) the words quoted do not occur.

* Added from MS.

1 See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. viii. § 15, 16.
tive precept of the Law, when by the right of a prophet He commandeth the same man, whom He had cured, to carry away his bed upon the sabbath (John v. [8)—10); the prophet of the old law having forbidden to carry any burden upon the sabbath, Jer. xvii. 21, 22. And the reason,—“My Father still worketh, and so do I work,”—inferreth, that as the rest of God was not from bodily labour, so neither is it the rest from bodily labour which He or His Gospel intendeth.

§ 10. I conclude, therefore,—that which will seem strange to unskilful people:—that the only thing commanded by the letter of the fourth commandment, is to rest from bodily labour upon the seventh day of the week, on which God rested, from whence it is called the sabbath; but, by the mystical sense of it under the New Testament, to rest from our own works of sin here, that we may attain to the rest of God in the world to come. And I cannot see, how a more evident argument can be expected for this, than the extending of the precept to “cattle” and “strangers,” not only to children, who otherwise are not under the precept. For “strangers” in the Law (that is, those that worshipped the true God alone but were not circumcised, who are therefore always translated “converts” in the Syriac, to wit, from idols) were only tied to seven precepts, which all the sons of Noe had received from him; whereof that of the sabbath was none. And, therefore, it is not they, that are commanded to rest; but God’s people are commanded that they shall not work, as they are commanded that their cattle shall not work.

§ 11. I know there is a strong argument against this in vulgar esteem, which to me makes no difficulty at all; that they are commanded to “sanctify” or “keep holy” the sabbath. But he, that admits the true difference between the Law and the gospel, must admit a legal as well as a spiritual holiness. And I would know, what holiness there is in offering a brute beast to God in sacrifice, that is not in sitting still on the seventh day: both being stamped with God’s command; and the rest of the body signifying the rest of the

* See also, and at length, Bonfrerius, Ad Exod. xx., pp. 463, sq. Antv. 1625.  
* See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., tom. i. pp. 161, 162.
soul from sin, which is very holy; as the sacrifice is holy, because it signifieth the holiness of our Lord Christ, or of them whom He sanctifieth. The apostle teacheth us thus to distinguish, when he saith, Hebr. ix. 13: "If the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a red cow, sprinkling" the purified, "sanctifieth to the purity of the flesh." For the holiness it procureth, is but the capacity of free conversation amongst the people of the true God, as to the letter of the Law; and bodily rest upon the sabbath is a full profession of the true God, which made heaven and earth, and brought μετανοεῖν."

His people out of Egypt.

§ 12. I do not deny, that the service of God was commanded by the Law upon the sabbath; but not by this precept. You have an order for public assemblies on the sabbath, as well as on other festivals; Levit. xxiii. You have an order, for what sacrifices should be offered on each of them; Num. xxvii. But had the Law gone no further than the fourth commandment, the Jews had not been tied to those precepts. I acknowledge further, that they were bound to serve God with other offices (such as are common to them and us both) upon the sabbath, as upon other festivals; when they had synagogues, or means to assemble themselves otherwise: as Abenezzar observes out of 2 Kings iv. 23. For had it not been the custom to resort to the prophets at the festivals, he would not have said, "Why wilt thou go to the prophet? it is neither new moon nor sabbath." And the order for this, which we see by the Acts of the Apostles, and the Gospels, as well as by the Jews' constitutions, no man will deny to have obliged them by virtue of the Law; but not by the letter of it: which had it been precisely followed, the objection of Origen and other of the fathers must have

\* Quoted in Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. ii. § 24.
\* See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., ibid.
\* "Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ διαβόλου σάββατον τῷ ἱερεῖ λεγομεν τὸ Καθολικὸν ἐκαστὸς εἰς τοὺς οἰκουμενικοὺς μεθιστημένος ἐπισκοπικοῦς τοῦ ἡμερήσιον τῇ ἑβδομαδίᾳ ἐκ τοῦ τότε αὐτοῦ τῆς ἡμέρας τῇ ἑβδομάδῃ ἐκ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἐκ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἡμέρας, καὶ ἀποτείχειν ἐντὸ τοῦ καθεσθίαν." Origen, De Princip., lib. iv., § 17; Op., tom. i. p. 176; and see above in Bk. II. as quoted in next note.
\* E. g. S. Hieron., Epist. ad Algesiam, Qu. 10. (Op., tom. iv. P. i. p. 207): "Præterea quia iussum est, ut diebus sabbathorum sedeat unusquisque in domo sua et non egrediatur, neque ambolet de loco quo habitat: si quando eos juxta litteram coeperimus arcare; ut non jacent, non ambulent, non stent; sed tantum sedeant, si ve-
taken place; and no man must have stirred out of the place where he should be found at the coming in of the sabbath. But in regard there was always in that people a sense of that spiritual service of God, which these carnal precepts tended to; therefore was there provided to limit the extent of the letter, so as not to destroy duties of greater consequence. And it seems they pitched upon a reasonable ground for a reasonable measure, when they made a sabbath-day’s journey so much as the distance of the utmost camp from the tabernacle in the wilderness. But he, that was not within that distance of a synagogue, by going to a synagogue must violate the law, that saith, “Thou shalt not stir out of thy place on the sabbath.” It was therefore holiness to sit still; otherwise, the service of God must not have been omitted for it. Therefore the service of God by those offices, which Christians serve Him with, is no otherwise intimated rather than provided for by the Law, than as the Gospel is witnessd rather than enacted by it. And it is truly said, that “God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it;” in that He appointed His rest in the world to come for those, who had rested from their own works here: but, consequently, in that He appointed the rest of the seventh day in the land of promise to be a figure of it.

§ 18. For I take not upon me to say, that God hallowed not the seventh day till He gave the Law (understanding

lint præcepta servare; solent respondere et dicere... magistri nostri tradiderunt nobis, ut bis mille pedes ambulemus in sabbato; et cætera hujusamodi: doctrinas hominum præferentes doctrinæ Dei. Non quod dicamus sedendum semper esse in sabbatho, et de loco in quo quis fuerit occupatus non redendum; sed quod id quod impossibile Legis est, in quo infirmatur per carmen, spirituali observatione complendum sit.”—And see Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxii. § 13. notes s. t.

* * *


* * *

that which is said at the creation—that "He blessed and sanctified it"—by a prolepsis, because He did it when He gave the Law; because I need not: the designing of the thing signified by it (which is more properly the rest of God than not working) reflecting the attribute of holiness upon the day, which He designed for the sign of it. For in that God rested the seventh day from making all His works; He signified, that He appointed rest for them, that do His work here, in the world to come. In that, delivering His people out of Egypt, He appointed them to rest from bodily labour upon the seventh day; He signified, that He appointed them, whom He had given the rest of the promised land, a shadow of resting from their own works to do His: the substance whereof is the conversation of Christians in the Church, which the land of promise figureth, as well here, as in the world to come. The former appointment is that, which the blessing and hallowing of the seventh day at the creation,—the second, that, which the hallowing of the same at giving the Law,—signifieth.

§ 14. Nor do I make it my business, that the fathers before the Law did ever keep or not keep the seventh day for God's service; because I neither see evidence for this, nor for that. For though the remembrance of the seven days of the week is so ancient and so general among all nations (as you may see by that very learned work, De Jure Naturae et Gentium secundum Ebraeos), that you may well

other school of theology, Hospinian, De Festis Judaeor. c. iii. p. 16. Genev. 1665.—On the other hand Cornelius a Lapide, setting aside both this interpretation, and theirs who say that "sanctificavit Deus jam tunc sabbatum, non actu et reipsa, sed decreto et destinatione Sus," concludes, that "Deus a mundi exordio hoc primo sabbati die illum sanctificavit, id est, actu festum instituit colique voluit ab Adamo ejusque posteria. ... Unde patet sabbatum suisse festum institutum ab origine mundi" (Comment. in Pentateuch, p. 53. Paris. 1630); quoting for this opinion, Ribera, Philo, Catharinus; and adding, "Fuit ergo hoc praeceptum sabbati Divinum, non naturale, sed positivum."—The Sabbatars of course side with Cornelius a Lapide and Catharinus; e.g. Bound, p. 10, quoting also Zanchy on the same side; and Ames (Medull. Theol., lib. ii. c. 15. § 9. pp. 291—293. Amst. 1648). On the other side, see Heylin, Hist. of Sabb., Pt. i. c. 1. § 1—4. pp. 1—11.


§ Lib. iii. c. 19. Works, vol. i. pp. 386, sq.; where Selden shews the antiquity of weeks, and of the assigning the
conclude it to be a mark and impress of the creation in seven days; yet will this argue no observation of it under the patriarchs: because the appropriating of them to the seven planets (though contrived by the devil, to divert that truth to superstition which is the ground of religion according to the Scripture) disables us to argue the creation itself from it to those, that know it not otherwise; much more any rule of God's service grounded upon it. But he that should say, that the sabbath was kept under the law of nature, as it was to be kept under the law of Moses, must first answer Tertullian, Cont. Jud. cap. iv. (and Justin, from whom he hath it, and all fathers that have used it after them, and understood the interest of Christianity better than we do); 'Quis legit Abrahamum sabbatizantem?' For why should he think to persuade us to such a ridiculous imagination, if he have no Scripture for it? And, therefore, though I agree not with Philo, that the Jews had forgot which was the seventh day till God recalled the remembrance of it by sending down manna, and therefore said, "Remember to keep holy the sabbath:" yet I do not allow this to be said, because they had forgot it by their apostasy in Egypt, where it is plain

[Exod.xvi. 5, 22—30; xx. 8.]

names of the planets to the several days: having in c. 15, ibid. pp. 358, sqq., disproved the observance among the Gentiles of a seventh day sabbath. He alleges in c. 19, that "autores sunt non contemnendi, qui etiam ab ipsis seculis primis hebdomadum in dierum periodis usum petant, atque eum apud antiquissimorum temporum artifices putat resque receptum, per alias prae truar Judaeos, secula vetustissimis, gentes sic velint inde propagatum ut nullibi ferme incognitum plane asset."  

* See Selden as in last note. He traces it up to Zoroaster, Chaldæa, and Egypt.


* Dial. cum Tryphon., § 19; Op., p. 119. B.

* See Heylin, Hist. of Sabb., Pt. I. c. iv. § 4. pp. 73, 74; White, Of the Sabbath, pp. 43, 44. third edit. 1686; and Bramhall, Disc. of Sabb. and Lord's Day, sect. v. Works, vol. v. pp. 22, 23; and on the other side, the quotations in Hamon L'Estrange, God's Sabbath before and under the Law, &c., p. 29.


"The Sabbath now first mentioned, but not now first commanded: in Egypt they had neglected the Sabbath." Lightfoot, in Exode. p. xvi.— Works, vol. i. p. 27. And see also L'Estrange, God's Sabbath, &c., p. 27.
they forgot their God, as I shewed you afore; but because they forgot God's first command at the giving of manna, therefore it is reason they should be charged to remember it for the future.

§ 15. As little do I esteem of that mere voluntary presump-
tion, that, being part of the decalogue, the precept of the sabbath must needs be part of God's perpetual law; whether natural or moral, and positive. For is it not the decalogue that saith, "That thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee?" Or doth the land of promise in the letter belong to any but Israelites? Again, the tenth command-
ment forbideth to covet another man's wife, adultery being forbidden afore; and, therefore, to covet another man's wife,
in the tenth commandment, is to compass another man's wife; which might be done where the law alloweth divorces, as Moses his law doth? If therefore the first and last command-
ment of the second table are, by the terms of them, appropriated to God's ancient people; is it strange, that the precept of the sabbath should not be thought perpetual, to oblige all mankind, but ceremonial, to oblige only the same? that there should be a ceremonial precept in the first table of the decalogue? Nay, seeing to all mankind it can import
no more than a circumstance of time for the public service of God; what reason can be imagined, why a precept of that consequence should make one in the first table of the deca-
logue? whereas, importing to that people the creation of all things by the true God, and their deliverance out of Egypt, and by consequence the obligation of His whole law, it is
worthily reckoned by the Jews' doctors among the very principal precepts of it

§ 16. As for Christians, the literal sense of it is no less unlawful for them to observe, than is it for them to be cir-
cumcised, or to undertake the law of Moses; to the which the sabbath, next to circumcision, obligeth. And, by conse-
quence, the spiritual sense of it importeth no less than the

* So e.g. L'Estrange, God's Sab-
bath, &c., p. 59, affirms, that if the Lord's day be not kept, God should have an "emealogue" instead of a de-
calogue; and that "the Sabbath God must have by the immutable law of the fourth precept;" &c. &c.

* See above, c. xii. § 3, sq.

* See Hospian, De Festis Judæorum,
c. iii. p. 18: and Selden, De Jure Nat.
et Gent. juxta Discipl. Ebræor. lib. iii.
whole duty of a Christian (which all ceremonies do figure); that is to say, resting from our works of sin, and consequently busying ourselves about the works of God's service.

§ 17. And therefore I do marvel, that those, who so obstinately promote this doctrine, are not sensible of the scandal they give to them, who have visibly been seduced to keep the Saturday by grounding themselves upon it*: and may, by the same reason, be seduced to be circumcised and turn Jews; if yet it be a thing to do, and that divers English in these unstable times, not distinguishing between that which did and that which doth oblige, when they find both in the Scriptures, have not hereby been moved to make that change. For when they are told, that by the letter of the fourth commandment they are obliged to keep the first day of the week; and by common sense, discovering a great part of the premisses, discern, that if the fourth commandment be in force they cannot be obliged to keep the Lord's day: is it not an even wager, that (not doubting the fourth commandment to be in force, as they are told) they shall keep the Saturday, which if it be in force they ought to keep, rather than the Lord's day, which (finding no reason for it, because they are told none) they will presently imagine to be a Popish custom?

§ 18. I know there is one argument, which is very plausible to induce well-meaning Christians into that zeal, which we see they have, for the strict keeping of the Lord's day, 195 which they call the sabbath; because this opinion will oblige the world to exercise more works of godliness, and to abstain from more of those debauchs, which festivals occasion in vulgar people, than otherwise. To which, for the present, I will say only this; that, having shewed the truth to be as it is, I can oblige all Christians to believe, that God's glory and the advancement of His service cannot be grounded well but upon the truth. And therefore I may well demand their patience, till I come by and by to shew the ground of the

* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxi. § 13. note a. And compare the account of a sect called Traskites, from one Traske, their founder; in Pagitt's Heresiography, pp. 135, 136. Lond. 1649: and Theophilus Braibourne's similar doctrines, for which see Fuller, Ch. Hist., Cent. xvii. Bk. xi. § 32: and Bramhall, Hist. of Sabb. and Lord's Day, Sect. i.; Works, vol. v. p. 9. note b. See also a letter, dated July 29, 1645, in Edwards' Gangrena, Pt. i. pp. 63, 64. 4to. Lond. 1646, alleging an instance of the actual observance of the Saturday-sabbath. An anabaptist named Dampfield revived the doctrine in 1672: see Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bapt., vol. ii. p. 356. note x.
mistake, which they are carried away with: to think, that God’s glory and service is not more plentifully provided for by the laws and customs of the Catholic Church, than by strict keeping the sabbath upon a false ground; which, hinder- ing the effect of those laws, by consequence hinders God’s service.

§ 19. But now, all this being settled, what is there re- maining to allege, why Christians should be bound to keep the Lord’s day, but the act of the apostles; by virtue where- of it came into force among all Christians in all Churches? For it would be too ridiculous to allege, that it is grounded upon those scriptures, whereby it appeareth that it was kept under the apostles, either as a reason sufficient, or as distinct from the authority of the apostles. For, these scriptures being the scriptures of the apostles, we can derive no au- thority from them but that which we first suppose in the apostles. I suppose here, that no man will say, that our Lord’s appearing to His disciples after His resurrection upon that day was enough to make it a law, or evidence that it was so made; unless His apostles could testify that He appeared to that purpose. As for the rest, if it may by circumstance appear, that under the apostles they did assemble to the service of God upon the Lord’s day; will it therefore follow, that all Christians are bound to do the same? Or can any more than this appear by that which I alleged out of the apostles’ writings? If there could, the writings of the apostles being their act as much as any act whereby they could de- clare an intent to oblige the Church, there will be nothing to bind it to keep the Lord’s day but the authority of the apostles.

§ 20. But he, that will give his own common reason leave to speak, shall hear it say: that it is not their words that oblige us to it, but the original and universal custom of the Church; evidencing, that they used to celebrate that day with an intent to introduce the obligation of it into the Church. For of this original and universal custom having as yet found no question made on any side*, I hold it super-

* See Bramhall, Disc. of Sabb. and Lord’s Day, sect. xi., Works vol. v. pp. 42, sq.; Bingham, XX. ii. 1, sq.: Cave, Prim. Christianity, c. vii. pp. 77—83. ed. Cary, 1840.—Heylin must be noted as an exception to the general rule: he being carried so far by zeal against Sabbatarians, as to maintain (Hist.
of Sabb. Pt. ii. c. 3. § 1. pp. 64, sq.), that the observation of the Lord’s day began in the Church as a fixed and universal law not earlier than the time and law of Constantine the Great. To whom may be added the Magdeburg Centurions, Hist. Eccl., Cent. i. lib. ii. c. 6. De Ceremonis p. 493; and De Festis p. 503; and Cent. ii. c. 6. p. 119.

"Τῷ τοῦ Ἡλίου λαγόμενον ἡμέρᾳ τῶν κατὰ τόλμον ἡ ἄγους μενότων ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς συνελεύσεις γίνεται," κ.τ.λ.

§ 24. It is true, that among the eastern Christians the Saturday was observed [also?] for the service of God; many ages after condensation to the Jews (in regard whereof the observation of Moses’ law was in use after Christ, in some parts of the Church more, in some less) was quite out of date. But that is no argument, that the Lord’s day was not kept, when the sabbath was kept; to them, who see

§ 22. Whether Easter was to be kept upon the fifteenth day of the first moon, upon which our Lord suffered, or upon the next Lord’s day, upon which He rose again; was a dispute in the Church as ancient as the apostles: the former custom having been delivered to the Churches of Asia by St. John, the latter to the west by St. Peter and St. Paul. But what ground could there be for this dispute, had not the first day of the week been honoured and observed above the rest in regard of our Lord’s rising again?

§ 23. Certainly the Ebionites were one of the ancientest sects that rose up against the Church; and they (as Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. 27), keeping the sabbath as the Jews, and because the Jews kept it, observ[ed] also the Lord’s day, because the Christians kept it.
St. Paul keep the Lord's day, Acts xx. 7, within the time of compliance with the Jews. For the offices, which God is served by the Church, are pleasing to Him at all times as well as in all places; whereas the keeping of the sabbath upon any day but a Saturday would have been a breach of His law. For when the other festivals of the Jews are called sabbaths in the Law: that is not to say, that the sabbath was kept upon them (for I have shewed you two several measures of rest due upon them by the Law); but that they participated much of the nature of the sabbath, and therefore may be called with an addition such or such sabbaths, but not absolutely the sabbath. Therefore when Christians afterwards continued the custom of serving God upon the sabbath, that is, the Saturday; it is to be understood, that they served God with the offices of Christianity, not with the rest of the Jews' sabbath.

§ 25. If it be further demanded, whether the obligation of the Lord's day do not depend upon the precept of the sabbath; so that it may be called with an addition the sabbath of Christians, though not absolutely the sabbath (because that name is possessed already by the Saturday in the language of all Christians as well as Jews, till men affected an abuse in the name to bring their mistake into men's minds): to this I answer, that, if the Lord's day had no dependance upon the precept of the sabbath, we could not give a reason why one day of seven is observed; for the choice of the number could not come by chance. And I cautioned afore, that the resurrection of Christ was as sufficient a reason why the Church should serve God on the Sunday; as the creation of the world was, why the synagogue should serve God on the Saturday. But this dependance was not immediate; because I shewed also, that this was not enough to introduce the obligation upon us. The act of the apostles intervening was the means to make the obligation necessary.

* See Bk. i. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxi. § 12.—Brewwood, Treatise of the Sabaoth (sic), Oxfo. 4to. 1630, maintains, in brief, that the fourth commandment has no connexion with the Lord's day.—Peter Martyr, Ad Gen. ii. 8. (p. 9. Tigur. 1579.), agrees very nearly with Thornside's view:—"Hinc homines admonentur, ut si illis praeceptur ab Ecclesia ut aliquo die in hebdomade cultui Divino vacent, hoc non esse prorsus humanum commentum, nee tantum pertinere ad legem Mosaicam, sed initium quoque habuisse hinc, et facere ad imitationem Dei."
and legal; whereof, before, the ground only was reasonable. But I do not mean this dependance to be the effect of the fourth commandment only, which prescribeth only bodily rest, as I have shewed; but of these appendencies of it, whereby the assemblies of the Jews and their sacrifices for that day are enacted. For, because they were to serve God upon the sabbath, it was certainly reasonable, in regard of our Lord's resurrection, that Christians should serve God upon the first day of the week.

§ 26. If any man in this regard will call the Lord's day the Christians' sabbath, or the like; I find no fault with it (nay, I find it so called by the Christians of Ethiopia, in Scaliger, vii. De Emend. Temporum): provided he con my opinion that thanks which it deserves, for leaving no further room to unstable spirits to imagine (as some great masters have done), that it is in the power of Churches (or of Christian powers protecting them) to choose another day of seven, or of less than seven, for God's public service. For, not being out of the reach of such power immediately by virtue of the fourth commandment, as I and they both have shewed, it is beyond the reach of it by virtue of the apostles' authority and the act of it.

§ 27. And now it is time to declare the sense of the Catholic Church derived from the doctrine and writings of the apostles, to be this, concerning the times of God's service: that, the offices thereof being always acceptable to God and seasonable, so that they be orderly done, it is the duty of the Church to provide, that they be as frequently celebrated as the occasions of the world will allow; not by particular Christians alone, but at the common assemblies of the Church. Whereby it may appear, how injurious and prejudicial to the service of God the zeal of those is, who, challenging the whole


c To statuas, Suarez, and (less explicitly) Thomas Aquinas; but more decidedly than any in the Roman Schools, Calvin, Zwing, Bullinger, Tindal, Frib, and other Reformers: for whom see Heylin, Hist. of Sabb., Pt. II. c. vi. § 1—6; and Bramhall, Disc. of Sabb. and Lord's Day, sect. i. Works vol. v. p. 10. notes d. e. Oxf. 1845.
Sunday for the service of God by virtue of the fourth commandment, seem thereupon to take it for granted, that there ought to be no order for the public service of God upon other festivals and times of fasting appointed by the Church; nor, which is more, for the daily celebration of Divine service in the Church.

§ 28. There hath been a pretence indeed, that, when the fourth commandment saith, "Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do," it forbiddeth the Church to give any rule of forbearing bodily labour for the exercise of God's service; but so ridiculous, that even those, who have the conscience to hold the conclusion, have not the face to maintain the premisses: that form of speech manifestly importing no more than this, that the present law requires no more than keeping the seventh day of the week; seeing it is manifest, that by other laws God intended to proceed further, and to except other days from the bodily labour of His then people for His service. Thereupon it is manifest, that the synagogue proceeded likewise to except other days, for which there rose occasions, for the like purpose. And truly those, who think it a burden to the duty of working for men's living, that there should be an order for the daily serving of God in the Church, [binding all] to attend it that are not prevented of it by necessary occasions; may look upon the Jews, and blush to consider, that they (as St. Jerome, Epiphanius, and Justin the Martyr assure us) should assemble themselves thrice a day in their synagogues to curse our Lord Christ (which their own constitutions not mentioning do provide for the service of God nevertheless), but that it should be counted superstitious for Christians to meet for God's service in public, unless it be on the Lord's day.

* See Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb., c. viii. § 1-8; and notes there: and above, § 5, note i.
* See quotations in Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb., c. viii. § 2. note z, § 5. note f.—And also Cartwright, as answered by Hooker, E. P., V. lxxi. 3: Musculus, Loci Comm. (as quoted above § 14. note f.) pp. 73, 74: Calderwood (Altare Damascenum, c. x. p. 671); and Zanchy (In IV. Precept. as before quoted, p. 661). But the last named writer inconsistently admits, that the Christian Church may and ought to keep some festivals besides the Lord's day.

f Misprinted "these" in folio edition.

g See Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb., c. viii. § 18.

h Corrected from MS; "having all them," in orig. text.


k Quoted in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 37. note k.

l Quoted ibid. note k.
§ 29. Certainly the practice of the primitive Christians at Jerusalem signifies no such thing; all the contribution there raised tending to no other purpose, but that the Church might hold together in the doctrine of the apostles and the service of God and celebration of the eucharist; though they went also into the temple, and served God with the Jews, whom they then hoped and intended to reduce unto Christianity.

§ 30. But I will refer myself in this point, as in that which follows, to that which I have said in my book of the Service of God at the Assemblies of the Church, chap. viii.; having received from no hand any manner of satisfaction in the least of it. Whereby it will appear, that the Church hath power to limit the times of God's service upon this ground; because the occasions of the world suffer not Christians always to attend it, which, so oft as the Church shall find it possible, they are bound to do: and that the use of this power, as it is justified by the practice of the whole Church, so it is necessary to the advancement of godliness according to Christianity: nor can the effect thereof be superseded without hindering the service of God, whatsoever the strict keeping of the Lord's day may contribute to the same. Those times of persecution succeeded to the primitive Church: wherein it is altogether admirable to consider, how it was possible to reduce the whole body of Christians to an orderly course of so frequent service of God, as appeareth; the difficulties of assembling themselves being so great, as under persecution must needs be. Therefore, when the exercise of Christianity was free and peaceable; when all nations and languages, upon their conversion to Christianity, had made it their business, and set aside means, by which the service of God might be daily celebrated, and all men have opportunity to frequent the same, so far either as their occasions would give leave or their hearts to God mind them to frame their occasions: to take away this order, and to destroy the means of executing it, as either superstitious or superfluous; what is it else but that curse, which the Jews in their synagogues would have wished Christianity, when they met to curse Christ?

= § 9—44.
§ 31. And if all difference of days for the service of God [have been\textsuperscript{a}] taken away by Christianity, so that no office of it is at any time unacceptable (as the offices of Judaism were abominable, not upon their legal days); and the apostles have notwithstanding, for order's sake, that there might be a certain time inviolably dedicated to that purpose, set aside the first day of the week for it: shall we question, whether it was they, that instituted the solemnity of Easter holy-days, and consequently of Whitsuntide, in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord and the coming of the Holy Ghost, or not\textsuperscript{b}? For all the Lord's days in the year have the mark that stands on them from that one, on which our Lord rose again. And since we know, that the difference about keeping Easter is as ancient as the apostles\textsuperscript{p}; and that there could have been no ground for it, had not the Lord's day borne that mark at that time (the question being only, when the fast should end and the celebration of Easter come on): can any doubt remain, that the solemnity of Easter was then in use?

§ 32. And if it can be said, that the keeping of Easter for seven days (from whence, instead of the heathen names, the Christians called the days of the week feriam primam, se-
198 cundam, &c., et septimam\textsuperscript{q}), and the use to pray standing from Easter to Whitsuntide\textsuperscript{r}, were not original nor universal customs of the Church, but accessory and local; yet can it never be said, that there was any time or any part of the Church, that did not fast before Easter that fast, which they called Τεσσαρακοστήν in Greek, and Quadragesimam in Latin\textsuperscript{s};

\textsuperscript{a} Misprinted "being" in folio edition.
\textsuperscript{b} See Bingham, XX. v. and vi.: and Cave, Prim. Christ. c. vii. pp. 89—94.
\textsuperscript{p} See above, § 22: and Serv. of God at Rel. Assa., c. viii. § 21, 22.
\textsuperscript{s} So Gunning, On Lent Fast, pp. 19, sq., and Append. c. vi. pp. 232, sq.; Oxf. 1845 (1st. ed. 1662): and Beveridge, Cod. Can. Vindici., lib. iii. c. 7. pp. 593, sq., c. 9. § 3. p. 414. Lond. 1878. But Jeremy Taylor, Ductor Dubit., lib. iii. c. 4. rule xiii. § 4, sq. (Works, vol. x. pp. 340, sq. ed. Eden), argues at length, that (not the duration for forty days only, about which the case seems clear and generally admitted, but) the fast itself was not of apostolical origin (as do others also, quoted by Bingham,
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though I cannot say for forty days, as the name seems to import, πεντηκοστῇ signifying a sum of fifty days in the language of all Jews or Christians that write in Greek; for I have not on any hand any satisfaction in the words of Irenæus, the true reading whereof [maintained in my book of the Assemblies of the Church] seemeth to import, that in some places they fasted but forty hours before the feast of the resurrection. Tertullian, De Jejuniis cap. xiii., objecteth to the catholics, that they fasted the Easter fast "citra dies quibus ablatus est Sponsus"—"on this side the days on which the Bridegroom was taken away:" more days than our Lord was in the grave. But that is far from forty. That which is alleged for the forty days' fast out of Ignatius is not found in the true copy. Thus far the solemnity of Easter, and the fast before it, appear original; but not forty days.

§ 38. This will scarce allow that to be true, which the learned Selden, in his book De Anno Jud. vi. 21, produceth [out*] of his Eutychius; which saith, that the Christians after the ascension of our Lord, though they kept Easter when our Lord suffered and rose again, yet kept the fast of forty days


* Added from MS.

immediately after the Epiphany, as our Lord after His baptism (which they supposed fell on the day of His birth); and that, when Demetrius was bishop of Alexandria, by many letters and messages, that passed between him and Victor of Rome and the then patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch, it was agreed, that the order which hath since prevailed should take place.

§ 34. Much less will the said passages of Irenæus and Tertullian allow that, which the book of the popes' lives, compiled by Anastasius but out of the records of that Church, reports of Telesphorus;—that he ordered the Lent fast for seven weeks afore Easter:—rather signifying, that he ordered something about it, which later authors report according to that which was later in debate: for that was dispute in the time of Pius about keeping Easter (that is, ending the fast) on the Lord's day, or according to the Jews, may appear by the revelation which Hermes his Pastor pretendeth to that purpose; which Anastasius allegeth to that purpose. Therefore, though I can allow Eutychius no credit of historical truth, when he agreeoth not with authors which have that credit; yet, in a case where intelligence is wanting, I must needs think his relation considerable.

§ 35. It is well enough known, what Socrates hath discoursed for his opinion, that the Lent fast came in by mere custom, not by any order of the apostles; what he hath alleged of the visible practice of the Church in his time to that purpose, Eccles. Hist. v. 21. Sozomenus, vii. 198, more

---

Note: The text appears to be a continuation of a historical or theological discussion, possibly from a work on the laws of the Church.
particularly: that the Montanists fasted two weeks; some, three continual weeks; others, as much or more time as came to three weeks (which perhaps may save Socrates his credit, reporting, that at Rome three weeks; if it be true which Petitus hath observed, that Leo and St. Augustin say, that they fasted not the Tuesdays and Thursdays of Lent in their time); others, five, six, or seven. More he might have said. For the Christians of Syria, and Ethiopia, and the Copitites, begin their Ninive a week before Septuagesima: that is, their forty days' fast; because Jonas prophesied,

"Yet forty days and Ninive shall be destroyed." The variety seems to argue, that it came by degrees to this certain number of days, by the example of the clergy, the freedom of the people, and the authority of the Church.

§ 36. Which though I shall be glad to be informed further in, whether so or otherwise; yet—having settled from the beginning, that the chief difference between the apostles' western Church, even Rome itself, singled out to themselves among their forty days of abstinence, as Leo fitly calls it, twenty-one days or three weeks, for full fasts until the evening;" &c. Gunning, Lent Fast, p. 126: and see the whole passage. See however H. Valesius ad Socrat. H. E. v. 22.

a See Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb., c. viii. § 23. note e.

1 Quoted ibid.

b "Vident ergo Romani quid agant: ... apud quos ... quotusquis ... invenitur ... frequentat quotidiana jejunia? Maxime quia ibi jejunandum quintab Sabati non videtur. S. Aug., Epist. xxxvi. Ad Casulanum, c. v. § 9; Op. tom. ii. p. 71. E, F.

c Corrected from MS.; "others in five," in orig. text.


b See in note f above.—"Where- upon I assure myself, that both the
orders and those of the whole Church is the matter of them, determinable by common sense and the state of times to conduce or not to conduce to the end of God's service, for which it stands,—to me it makes not much difference, whether instituted by the apostles, or received by the whole Church: the power of the Church manifestly extending to it; and the solemnizing thereof being of such inestimable use, though not for the instructing of them that stood to be Christians, as in the primitive times, yet always for the profession and practice of penance, and for the reconciling of sinners to the communion of the eucharist at Easter. And, therefore, if I do not apply unto the forty days' fast (as to the fast before Easter I do apply) the rule of St. Augustin⁹, that—those things which the whole Church observeth, having no remembrance of the beginning of them, must be ascribed to the tradition of the apostles; yet I do apply unto them that other saying of St. Augustin⁹, which importeth, that to dispute against those things, which the whole Church observeth, is the height of madness.

§ 37. Nor is there any thing in that law unsuitable to Christianity, but that which the coming of the world into the Church necessarily enforceth:—that all are constrained to keep it; and so good Christians, notwithstanding the exception of the sick and impotent, may suffer for the refractory and profane, among whom they live: who, when it came first in use, no doubt were left to themselves; and to that, which the good example of the clergy moved them in conscience to undergo.

§ 38. The Church of England, I see, for the prejudices which that time was possessed with, could not undertake to restore the ancient custom of public penance at the beginning of Lent⁹. But when the Church professeth withal, [Nothing in it of itself unsuitable to Christianity.]


"In the primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that at the beginning of Lent such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance: . . . instead whereof (until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished) it is thought good," &c. Commination Service.—That the Presbyterianians deemed Lent a superstitious observance, see
how much it were for the souls’ health of all, that penance were restored; when it prescribeth a Commination against sinners, to charge upon particular consciences to exercise that themselves, which for preserving of unity it undertaketh not to impose upon all; when it ordereth those prayers for the service of that season, which cannot be said with a good conscience but by those, who in some measure apply themselves to these exercises: well may we grant, that the tares of false doctrine, springing up with the Reformation, have made these wholesome orders of little effect; but it must never be granted, that the Church of England maketh either the Lent fast or other times of fasting superstitious.

§ 39. As for the difference of meats; true it is, that St. Paul hath marked those, that “forbid marriage,” that enjoin “abstinence from meats, which God hath made to be received with thanksgiving by those that believe and know the truth;” as men of “lying spirits,” and teaching “the doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy with seared consciences” (1 Tim. iv. 1—3): but always understanding those followers of Simon Magnus, and Cerinthus; from whom the heretics, that succeeded, learned, that this world was not made by God, and that the bond of marriage came in by the spirits that made the world, whom we must escape by abstaining from some kinds of creatures. What Christian can dare to say with a good conscience, that the rule or custom of the Church to forbear those meats and drinks, that inflame the blood most, for the mortification of the flesh, hath any dependence upon those wicked blasphemies?

§ 40. Nay, who can read, that Daniel in his fastings “eat no pleasant meat;” but he must infer, that there is no fasting observed, where men observe no difference of meats? Look

---

[Example of Daniel, and of the Jewish constitutions.] [Dan. x. 3.]


* See Wordsworth’s Sermon of Evang. Repentance, Append. c. iii. “What our Church has done, and what she has wished to do, with a view to the practice of Penitential Discipline,” pp. 24—122. Oxlf. 1841: for ample proofs, that the “Church has done what she could, and gladly indeed would she have done more,” in this point.

* See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xii. § 10, sq.—Grotius (ad loc.) interprets the passage of the Pythagoreans, “quorum precipue erant magi,” and among whom “insignis crat Apollonius Tyanaeus, qui hie eximie notatur;” and of the Encratite and other heretics who followed them. Hammond (ad loc.) thinks these too late in point of time to be immediately intended, and agrees with Thordike in referring the passage to Simon Magnus and of course the Gnostics.
into the Jews' constitutions, and see how they observed
their fasts, and their festivals: you shall find it more ancient
than Christianity, to solemnize sabbaths (and proportionably
other festivals) with the best meats, the best drinks, the
best apparel, all things of the best; and, on the other side,
as much care, that there be nothing to signify or ground
any such construction upon their fasts and humiliations.
So that we may well ask those, that appoint their solemn
humiliations upon the sabbath7 (for so they will needs call
the Sunday, right or wrong), what religion they intend to be
of; neither Judaism nor Christianity having produced any
such sect, till our time.

§ 41. And therefore we must say, that those, who make a
difference of meats for conscience' sake,—as if all meats were
not God's creatures alike, or as if we held choice of meats to
be still the service of God, because once it entitled the Jews
to the land of promise,—are justly reproved by St. Paul;
adding in the place afore-named as a reason of the premisses,
"For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be re-
fused, if it be received with thanksgiving, being sanctified
by the word of God" (assuring us hereof) "and by prayer." But
if the meaning be further to say, that it is superstitious
to observe fasting with meats of less nourishment, that sig-
ify mourning, that effect the mortification of the flesh and
the concupiscences thereof; and that for conscience' sake, not
only in that regard, but in regard the Church hath
appointed it for that purpose: then must I say plainly, that

200 this doctrine, instead of reforming or maintaining the ser-
vice of God, is the author of that licentiousness which we see
come to pass.

§ 42. I will not here dispute, that there may not be
as much riot, as much contradiction to the end and purpose
of fasting, in eating of fish, as in flesh; especially allowing
wine and sweet-meats, as the Church of Rome doth8, to

---

2 See above, § 8, 12.
7 See above, § 6. note I.
8 Alexander Alensis (Summ. Theol.,
P. IV. Qu. xxviii. memb. viii. art. 1. § 3
and 4. tom. iv. pp. 783, 784. Col.
Agrip. 1622), answers the question,
"An vino de vite, vino de frumento, et
consimilibus, quae sunt cibus et potus,
jejunnium solvatur," by the resolution,
"Et quidem ante prandium sed non post
prandium;" and the question, "An esse
orum quae ad digestionem juvant, puta
specierum et electuariorum, &c., jejui-
nium solvatur," by the resolution,"Tum
solvitur, tum non soleitur, diversa ra-
tione:" proceeding to state his distinc-
those that are content to sublabor to other laws of it. For he, who maintains, that there is no fasting properly so called, where there is no difference made between meats; and those, that provoke the appetite and inflame the blood, are not laid aside; those, that signify mourning best, are not used: maintains, that it is not properly fasting, where only fish is served, if the quality or the quantity of that which is served may serve for feasting. And such customs as those are mere irregularities, which the rule and practice of the primitive Church no way alloweth: all the diet which it granted, being only exceptions from total abstinence, to sustain nature and to maintain health; which no religion destroyeth, and therefore excepteth weak ages and constitutions from this strictness.

§ 43. The granting of fish, above bread and water and salt and herbs, is an abatement of the primitive strictness: which Clemens Alexandrinus reports [of] St. Matthew, Pædagog. ii. 1; Hegesippus in Eusebius, of St. James of Jerusalem, Hist. Eccles. ii. 23; and St. Augustin, Adversus Faustum, libro [x]xx. d: "caena pura," in Irenæus, that is to say,

tions at length.—See also Chemnitius, Exam. Conc. Trid., P. iv. § De jejunio (p. 114. Francof. 1578); and the other Romanist authorities besides Alex. Alensis there quoted.
a Added from MS.

d "Christianoi, non hararetici sed Catholici, edomandi corporis causa, proper animam in orationibus amplius humilierant, non quot illa esse immunda credant, non solum a carnibus verum a quibusdam etiam terræ fructibus abstinent; vel semper, sicut pauci, vel certis diebus atque temporibus, sicut perenni Quadragisimam ferum omnes, quanto magis quisque vel minus seu voluerit seu potuerit." S. Aug., Cont. Faustum Manichæum, lib. xxx. c. 5; Op., tom. viii. p. 447. E, F.

a supper without any thing of a living creature at it, being the same that "parasceue" or Friday. And if we may reasonably imagine, that the cold climate wherein we live, and the spending of our bodies by the air, requireth more effectual restoratives than the eastern countries, from whence these practices first came; yet to make fasting and forbid difference of meats, will always be things contradictory: to abate of that difference by little and little, acknowledging the general ground of it, will be but the same that may be observed in all exercises of Christianity;—that the strictness thereof decayed by degrees, in succeeding times, from that which was practised from the beginning under the apostles.

§ 44. For the measure of fasting in the ancient Church was also till three in the afternoon; which the more devout extended (with the Jews) until the appearing of the stars, and that the Montanists would have imposed upon the Church for a law declared by their prophets. Now in all these western parts (at least according to practice, whatsoever be the rule) it is granted, that fasting is but eating one meal a day, though it be at noon; not denying the collation at night, nor every where (no not at Rome itself) a draught of drink in the morning, and a bit of bread, lest that draught do harm. And this is called the fast of the vened bread. Scaliger in answer (as above quoted, and De Emend. Temp. p. 533, and in the Addenda Prole- gomenia ed. 1598;) alleges it to be so called "non quia careat carnisus sed quia religiosis et dicis causa fit."

See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. viii. § 26, 36; and Bingham, XXI. i. 15, 25; iii. 3—5.


Chennuti, as quoted above in § 42. note z, pp. 114. b, 115. a, describes the then Roman custom to be this,—1. to say vespers two hours after midday, and then to consider themselves at liberty to dine,—"Antonius vero dicit, modo sexta, hoc est, meridiana hora transierit, posse diebus jejuniis cibum sumi, hoc est, cœnari in meridie;"—this in general, but that in Lent also, "vespertino officio ante meridiem decantato, libere comedunt, . . . fictione juris, sicut Summa Angelica dicit." 2. "Post
Of the Keeping of Our Lord's Birthday.

Church; in opposition to the fast of nature, prescribed to those that celebrate and receive the eucharist, even from physic, and any thing that may be received afore. But these are abatements, which no rule or custom of the ancient Church justifieth. Only, when more cannot be obtained, it is requisite rather to cherish such a measure as can be maintained, than to let all order go under pretence of Christian liberty; which is indeed abandoning ourselves to sensuality, by casting off the rules which oblige us to mortify natural concupiscence.

§ 45. In the next place, it is a marvel to see, how ready men are to embrace a slight plea, why the solemnity of our Lord's birth should not be observed; though in the end tale prandium, deinde sub vesperam non cœnæ sumunt, sed collationem (ut loquuntur) faciunt Pontifici, ut scilicet mensa non sollenniter sternatur, sed tantum mantili circumposito confectiones, electuaria, placentæ, ficus, boletinuces, &c., præsertim in confectionibus imponuntur, addito bono vino:—adding further from Petrus de Palude, that "si quæ etiam mare non propter volupatem sed per modum medicinæ, ne defeceret in die jejunii, ante horum comestionis vinum biberet, vel ficus et aliquid hujusmodi praebibaret, non frangeret jejunium; sed hoc, inquit (Petrus), vulgo non est prædicandum. Richardus vero ita disputat, Quamvis aliqui dicant quod die jejunii bibere vinum vel cerevisiam mane, et comedere electuaria de sero, delectationis causa, frangit jejunium, ego tamen, inquit, credo contrarium, quia quamvis illa aliquo modo nutrant, in hoc tamen non est principaliorem eorum usus. Antonius vero recitatis illis scholasticorum disputationibus addit, Sed communis usus Christianorum est, diebus jejunii facere collationem de sero, et aliquid parum sumere cum potu, sine tali consideratione, an per modum medicinæ sumatur."—Bellarmine, De Bonis Opp. in Partic., lib. ii. De Jejunio, c. 1; Controv. tom. iii. pp. 1362. C., 1383. A.—id., De Missa lib. ii. c. 14 (ibid. tom. ii. p. 1110. A.), allows, besides cases of necessity, that "qui inter abluendum aliquas aquas guttas traje cerit ad stomachum, non cenetur solvisse jejunium," referring to S. Thom. Aquinas P. III. Qu. lxxx. art. 8: an exception which may serve to prove the strictness of the rule.—"Jejunium ecclesiasticum... definiri solet abstinentiam cibi secundum Ecclesiæ regulam assumpta,"—Bellarm., De Jejunio, as before, p. 1383. A. He distinguishes also (ibid. p. 1382. B.C.) the jejunium spirituale et morale; which explain themselves, being simply abstinence respectively from vice and from intemperance. The latter appears to be called also by the schoolmen the jejunium virtutis: see Chemnitus, as before quoted p. 119. a. Other distinctions respecting fasts may be found in Du Fresne, Glossary, sub voce Jejunium; and the passages of the fathers, in Suicer, Thesaur., sub voce Ἴμπραχθή.

1 In the Phoenix, vol. i. pp. 114, sqq., is reprinted a short tract by one R. S. in 1649, entitled, "Christ's Birth Misstimated; or a Resolution of the Rt. Homble, the Lord Carew's Question touching the true time of the Conception and Birth both of John Baptist and also of our Saviour: proving that Jesus Christ was not born
they forfeit the credit of their skill in reforming by discovering their ignorance.

§ 46. Joseph Scaliger, a very learned man and much studied in chronology, thinking that he had found the true

in December:” in which, assuming that the priests’ courses began with the year, it is inferred (after Scaliger’s first argument in the De Emend. Temp. as below in note m), that Zacharias’ time would come round about June, consequent John’s birth in March, consequently our Lord’s in September, about the time of the Feast of Tabernacles. This tract was answered by another, entitled Christ’s Birth not Misstimated, Lond. 1649, by John (afterwards Bishop) Pearson (in his Minor Theol. Works, vol. ii. pp. 153, sq. ed. Churton, and see Churton’s notes). And another tract in defence of Christmas day, by J. Heming in 1654, is in Some Tracts ed. Scott, vol. vi. pp. 3—21. The eccentric Hugh Broughton likewise dates our Lord’s nativity at the Feast of Tabernacles in September, giving however none but topical reasons for his assertion, such as the “unlikeness” of shepherds being in the fields at night in midwinter, &c. &c. (Corruptions in our Handling of Religion, Works, tom. iii. c. ii. p. 589, Lond. 1662, a tract first published in 1604). And Lightfoot also (Harmony of the New Test., sect. vi. Works, vol. i. p. 204, and Harriet’s Exerc. on S. Matt., c. ii. Works, vol. ii. p. 107) affirms the Nativity to have taken place in September; but gives nothing that can be called a reason for it. Upon Dec. 19, 1644, Christmas happening to fall on the monthly fast, the parliament passed an order, that “whereas some doubts have been raised, whether the next fast shall be celebrated, because it falls on the day which heretofore was usually called the feast of the nativity of our Saviour; the Lords and Commons in parliament assembled do order and ordain, that public notice be given, that the fast appointed to be kept the last Wednesday in every month ought to be observed” (Neal’s Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 4. p. 116. Lond. 1754). In the previous year the London ministers had determined, after a meeting held, by a small majority, to preach upon Christmas-day (Neal, ibid., from Dr. Lightfoot). June 8, 1647, the parliament passed another ordinance,—that “forasmuch as the feast of the Nativity of Christ, Easter, Whitsuntide, and other festivals, commonly called holy-days, have been heretofore superstitionally used and observed, be it ordained that the said feasts and all other festivals be no longer observed as festivals” (Neal, ibid. c. 8. p. 286). Upon which ordinance see King Charles the first’s pertinent question, in his Works, p. 188.—Evelyn in his Diary mentions the non-observance of Christmas-Day in England for several years after his return thither from abroad, viz., from 1652 onwards.—See also Hammond’s Answ. to Six Quæres &c., Answ. to the Sixth Qu., Of the Observance of Christmas-Day and the other Festivals of the Church, sect. 55, sq. Works, vol. i. pp. 656, 657 (first printed in 1653); and Practical Catechism, lib. ii. sect. 12. pp. 186—196. Oxf. 1847.
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year of Christ’s birth, which had not been preserved past question in any record of the Church (for the world, when it was not Christian, counted not by the time of Christ’s coming, as now it doth), bethought himself, that, by count-
ing the courses of the priests in the temple from the cleans-
ing thereof by Judas Maccabæus (the year and the month and day whereof is certain), he might attain to the day, that the course of Abia, whereof Zachary was, being the first course (Luke i. 5), came on to minister in the temple (the twenty-four divisions spending twenty-four times seven days, in one course, certain); and by consequence the day of the annunciation six months after, and the day of our Lord’s birth nine months after that: at least for the month and season of the year, though not to a day: and accordingly found, that our Lord was born about the feast of tabernacles with the Jews, in September, being a figure of the tabernacle of His Flesh.

§ 47. Though this was ingeniously argued; yet, had it proved true, it had been an unsufferable levity in any man, to infer the dissolution of order in the service of God and the peace of His Church upon the supposition of it. For who ever heard the Church declare, that the celebration of our Lord’s birth on the twenty-fifth of December proceeds upon supposition that He was indeed born that day; so that, sup-
posing it uncertain on what day He was born, it was to be celebrated on no day? What reason, what sense can justify such a consequence: when the circumstance of time is not considerable towards the end of festivals, which is the service of God; but only as an occasion for the Church to take of assembling Christians. Not as among the Jews; whose solemnities, having dependence upon the land of promise and the temporal promises thereof, if they kept not the due sea-
son of the year, were indeed abominable.

§ 48. Those therefore, that would persuade us, that there is any fault in solemnizing the remembrance of Christ’s birth*, ought first to shew us (if they mean any good to our common Christianity), that the birth of Christ is not a fit occasion of assembling Christian people to serve God with the offices of Christianity: which if they should go about,

* See above, § 45. note l.
they might well blush to remember that, having been so zealous to cry up market-days for fit occasions of God’s service⁹, wherein there is so much appearance of worldly profit by increase of trade and commerce of people, they should have so little regard to that consideration, upon which all the matter of all Christian assemblies depends, as not to think it a just occasion of assembling God’s people.

§ 49. It is true, indeed, there hath been some difference in the observation of the Church about the day, the sixth of January having heretofore been observed in some parts of the Church for the day of Christ’s birth as well as of His baptism⁹; which probably came from the Gospel, saying that our Lord was baptized at thirty years of age (Luke iii. 23), and giving thereby occasion to place both upon one and the same day. This you shall find in Cassian, Collat. x. 1⁹. And where Ammianus, xxix., relateth of Julian, that, not willing as yet to declare himself apostate, he came forth to church “die epiphaniorum”—“upon the epiphany;” Zonaras⁹, reporting the same, saith, “upon the nativity;” not because it was so held and observed in the west: but because Zonaras, a Greek, relates it as the east accounted it. And this was the ground for the twelve days, when the twenty-fifth of December prevailed over the east: which was lately come to pass in St. Chrysostom’s time; as it is well known, that Scaliger⁹ hath observed.

---

* Neal (Hist. of Puritans, vol. i. c. 5. p. 593) quotes Bp. Montague’s Injunctions in 1638, directed against lectures “of combination” (among others), “when the neighbouring ministers agreed to preach by turns at an adjoining market-town on market-days.” —See also Fell’s Life of Hammond, p. xxiij.; pref. to his Pract. Catech., Ox. 1847.

† The greatest part of the Eastern Church so kept it, for “three or four of the first centuries.” see Bingham, XX. iv. 2. Some persons are mentioned by S. Clement of Alexandria who kept the Nativity upon May 25, and the Basilidians he says dated the birth of Christ upon April 24 or 25: see authorities in Bingham, ibid. 1; and Selden, De Syned. Vet. Ebror., lib. iii. c. 15. § 9, Works, vol. i. pp. 1819, 1820.

⁹ “Peracto epiphaniorum die, quem provinciae illius” (viz. Egypt) “sacer-
§ 50. But what will half-sighted ignorance plead for the great boldness, which it taketh, of innovating in the orders of the Church upon a supposition always conjectural, and [now] acknowledged false by all chronologers? For could ever any man assure, but upon probable conjecture, that Judas Maccabæus did begin the service of the temple rather with the first order, than with that at which it left off three years afore, which every man remembered? But time having since discovered, that it was not the true year of Christ's birth, upon which Scaliger thought He was born; so far is this ignorance from any plea for itself, that it may well be a warning to the like boldness to be better informed, before they undertake to reform.

§ 51. For now they are to advise, how to answer Bucherius the Jesuit; who, by counting the courses of the priests from the dedication under Judas to the true year of Christ's birth,
hath found the time of it to fall near the twenty-fifth of December, from the annunciation of Zachary, being of the course of Abia. And the lord primate's late Annals maintain the twenty-fifth of December for the true day of our Lord's birth, delivered by St. Peter to the Church of Rome, upon the credit of the records of the taxes then extant at Rome, and alleged by Tertullian: though the same tradition was not preserved in the eastern Churches; in so much that, till St. Chrysostom's time, all the Churches agreed not in the day upon which they solemnized it.

§ 52. Now, if there be so great reason, why the Lent fast should go before the feast of Easter, to prepare all the world to renew the purpose and profession of their Christianity by the exercise of devotion and penance, as well as to prepare those that stood for their Christianity to their baptism at Easter, which was for many ages the custom of the Church; how can it be denied, that the solemnity of Advent, before the celebration of Christ's birth, is an order fit to provide the like means and opportunities and advantages for the advancement and improvement of Christianity by the like exercises?

§ 53. Nor shall I need further to dispute for the observing of Wednesdays and Fridays, or Saturdays, with those that have admitted the premises;—that the Church may and ought to set aside certain days for the service of God, in fasting and penance for our own unworthiness, as well as in feasting and rejoicing for God's goodness. For since our transgressions have their recourse, as sure as the remembrance of our Lord's rising again; is it for the advantage or for the disadvantage of Christianity, that the Friday should be observed for the service of God by humbling ourselves in the sight of our sins,

The 2nd Part of Abp. Usher's Annales, extending from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes to the destruction of the Temple, was first published vol. Lond. 1654: and our Lord's birth is dated in it at the close of the year of the Julian Period 4709, A.M. 4000, and so that the Circumcision falls in the year of the same Period 4710, before the Vulgar Christian era respectively 5 and 4 (p. 531; and Works, vol. x. p. 473). And in his Chronologia Sacra, P. i. (Works, vol. xi. p. 489), not however published until after Thordike's Epilogue, viz. in 1660, he names the day itself, viz. Dec. 25. A.M. 4000. But in neither work is there the least mention of the evidence above referred to for the fact. Probably the reference was meant to be to Hammond, as cited above in § 45, note 1, who does urge all the topics mentioned above. And see also § 49. note 1. Cawdrey, who answered Hammond in 1654, says nothing of Usher.

* See Dufresne, Gloss., sub voc. Adventus, and Wheatly, c. v. § viii. sect. 1.
* See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. viii. § 26, 33: and Bingham, XX. iii., and XXI. iii.
* See above, § 24.
as the Lord's day for His service by setting forth His praises
in the sight of His mercies? And seeing the Jews from
before our Lord's time observed Mondays and Thursdays for
their private and public humiliations, and the more solemn
days of assembling in their synagogues, as I have shewed
there; and that the Christians have always observed Wednes
days and Fridays to the like purposes: it seems to remain
certain thereby, that the translation of the days is the act
of the apostles, seeking those days which were alike distant
from the Lord's day, as those which the Jews observed were
from the sabbath; because no reason will allow, that after
the time of the apostles, the breach between the Church and
the synagogue being completed, Christians should imitate the
orders of the Jews, and all agree in it. It must therefore be
concluded, that the observation of Wednesdays and Fridays
is from the apostles: though the fasting upon Saturday, which
the west observeth, come from the custom of the Church of
Rome; which the rest of the west hath conformed itself to
in succeeding ages.

§ 54. Of the observation of the saints' memories, and the
days on which the martyrs suffered, which the ancient Church
called their birth-days, to wit, into a better world; I shall
not say much, for the reason alleged before. Only this; that
those, who think not so eminent accidents sufficient occasions
for the Church to meet upon for the service of God in the
offices of that Christianity, which they either died in or for,
whatsoever they may pretend of their zeal for Christianity,
cannot pretend towards that Christianity, in and for which
they either lived or died. For to what purpose tendeth that
Christianity, the seeds whereof were sown in their lives and
examples or in their deaths and sufferings; but that God may
be glorified in the service of His name by those, that do study
to imitate those patterns thereof, which they have set us? I

* Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb.,
c. viii. § 19, 20, 30: Rt. of Ch. in Chr.
St., c. iv. § 14.
* Corrected from MS.; "Thursdays,"
in orig. text.
* See Albaspinaeus, as cited in
Serv. of God. at Rel. Assemb., c. ii.
§ 6, note i: Cave, Primitive Chris
tianity, c. vii. pp. 83—86: and the well
known story of S. Ambrose fasting at
Rome upon the Saturday but not at
Milan, at which latter place the eastern
custom prevailed; ap. S. Aug., Lib. i.
tom. ii. p. 124. E. F.—Cosin affirms
the Saturday fast to have been still
kept in the English Church in his time
* See quotations in Bingham, XIII.
ix. 5, XX. vii. 8.
* Above, § 30, 36.
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deny not, that there may come a burden upon the Church by multiplying the number of festival days, and that there might be and was reason, why it should be abated; but never, that there is superstition, either in the service of God, or in the circumstance of it, and occasion of celebrating it, upon the remembrance of God’s saints.

§ 55. Neither will I say any more for the fasts of ember weeks, and of the Rogations; since I understand not, what quarrel there can be to the occasions of them in particular, if it were agreed, that there is due ground for the setting apart of certain times for the service of God, whether as fasts or festivals.

§ 56. Nor of the hours of the day, or the deputing of them to the service of God, whether in public or in private. For what will those, that pretend so much to the Scriptures, answer to those testimonies of the Old and New Testament; whereby I have proved, that the people of God did set aside the third, sixth, and ninth hour of the day for that purpose? that the apostles of our Lord followed the same custom? that the Church hath always done the same? all this while, supposing morning and evening prayer over and above, as brought in by Adam, or by Abraham, as the Jews will have it. Whereupon the Christians in St. Cyprian’s time, as appears by his book De Oratione, had recourse to God five times a day: till afterwards, as it is fit that Christianity go beyond Judaism in the service of God, the custom being taken up by the more devout (whereof St. Cyprian makes mention in the same place) of rising by night to praise God (according to the prophet David, Psalm cxix. 62, “At midnight I will rise to praise Thee because of Thy righteous judgments”), and the evening service requiring some exercise as well at going to bed as in closing the evening (which was called the Compline, as the complement of the day’s service), the service of
God, whether public or private, became divided into seven hours; which upon these grounds were very reasonably counted canonical, according to the same prophet David, Psalm cxix. 164, “Seven times a day will I praise Thee because of Thy righteous judgments.”

§ 57. In fine, there can no question be made, that the law of regular hours of the day for prayer is evidently grounded upon the Scriptures, evidently authorized by the practice, not only of the Church, but of God’s ancient people. And, therefore, to make the Reformation to consist in abolishing that law, is to make the Reformation to consist in abolishing God’s service. And this I think enough to be said in this abridgment; seeing I am no further to enter into debate of the particulars, than the justifying of the general ground requires: only remembering that, which I have said already, —that the obligation is the same, whether the particulars may appear to have been established by the apostles or received into the general practice of the Church; the power of the apostles supposing the being of Christianity, which their work was to preach, and extending no further than the settling of it in the community of the Church by the order of God’s service; which the alteration of the state and condition of the Church must needs make changeable, as well as that which the whole Church should introduce: —so that —whether the apostles, or the Church authorized by the apostles, have introduced an order within the compass of God’s law (that is, the substance of Christianity), in the observation whereof the unity of the Church in the service of God, which is the end of all order in the Church, consisteth,—it shall equally oblige every Christian to maintain
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CHAP. XXI.

and cherish it, upon the crime of schism to be incurred, in case any breach fall out by violating the same.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE PEOPLE OF GOD TIED TO BUILD SYNAGOGUES, THOUGH NOT BY THE LETTER OF THE LAW. THE CHURCH TO PROVIDE CHURCHES, THOUGH THE SCRIPTURE COMMAND IT NOT. PRESCRIBING THE FORM OF GOD’S PUBLIC SERVICE, IS NOT QUENCHING THE SPIRIT. THE PSALTER IS PRESCRIBED THE CHURCH FOR GOD’S PRAISES. THE SCRIPTURES PRESCRIBED TO BE READ IN THE CHURCH. THE ORDER OF READING THEM TO BE PRESCRIBED BY THE CHURCH.

Now, as for the determination of certain places for the service of God, I cannot see how there is or can be generally and absolutely any dispute, whether or no there ought to be places set apart for that purpose, so that all Christians may know where to resort to serve God; the matter being so evident to the common reason of all men, that to make any scruple about it, in regard that there is no precept of God’s law for it written, either to the Jews in the Old Testament, or the Christians in the New, were to make a doubt whether God gave His law to reasonable creatures or not.

§ 2. Indeed, in the Old Testament, there is a precept for all God’s people, to resort to "the place" where He "should choose to place His Name" for the offering of their burnt-sacrifices and oblations, which He thereby makes abominable any where else to be offered. But this might have been a colour to have pretended, that God had forbidden (so far from requiring) all other religious assemblies of His people, or any places to be set apart for that purpose: had not His prophets and the governors of His people understood from the beginning the difference between His spiritual and carnal law, answerable to the difference between the kingdom of heaven and the land of promise; and that, though the ceremonial service of God in the temple could not be so
parted from His spiritual service, that the place to which the one was confined should exclude the other, yet the spiritual service of God was to extend to those places, from whence His figurative and ceremonial service stood excluded by the Law. It is no marvel then, if for a time (the acts 204 whereof we read in the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Samuel) sacrifices were offered in the high places; that is, in other places deputed to the service of God, besides that where the ark of the covenant stood: whether we suppose, that the choice, which God by the Law had intimated that He would make, of a place where He intended to settle His service, were not executed all the while before the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem and the building of the temple there; or whether there was a conditional purpose of God of settling His service in the tribe of Ephraim at Shiloh, declared unto His people, which obliged them to resort thither (as we see they did by the beginning of Samuel), but that, this purpose being declared void by the captivity of the ark, the high places came to be permitted again, as before the ark had begun to settle in Shiloh.

§ 3. In the mean time, I hold the opinion neither blameable nor improvable, which the best learned do advance for the beginning of synagogues in the land of promise (that is to say, of places where the people might and were to assemble for the service of God, which was not confined to the ark); to wit, that these high places were afterwards deputed to the residence of prophets and their disciples, and to that service of God which all Israel could not be present.

at in the temple: though those, that submitted not to the Law as the determination of God's choice to Jerusalem, did not cease to offer sacrifices and burn incense in the high places; especially in such times, when idolatry was grown so strong, that it could not be punished by exterminating those cities that were found to have a hand in it; according to the Law, Deut. [xiii. 12—16]. For it is evident, that offering sacrifice in the high places was a great mean to palliate idolatry; and for that reason had been forbidden by the Law. But what reason hath any man to reject this opinion, having no better evidence for any other place or opportunity for any religious assembly of God's people, but only that before the ark, for so long time? Indeed, in those psalms that are entitled to Asaph, from lxxiii. to lxxiii., there is mention more than once of other houses of God besides the temple. But of those psalms, and the author and time of them, there is difficulty made, whether written by Asaph, or afterwards given to his posterity to sing in the temple. For seeing they not only seem to point out Nebuchadnezzar by "the wild boar out of the wood" (lxxx. 13), but also the time when they had no prophets (lxxiv. 9); either we must grant, that these things are said by the spirit of prophecy, or that they were written in after times. I do indeed continue rather of the former judgment. But I spare not to allege the uncertainty for an evidence, how far they were from having any written law for the building of synagogues; which nevertheless was a thing so necessary for maintenance of their religion, and the service of God according to it, that no man in his right senses can question, whether they were tied to it or not.

§ 4. Be it therefore uncertain, how far synagogues were propagated in the land of promise before the Babylonian captivity. For after the return, which is the foot of account

Ps. lxxxiii. 12.—See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. ii. § 18.

"Thine enemies roar in the midst of Thy congregations." Ps. lxxiv. 4.—"All the synagogues of the land." Ps. lxxiv. 8. Bible version.—"The Lord loveth the gates of Sion more than all the tabernacles of Jacob." Ps. lxxx. 2. (interpreted by Lud. Molinèus, as above, of synagogues).—"Let us take to ourselves the houses of God in possession." Ps. lxxxiii. 12.

\* E.g. Junius refers Ps. lxxiv. to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes: see Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. ii. § 18. note x. So also Piscator, ad Ps. lxxiv. (ap. Poli Syn.). And see Munster, and Clarius, on the same Psalm; ap. Crit. Sac. tom. iii. pp. 3839, 3841.
for the time, from whence all idolatry was detestableness by them; from this time, when their dispersions among the nations began together with their detestation of their idolatries, be it resolved, both that they did take upon them the building of synagogues for that service not confined to the temple, which they found themselves tied to frequent, and that they ought so to do.  

§ 5. Now when Christianity first came in, not severed from Judaism, but distinguished by some offices, namely of baptism and the eucharist, that is to say, by such prayers as were made at both; it is no marvel, that the Christians, frequenting the service of God together with the Jews either in the temple or in the synagogue, did content themselves to celebrate the offices proper to Christianity in private houses. For I confess, when St. Luke says, that they "broke bread," that is, "celebrated the eucharist," as the Syriac translates it, "κατ' ὁλοκλ.," that is, "at home," or "from house to house," Acts ii. 46; I rather think this was done in private houses: though Epiphanius might be my author, that they had houses set apart for that purpose, if I meant to strain mine opinion beyond the evidence of it.

§ 6. But of the Church of Corinth I say not the same; where I find no appearance by St. Paul's Epistles, that there was any correspondence between the Jews and the Chris-

[Christians at first worshipped in private houses.]

[But churches at Corinth in St. Paul's time.]


1 In the Biblia Polyglot. tom. v. p. 524, the Syriac words are rendered merely by "domini frangiant placetam."

2 So Grotrius, ad loc.: "Deni aut vicieni simul ad mensam convenienciat in sedibus ad id commodissimis:"—rendering the word (with the Vulgate) "circa domos;" but speaking (on the previous clause of the verse) of the "peculiares cætus" of the Christians, "tanquam synagogas," in distinction from their meetings in the temple.

3 "Multitudo eorum qui Joan nomem de'erant Christo Hierosolymis iam tum procudibus prorsus requirebant ut ad communem illum convictum placres ad id domus commodas deligerentur; sicut videmus in urbis populosis ecclesiis cujusque civitatis in plures ρωματα distributam." Beza, ad loc.: proceeding to reject Erasmus' translation—"per singulam domos" (Beza himself translates, "domatim")—as ambiguous, "quoniam singularem domorum appellazione cujusque domus privatae signiferat, qua interpretatione communis illae in sedibus certis, quot opus fuit, convictus tolli videretur."—But Mede, in his Discourse upon "Cherches, that is, Appropriate Places for Christian worship, both in and ever since the Apostles' time" (Works, Bk. II. pp. 408—410; first publ. in 1638), is even more decided, translating κατ' ὁλοκλ. neither "domatim" nor "per domos," but as equivalent to εν ὁλοκλ., in the house, i.e. the one particular ἀνεφών or cenaculum which he maintains to have been appropriated from the first to Christian worship.

In the paging of the folio edition pp. 207, 208, are inserted by mistake between pp. 204, 205; being repeated again in their proper place after p. 206.
tians, or any expectation that the service of God according to Christianity, succeeding Judaism, might convert synagogues into churches. And when St. Paul says, 1 Cor. xi. 22,—"Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame those that have not?v—not only the antithesis between "houses to eat and drink in," and "the church of God," but also the difference between "shaming the poor," and "despising the church of God," seems to require, that a "church" there signify a church?; that is, the place, not the people: though not doubting, that the assemblies of the Christians were there held many times in ordinary houses and upper rooms, Acts i. 13; xx. 8; but finding the Church at Corinth so well settled, that, if those of Jerusalem contributed their estates to the maintenance of the people of the Church, no man can marvel, that they should disburse for a church.

§ 7. How far, then, the Church began to be possessed of[And places set apart for the offices of Christianity, seems to depend upon two points, severally in several places; the probability of persecution, and the compliance with Judaism: unless those two be reducible to one, in regard of the great appearance, that at the beginning all probability of persecution depended upon the interruption of compliance and correspondence with the Jews. This all reason justifieth, that the Christians, so far as there was appearance of probability that they might enjoy the liberty of meeting at certain known places, did from the beginning set apart certain places for that purpose, either upon contribution of the Churches, or upon the liberal devotion of particular persons†. And for the proof of this I think I need no more than the visible example of the Jews, and the advantage which their religion and the truth of God had found by having set places, to which not only their own might resort to serve God out of a profession of His truth, but even the gentiles be won from the worship of idols, by becoming acquainted with the profession which they celebrated at such certain places. The effect of this advantage is evident to us

---

8 See Mede and Fuller as before quoted: and Selden, De Syned. Vet. Ebreeor., lib. iii. c. 15, Op. tom. i. pp. 1796, sq.; who cites numerous authorities to the same purpose.
by the Acts of the Apostles, and the mention which there we find of their preaching in the Jews’ synagogues. For commonly there is also mention of “devout men,” and “devout women,” and “such as worshipped God,” of the gentiles; being indeed those, that were converted from the worship of idols to the true God, Whom the Jews worshipped. And therefore St. Paul, when he sheweth that Christianity had the like advantage by the resort of gentiles unto their assemblies, 1 Cor. xiv. 28, makes me think it still more probable, that they had then at Corinth certain known places, set apart for their assemblies. Only I will add the evidence of common sense, how much more opportunity there must needs be for companies that are grown numerous to assemble in certain known places set apart for that use, than in ordinary houses, serving for other purposes.

§ 8. And therefore, though I believe, that there is still mention in such records as the Church hath left, of assemblies held in ordinary houses (that is to say, that there is many times mention of the assemblies of Christians, in the lives of the saints and the acts of martyrs, in private houses, and not in churches); yet of the titles and cemeteries of the Church of Rome I do not believe the like. For this word “title,” necessarily importeth a mark set upon a place, set aside for church-goods to church-uses: it being then a visible custom in the world, for those things, that became the exchequer’s by some title of right, to have marks set upon them, challenging them upon that title; and this being the reason of the name. Neither is it necessary, that this mark should be a cross without, as the Cardinal Baronius imagines, which might discover them to persecutors; seeing the mark might be visible, though only to Christians, witnessing the consecrating of the place to that distinct use. There is no cause, then, to discredit that which we have immediately from Anastasius, because he had the best and the ancientest

---


*b* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xvi. § 42.

*c* Quoted ibid., note n.

*d* Quoted in Serv. of God at Rel.
records of [that] Church for his materials;—that Pope Evaristus, so near our Lord, divided the titles, that is, the churches then extant, among his presbyters. For whereas Cornelius, in his letter to Fabius, Bishop of Antiochia, in Eusebius, which I speak of elsewhere, tells him, that the Church of Rome had then six and forty priests; Optatus in his second Book affirms, that the Christians had in Rome, when the Donatists first came thither, "quadranginta basilicas et quod excurrat"—"forty fair churches and upwards." For those houses, which Christians having consecrated to the use of the Church, a room was reserved in for Divine service, were afterwards turned into better buildings, merely for the service of God, and not for the retiring of Christians in time of persecutions. Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. viii. 21, shews us, that, afore the persecution of Diocletian, the Christians in all cities had raised new buildings from the very foundations, because the old received not their assemblies. So near then comes the number of churches at the Donatists' coming to Rome, to the number of priests in Cornelius his time. So near comes this agreement to justify the distribution of titles under Evaristus.

§ 9. As for the burying places of Christians (which their faith must need[s] require them to keep distinct from the sepulchres of them who had it not, whether within or without their cities), who can deny, that it was a great opportunity for the celebrating of their assemblies? Especially the remains of them near Rome, that are yet extant, witnessing, what means there was, both for their refuge there in the time of persecution, and also for the solemnizing of the offices of Christianity: as you may see by those things which Cardinal Baronius relating.

Assembl., c. xi. § 2. note y. And see Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 21, 22.
* Corrected from MS.; "the," in orig. text.
[Diagrapheis tais mureous eklogei thiesunagogas kal tais pleros tais kata xasan polin droumata tais tis eisowmous en tois prosenepiriono tois sundromas; "en de ekseis eisomai eti tois palaios oikodomeusin arxwmen, eisoriais eis platos eti xasan tais polies eis themeliados ekklisias." Euseb., H, E., lib. viii. c. 1. (2 in the text is a mistake) p. 292. B.

k Annal, in an. 226. numm. vii.—xi.; where he reckons up 43 Christian
§ 10. I alleged afore the sentence of the emperor Alexander Severus about a place questionable between the Christians and the taverners: being very confident, that no reason will allow, that this place could be otherwise adjudged to the Christians than as belonging to the Church of the place.

§ 11. I know we have many places alleged out of Origen, Arnobius, Lactantius, and others, to shew that Christians then had no temples. But the effect of them lies in the word templum, vaōs, ἱερὸν, signifying stately fabrics, built for the magnifying of the professed religion by those who built them; which the Christians could not then do, when their religion was not allowed. In the mean time, places for the opportunity of assembling themselves, which Arnobius and Ammianus call "conventicula," they have no more then been supposed to have, than that we have no more Christians.

§ 12. And that before Constantine they had those fabrics, which might bear the name of "templa," or "basilicæ," because for the bulk and beauty of them answerable to the tem-
ples of the heathen gods or the great men's palaces among the Romans, some whereof perhaps were by that time dedicated to be churches, the same Lactantius may be my witness, where he mentioneth such a one at Nicomedia; "Ego, cum in Bithynia oratorias literas accitus docerem, contingissetque, ut codem tempore Dei templum everletur"—"I," saith he, "being sent for into Bithynia and teaching eloquence, when it fell out that the temple of God was pulled down." This was one of those fair buildings, which Eusebius spoke of, set up before the persecution of Diocletian and pulled down by it. And besides the place quoted afore, Optatus, lib. i.; where, speaking of the bishops that made the [sect] of the Donatists after the persecution of Diocletian, he saith, that they met in council at Carthage "in domo Urbani Carissii:" giving for a reason, "Nondum enim erant basiliae restituta"—"Because the palaces were not restored" to the Church, therefore they met in a private house.

§ 13. And truly it were a thing so barbarous, Cyclopal [No question can be made, but that Christians ought to have certain known places to meet at for the service of God, that I will not suppose, that the question is about that point amongst us, whatsoever noise may have been made in this confusion amongst us: but, rather, that the difference is about having stately fabrics, for magnifying of the religion which we profess; about the manner of building them, according to the importance of those offices for which they are built; about the consecrating of them, and the holiness to be ascribed to them; about using the same buildings, which have once, either truly or imaginarly, been polluted with idolatry: all which being considerations not proper to this place, I shall content myself to have said this to the point proper to this place.

§ 14. I go forwards to consider the order, or the matter Prescrib-
and form, of the public service of God; which I cannot do without setting aside one scruple, which was never heard of in God's Church till our time, and in our time hath been carried on so hot, that it hath been one of the chief pretences of dissolving the unity of the Church in England, which hath opened the gap to all the divisions which we are overrun with. It is pretended, that God is not to be served with forms of prayer prescribed by the Church; but with that which His Spirit indites to those who have the grace of the Spirit, whether appointed by the Church to the ministry of God's service in public (which are those, and only those, as I have shewed, that are designed to bear a share in the government of the Church), or not.

§ 15. What the Presbyterians have abated hereof by their Directory, I will not be troubled to enquire. Every man may remember, that, so long as the business was to dissolve the unity of the Church and to make void the laws which settled it, they cried up this position as much as the rest. But when it came to order that confusion which they had made themselves, they then found it necessary to limit both the matter and form, though not the words, which the offices of Divine service should be celebrated with. Which, what was it but Plowden’s case: that, for the form of God’s service to be prescribed by themselves, it is not only lawful but requisite; by the Church, altogether abominable. And, indeed, those who must needs take upon them to appoint the persons who are to minister to the people, must needs take upon them to appoint the form in which it was to be done:

—See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. vii. § 2, 8.
—Ibid. c. iv. § 41, and c. v.: Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. ix. § 7.

—Independents cried out upon this as well as Churchmen. E.g., in a pamphlet entitled John Baptist (quoted by Hammond as above, c. iii. p. 395), the Presbyterians are charged with beginning “to take upon them to establish a Dagon in his throne, in stinting the whole worship of the God of Heaven,” &c.
they who make the one to depend upon the motion of God's Spirit, must make the other do the like; though never able to make evidence of any such motion in any person that ever pretended it.

§ 16. And yet is that all, that ever hath been alleged, so far as I know, for an opinion so new to God's Church; that St. Paul forbiddeth to "quench the Spirit" (1 Thess. v. 19). I do not deny, that other texts of St. Paul have been alleged who in 1 Cor. xii., xiv., discourseth so largely of the use of spiritual graces; ordering also how they should be exercised and employed in the said Church: nor that, writing to the Romans, viii. 23, 26, 27, he saith, that the Spirit, which groaneth for the resurrection in those that "have the first fruits of" it, "helpeth the infirmities" of the saints ("not knowing what to pray for as they ought"), "interceding for them with groans unutterable;" "which the Searcher of hearts, knowing the mind of the Spirit, findeth to be made "after the will of God." But in these sayings there is nothing like a precept, much less such a one as may seem to oblige the whole Church. On the contrary, the evidences are so frequent, and so palpable, in the discourse of St. Paul to the Corinthians, that the graces whereof he speaketh are miraculous graces (such as God then furnished the Church with, to evidence the presence of His Spirit in it, as well as for their edification in Christianity and assistance in God's service); that it were madness to require the Church to follow the rules, which suppose them, which now appear no more in the Church. And, truly, with what conscience can he allege against the Church of Rome, that miracles are ceased (the grace whereof is ranked by St. Paul with those which tend to the edification of the Church, 1 Cor. xii. 8—10, 28—30), who challengeth for himself or his fellows the privilege of those graces in God's Church? With what conscience can they hear St. Paul say, 1 Cor. xii. 7, that "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit with;" and challenge themselves the privilege of profiting the Church by teaching or by praying, without any "manifestation of the Spirit?" For are they not challenged every day to make

---

* Corrected from MS.; "for all opinions," in orig. text.

** See above in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. vii. § 2. note d.
manifest, that ever any of them did speak by God’s Spirit, and not by the spirit of this world, inspiring the fruits of the flesh, by carnal or rather diabolical pride, innovating in matters of faith and destroying the uniformity of God’s service?

§ 17. And, therefore, when St. Paul, having said, “Quench not the Spirit,” addeth, “Despise not prophecies;” what hath been alleged, what can be alleged, why it should not be thought, that he repeateth in brief that order, which he had declared so largely to the Corinthians:—that the grace of speaking in unknown languages should not be discountenanced in the Church, and so the Spirit extinguished; but that prophecies, the grace whereof he there preferreth so far before it, should no way be neglected for it. Truly, he that saith, “The manifestation of the Spirit is given to all to profit with,” doth say in effect, that the Spirit, which groaneth for the resurrection in them which have the first fruits (that is, the prime graces) of it, makes intercession for the saints according to God, by helping that infirmity of theirs, whereby they know not what to pray for of themselves. For those, who had not always had the apostles’ doctrine sounding in their ears, but only were instructed by them and their fellows so far as to be fit for baptism, remaining nevertheless novices in Christianity; why should we think them fit to know what to pray for in all occasions? Why should we think it strange, that God should give the first-fruits of His Spirit to profit them with in this case?

§ 18. But the faith of Christ with the reasons and consequences thereof being settled, and the order of the Church being established: as the gift of miracles ceased, as well to the bodily health and support of Christians and the Church, as to the demonstration of God’s presence and witness to the truth of Christianity; as the delivering of incorrigible sinners to Satan, “to the destruction of the flesh” by bodily diseases and death, ceased, when obedience to God’s Church was established; so is it no marvel, if the graces of God’s Spirit, Which profited the Church in teaching them what to pray for, should no more be granted, when the Church had not only knowledge but good order established, by which those offices might be performed to the profit and edification of Christians. Let
them, then, who find that they can cure the sick by their prayers, anoint them with oil upon that ground and to that purpose. Let them, who can, sing psalms extempore, so as to become the praises of God (because St. Paul saith, "When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation;" and that may be as well suggested upon the place as aforehand). St. Paul saith, that, if a stranger coming into the Church should hear divers speak in strange languages that which they made not their hearers understand, he "would say [they] were mad" (1 Cor. xiv. 23); notwithstanding that it might appear, that they [could] not speak those languages but by God's Spirit. I will only demand of them not to abuse and dishonour God's Spirit, by imputing unto it those operations which it is not for the honour of God to acknowledge; and then tell them, that they must be tried by our common Christianity, whether that they pretend to say or to do by the same, agree with it.

§ 19. But for the order of God's service in the Church, let us proceed according to the principles premised, comparing that which we find extant in the Scriptures with the original and general practice of God's Church, to say, that, the service of God consisting of His praises, the doctrine of the Scriptures read and expounded, and the prayers of the Church (especially those which the communion of the eucharist is celebrated with), in the first place, the psalms of David (that is, the book of Psalms) is necessarily, by the practice of the whole Church, a form of God's praises, determined to the Church. Which conclusion, as it is easily seen, extendeth further than those psalms, which by the titles of them or by other circumstance of Scriptures may appear to have been composed to be sung in the temple; though this contain a peremptory instance against this strange demand, that it should be unlawful to serve God with set forms. For what difference can be imagined between psalms and prayers as to that purpose?

§ 20. But the conclusion is directed against that new light, which pretendeth to cast the Psalms out of the Church,

---

1 Added from MS. orig. text.
2 Corrected from MS.; "would," in
3 See above, § 14. See above, § 14.
because it appeareth, that they were composed upon the particular occasions of the prophet David or other servants of God by whom they were penned, and therefore not concerning the state of Christ's Church, so as to be frequented by Christians, upon public as well as private occasions, for the praises of God. This conceit is sufficient to shew, how little these new lights do understand of our common Christianity: overlooking that, which the Church hath always supposed against the Jews, as the only ground, whereupon she wresteth the Scriptures of the Old Testament out of their hands, and turneth them to the interest of the Church against themselves; to wit, that the prophets, being inspired by the same Spirit Which our Lord sent His apostles, did preach the same Christianity with them, though, according to the dispensation of that time, figuring the spiritual estate of Christians by the temporal estate of God's then people, and enjoining the duties of God's spiritual obedience in a measure correspondent to the light of the time. For upon this ground hath it been received by the whole Church, that the case of David, and of other the servants of God, who penned the Psalms, is the case, first, of our Lord Christ, then of Christ's Church, whether in the whole thereof, or in the state of particular Christians; David and the rest bearing first the person of Christ, then of His Church, according to the principles premised in the first Book.

§ 21. I might here allege that ingenious saying of St. Hilary, that Christ "hath the key of David," because the spiritual sense of the Psalter is opened by the discovery of Christ and His Church. I might allege St. Augustin, accepting of

---

1 An objection started by Cartwright, as answered by Hooker, V. xi. 3.
2 See above, § 6. note x.
3 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 27, sq.: and see also Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xvi. § 2, 3.
4 "Clavem igitur David habet (Christus); quia Ipse per hanc septem quae dam signacula quae de corporalitate Eius et passione et morte et resurrectione et gloria et regno et judicio David de Eo in psalmis prophetat, absolut: aperiens quod nemo claudet, et claudens quod nemo aperiet, quia per hanc quae in Illo expleta est prophetiam, aperiet quod nemo praecedit; et contra ex-
Tychonius the Donatist his rules for the exposition of the Psalms;—that those things, which are literally understood of the temporal state of David and God’s then people, are to be spiritually understood of the state of our Lord Christ here on earth first, then of the spiritual estate of His whole Church and of each Christian. But I had rather allege the practice of God’s whole Church; of which there is no age, no part, to be named and produced, in which it may appear that God was not served by singing the psalms of David to His praise.

§ 22. Not that I would confine this office to that form which the Psalter yields; or think, that the apostles’ exhortations, Col. iii. 16, James v. 13, Ephes. v. 19, can be confined unto them: being well assured, by comparing that which I read in the apostles with that which I read in Tertullian’s Apologetic (where he saith, that the Christians, at their feasts of love, were wont to provoke one another to sing something of God’s praises), that they did in a simple style, but from a deep and lofty sense, compose the praises of God in psalms of their own, fitted to that light which the coming of Christ hath brought into the Church. But that I would have this loathing of the book of Psalms, recommended (not occultā. Quaram primum ponit, ‘De Domino et Ejus Corpore,’ secundam ‘De Domini Corpore bipartito,’ tertiam ‘De praemissis et Lege,’ quartam ‘De specie et genere,’ quintam ‘De tempore,’ sextam ‘De recapitulatione,’ septimam ‘De diabolo et ejus corpore.’ Qua quidem consideram, sicut ab illo aperiantur, non parum adjuvant ad penetrandam quae tecta sunt Divinorum elogiorum: nec tamen omnia, quae ita scripta sunt ut non facile intelligantur, possunt his regulis inventiri, sed aliae modis pluribus, quos hoc numero septenario usque adeo non est iste complexus, ut idem ipse multa exponat obscura, in quibus harum regularum adhibet nullam, quoniam nec opus est.”

S. Aug., De Doct. Christ., lib. iii. c. 30. § 42; Op., tom. iii. P. l. p. 57, E, F. “Prima (regula) ‘de Domino et Ejus Corpore’ est; in qua scientes aliquando capitis ex corpore, id est, Christi et Ecclesiae, umam personam nobis intimari... non hæsitemus quando a capite ad corpus, vel a corpore transitur ad caput, et tamen non creditur ab una eademque persona.” Id. ibid., § 44. p. 58. E... “Secunda... poterat et sic appellari, ut dicetur de permixta Ecclesia,” &c. Id. ibid., § 45. ibid. F... “Tertia... alio modo dici potest de spiritu et litera,” &c. Id. ibid., § 46. p. 59. C. And so on of the rest in the following sections: summing them up (except the third) in § 56. (p. 64. C.) thus—that “aliud ex alio facient intelligi, quod est proprium tropice locutionis,” &c.; and characterizing them in general as “bene sed non plene” (ibid., § 46. p. 59. C). The Regula of Tychonius are in the Biblioth. PP. tom. xv. pp. 125, sq. ed. 1622: and relate to the whole of Scripture, not to the Psalms exclusively.

by the Church of England but) by the whole Church, to be taken for an evident mark, that we are weary of the common Christianity of God’s people, and do lust for new meat of our own asking, if not for the fleshpots and onions and garlick of Egypt.

§ 23. As for the reading of the Scriptures in the Church, which the whole Church hath used as generally as it hath had the Scriptures (for we understand by Irenæus, and may see by our ancestors the Saxons, that Christianity hath subsisted among people that had not the use of letters; though our ancestors the Saxons had the Scriptures before they had the use of letters, by the means of them who brought them Christianity, but Irenæus speaks of barbarous nations, that were Christians before they knew of any Scriptures): I see it rather neglected than disputed against by the sects of this time. Why neglected, divers reasons may be conceived; though they (perhaps as a disparagement to the Spirit, whence they may pretend to have their orders, the carnal man only choosing in religion that which by the use of reason he is convinced to come from God, contrary to the principles settled at the beginning) think fit to allege none.

§ 24. Their illuminati, perhaps, are already so perfect in the text, that it were loss of time for them to assemble to hear the Scriptures read. To whom I must say, that those, who are enlightened by God, are always humble and ready to continue in the unity of the Church; as I have shewed by the premisses, that all Christians ought to do: that, if they do so, the greater part of the Church by much will have need to

---


* St. Augustine entered England A.D. 597. It appears a question whether the Saxons had not some alphabetical characters before his time (Sharon Turner, Anglo-Sax. Bk., vii. c. 4: Kemble, Cod. Dipl. Ævi Sax., Introd., pp. vi. lxx.); but writing in Roman characters at any rate came in with him, and the use of letters of any kind only spread very gradually through Saxon England, being very far from general even in the time of Alfred, A.D. 849, sq. (Turner, ibid., Bk. v. c. 1, Bk. viii. c. 2, Bk. xii. c. 4).
learn the Scriptures (that is, instruction out of them) by hearing them read in the church: that all, that are enlight-ened by God, are taught to condescend to the necessities of the weak and simple; and that those, who break from the Church rather than do so, may think themselves strong, but their strength is the strength of madmen, that see not what they do: in fine, that they, who have received light by the knowledge of the Scriptures, must needs add to their light by hearing them read; and that there is no better way for them to add to it, being the way which the primitive fathers took for that purpose.

§ 25. It may perhaps be imagined, that the reading of the Scriptures takes up the time of the assemblies, and excludes the preaching of the word*. To which I must say, for the present, that it is a strange piece of providence to exclude the reading of the Scripture, which we know to be the word of God, and to have in it no cause of offence but that which the want of understanding in the hearers thereof ministereth, out of a desire to make way for that, which pretendeth indeed always to be the word of God, but no understanding so simple, no conscience so seared, that must not needs know, that it is not, that it cannot always be, the word of God, because of the contradictions that pass under that title; and that, in matters of so high nature at this time, that, if the one be the word of God, the other must not be counted the word of human weakness, but of diabolical malice. There are indeed certain bounds, within which that which is preached out of the pulpit, may be presumed and taken for the word of God; as it might be, if it were said in another place. But if ignorant people, that cannot take upon them to judge, shall presume it of that which they hear from those that do not profess to preach within those bounds; who can deny, that they are guilty to their own death?

§ 26. What those bounds are, I shall say by and by x. In the mean time, let them take heed, whose neglect of the writ-

---

* See above, § 6. note x.

x* See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembi., c. vi. § 11, sq.:—Calderwood, Altare Damasc., c. x. pp. 616—618.—That the Liturgy hindered preaching, was one of the common objections urged by Puritans; e. g. in the Pref. to the Directory, p. 3, and in the tract against the Prayer-Book quoted above in c. xxi.

§ 6. note i.

‡ Below, c. xxv. § 9, sq.
ten word, or whose zeal to preaching, shuts the Scriptures out of the Church, that they contribute not to the bringing in of the secret and invisible word of the enthusiasts. It is now no dainty to hear, that the word, which we have written in our Bibles, is not the word that saveth; but that which is secretly and invisibly spoken to us within by God’s Spirit. And whosoever attributeth the reverence due to God’s word to any such dictate, without dependence upon the Scriptures (that is, deriving the same from the Scripture, by those means which God hath allowed us for the understanding of them, according to the premises); what shall hinder him to prefer the dictate of his own spirit under pretence of God’s, before that which he admitteth to come from God’s Spirit? For he, who admitteth the greater contradiction—of two parallel sovereigns,—why should he not admit a less—that the written word is not God’s word, in competition with the dictate of his own spirit;—when there is so easy a cloak, of expounding the written word, though against all reason and rule of expounding it, yet so as to submit even the substance of Christianity to the dictate of a private spirit?

§ 27. We have an example for it in the impostures of Mahomet. For doth not the Alcoran acknowledge both our Lord Christ, and Moses, true prophets of God, besides all other attributes. Yet, in as much as it pretendeth the spirit given to Mahomet in such a degree as to control them both, it smoothed the way to the renouncing of Christianity, when the power of the sword fell out on the side of it. Simon Magus, and his followers the Gnostics, might have done the like, had the like power been on their side (as the Ma—

---

7 Several quotations from Fox the Quaker to this effect are in Leslie’s Snake in the Grass, sect. vii. Works, vol. iv. pp. 98, sq.—So also Edwards in his Gangræna, Pt. i. p. 18, reckons as the first of his “Catalogue of Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies of the Sectaries,” that “the Scriptures cannot be said to be the word of God, there is no word but Christ, the Scriptures are a dead letter” (for which he gives his authority in p. 54); and ibid., num. 50, p. 24, that “there is a perfect way in this life, not by Word, Sacraments, Prayer, and other Ordinances, but by the experience of the Spirit in a man’s self.”


* Corrected from M.S.; “smooths,” in orig. text.
nichees did in part, if those things be true that we read in Cedrenus, of a party of them, possessed of the power of the sword, about the parts of Armenia: all, upon pretence of higher revelations than were granted to the apostles. The same is alleged against the paraclete of Montanus (and perhaps his followers, being disowned by the Church, might fall to such extremities): but, at the beginning, it doth not appear, that he pretended any more than to introduce certain strict orders into the Church, as enjoined by his spirit and those of his fellow prophets; which it was not expedient for the Church to undertake (and, being so, it was requisite for him to conform unto the Church, any pretence of the Spirit notwithstanding), but, otherwise, were no way destructive to Christianity.

§ 28. Suppose, then, the reading of the Scriptures to be one of those offices, for which the Church is to assemble; the order of reading them (which is that which remains) is a thing so subject to common reason, that there need[s] not much dispute about it. If we look upon Tertullian’s, or before him Justin Martyr’s, Apologies for the Christians, there will appear no more than this;—that every Church (that is, every body of Christians under one bishop) did prescribe themselves that order for reading the Scriptures in the Church, which they found requisite. And if that primitive

---


3 See Tillemont as just quoted, from Tertullian: and above in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ix. § 12, 13.

4 "Coimus (nos Christiani) ad litterarum Divinarum commemoratio- nem; si quid presentium temporum qualitas aut praemone cogit aut reconoscere. Certe fidei sancti voci- bus paschimus, spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus, disciplinam praecedorum nihilominus incaginationibus densamus." Tertull., Apolgoet., c. xxxix.; Op., p. 31. A.

5 Quoted in Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. vi. § 10.

6 See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., cc. vi. § 9, 10, x. § 11—18.
simplicity, which the Christianity under persecution was managed with, had continued, what fault could have been found with it? But when the world was come into the Church (which he, that enjoys his right senses, will not believe did come into it all with the like affections to the professions which they undertook); it was in vain to hope, that differences would not rise, or might not rise, about this as well as other points, in which the exercise of Christianity consisted. Differences arising, the greater authority is that, to which the ending of them obliges all men to have recourse. The greater authority, you have seen, is that of the greatest Churches; whether in synods, or not requiring synods to oblige the less, by reason of the exigence or reasonableness of the case: the order of reading the Scriptures, and of singing or saying the psalms and hymns of God’s praises, being grounded upon no other reason, nor tending to any other end, than that of exercising and improving the Christianity of God’s people.

§ 29. I need not dispute, that the order, which the power of the Church of Rome had introduced here as well in the rest of the West, was such as made the assemblies of the Church fruitless to that purpose. For what could those shreds of psalms and lessons, which that order prescribeth, contribute, that might be considerable to that purpose?

§ 30. Nor need I argue, how considerable the order of the Church of England is to the same. For to finish the Psalter once a month, the New Testament thrice a year, the Old once; besides (for reverence to the ancient ordinance of the Church) another order for beginning the prophet Essay at Advent, and Genesis at Septuagesima, to be prosecuted on festival days;—is an order, from which the Church hath reason to expect a good effect in the instruction of God’s people. And the interweaving of the lessons with hymns, as it is agreeable to the rules and the practice of the ancient

---

b See above, c. xviii. § 8, sq.

1 "But these many years passed this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories, and legends, with multitudes of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals; that commonly when any book of the Bible was begun, after three or four chapters were read out, all the rest were unread," &c. Pref. to Book of Common Prayer. See, for an accessible and plain commentary upon this paragraph, Bennett’s Principles of the Bk. of Comm. Prayer, Serm. iv.
Church, so it is, in reason, a fit mean to preserve attention and quicken devotion in them who use it. In the mean time, supposing there were considerable objections to be made against this or that order; yet, order in general being a thing so requisite to the preservation of unity in the body of the Church, there is no reason to be given, why any body should be admitted to dispute any order received, that cannot advance another order, which he can pretend to be more effectual to the purpose, in which the parties must needs agree.

§ 31. I am here to answer that part of the question concerning the canon of Scripture, which I said in the first Book, concerneth the law, not the faith, of the Church;—whether the reading of those Scriptures, which St. Jerome calls "apocryphal," Ruffinus upon the Creed, "ecclesiastical," for part of the Church office, be for the edification of the Church, or not. And a few words shall serve me to answer it with. The very name of "ecclesiastical" serves him, that admits the Church to be one body, the unity whereof requires some uniformity in the order of those offices, the communion whereof is one part of the end for which it subsisteth. For it is manifest, that the whole Church hath frequented the reading of them; and that they are called "ecclesiastical" for no other reason, but because the reading of them hath been frequented by the Church in the church. And whosoever makes this any title of separation from the Church of Rome, will make his title schismatical, separating for that which is common to the present Church of Rome with the whole Church.

§ 32. But because the repute of the Church is so slight in

[The reading of the Apocrypha frequent by the whole Church.]
the judgment of many, that think themselves the most refined Christians, that they allow it not that common sense in managing the business of Christianity, which they must needs allow Jews, Pagans, Mahometans, in faithfully serving their own faithless suppositions; and which all experience shews us, that it serves all mankind, to what purpose soever it is employed (and that, notwithstanding so great a trial of it, as the governing of so great a body as the Church is, in unity, so far and so long as this unity hath prevailed): it is therefore necessary to give a reason, why the Church so used them. Which, supposing the premisses, it will be as easy as it is necessary for me to give; and that, more sufficient, if I mistake not, than can possibly be given, not supposing the same. For if the secret of the resurrection, the general judgment, and the world to come, if the mystery of the Holy Trinity, consisting in the Word or Wisdom and Spirit of God, if the inward and spiritual service of God in truth of heart, be more clearly opened in them (by the work of providence, dispensing the effect of canonical Scripture by the occurrences of time) than in the Law and the prophets themselves (which I have shewed, both that so it is, and why so it is, from the ground of the difference between the Old and the New Testament*); then, I suppose, there is sufficient reason, why those, who admit the Old Testament to be made for common edification in the Church, should not put any question concerning those Scriptures. Those new lights among us, who do not allow the Psalter to be pertinently and reasonably employed for the public service of God upon all occasions*, as the Church hath always employed it, may assure us, that they understand not, why the Scriptures of the Old Testament are read in the Church, because they understand not the correspondence between the Old and the New Testament; in the understanding whereof the edification of the Church by the Scriptures of the Old Testament consisteth.

§ 33. There may be offence taken at divers things in these Scriptures, I deny not*. But there may be offence taken in

---

* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxxi. § 14—18: Bk. II. Of the Gov. of Grace, c. xvi. § 8.
* See above, § 20.
* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxxi. § 38—44: and Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxii. § 24, 27—29.
like manner at divers things in the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. The humility of Christians requires them, edifying themselves in that which they understand in the Scriptures, according to our common Christianity, in the rest, which they understand not, to refer themselves to their superiors.

§ 34. The Church understood well enough this difference and this correspondence to be discovered by these writings, as the time required, when it appointed learners to read them. And, though I stand not upon terms, yet I conceive they are more properly called "ecclesiastical," because the Church hath employed them to be read in the Church, than "apocryphal;" according to the use of that word in the Church, to signify such writings as the Church suspecteth, and therefore alloweth not to be read, whether in public or in private.

§ 35. Whereupon I conceive also, that the term of canonical Scripture hath and ought to have two senses: one, when we speak of the Jews' canon in the Old Testament; another, when we speak of the canon of the Church. For seeing the tradition of the synagogue is perfect evidence, what Scriptures of the Old Testament are to be received as inspired by God; the word "canon," in that case, may well signify the rule of our faith or manners. But because the Church cannot pretend to create that evidence originally but only to transmit what she receiveth from the synagogue, pretending nevertheless to give a rule what shall be read for the edification of the Church; the word "canon," therefore, in that case will signify only the list or catalogue of Scriptures, which the Church appoints to be read in the Church: which seems to reconcile the diverse accounts extant in several records of the Church.

1 See references in note q.
2 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxxi. § 50.
CHAPTER XXIII.

THE CONSECRATION* OF THE EUCHARIST PRESCRIBED BY TRADITION FOR THE MATTER OF IT. THE LORD'S PRAYER PRESCRIBED IN ALL SERVICES. THE MATTER OF PRAYERS FOR ALL ESTATES PRESCRIBED. THE FORM OF BAPTISM NECESSARY TO BE PRESCRIBED. THE SAME REASON HOLDETH IN THE FORMS OF OTHER OFFICES.

In the next place, I do maintain, that the order of celebrating the eucharist, and the prayer which it was from the beginning solemnized with, were from the beginning prescribed the Church by unwritten custom, that is, by tradition from the apostles; containing, though not so many words, that it was not lawful to use more or less (for there were always occasions for celebrating the eucharist emergent, which must be intimated in fewer or more words in the celebrating of it), yet the matter and substance of the consecration of it, together with the matter and substance of the necessities of the Church, for which it was offered (that is to say, for which the Church was and is to pray at the celebration of it, as hoping to obtain them by the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross which it representeth): [all which*] as received from the beginning, was every where known to be the same. This I infer from that, which I have said in the book afore quoted, of those texts of St. Paul, where those prayers of the Church, which the eucharist is consecrated with, are called "eucharistia" or "thanksgiving" (if not rather, "the thanksgiving," because it was a certain form of thanksgiving, well known to all Christians by that name; from whence the sacrament so consecrated was also so called, from the time that our Lord, having "blessed" or "given thanks" to the Father over the elements, had said, "This is

* Corrected in MS.; misprinted "consideration" in folio edition.
+ See above, c. iv. § 8, sq.
: Corrected from MS.; "these," in orig. text.
; "The occasions must be intimated which must cause such addition to the!" substituted in margin in MS.
* The sentence is ungrammatical in the orig. text. Some such words as those here added, seem to be required.
: Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 38—40: and see above in c. iv.
My Body—This is My Blood”); and order is given, that at the celebration thereof prayers be made for the necessities of the Church and of all people, 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16, 1 Tim. ii. 1—8: together with those passages of primitive antiquity, from whence it appeareth there, that the form of consecrating the eucharist, used and known generally in the Church, is called “eucharistia,” and that the custom of interceding for all the necessities of the Church, and for the reducing of unbelievers to the same, is and hath been taken up and ever frequented by the Church in obedience to and prosecution of the said precept of the apostles. This observation might perhaps be thought too obscure evidence to bring to light a point of this consequence, were it not justified by all that I produced afore to shew, that the eucharist is consecrated by the prayers of the Church, which celebrateth it, upon the faith of our Lord’s institution and promise. For the matter of these prayers tending to a certain purpose,—that the elements may become the Body and Blood of Christ, and convey His Spirit to those who receive them with living faith,—the consecration, which is the effect of them, requires, that the form of them be prescript and certain, though not in number of words, yet in sense, intent, and substance. And this, by the evidence there produced, may appear to have been maintained from the beginning by tradition in the Church; according to the affirmation of St. Basil, that this prayer is a tradition of the whole Church.

§ 2. Many are the liturgies (that is, the forms of celebrating the eucharist) in the eastern Churches under Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antiochia, yet extant, which shew the substance of it—(after the deacon had said, “Lift up your hearts,” the people answering, “We lift them up to the Lord,” which evidently pointeth out that which St. Paul calls the “thanksgiving” or “blessing,” wherein the consecration of the sacrament consisteth, beginning there and ending with the Lord’s prayer, in all of them)—to be this:—repeating the creation of all things and the fall of man, to

---

* Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 40—42.
* Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 42—45: and above, c. iv. § 10, sq.
praise God, that He left him not helpless, but called first the fathers, then gave the Law, and when it appeared that all this would not serve to reclaim him to God, sent His only Son to redeem him by His cross, Who instituted this remembrance of it; praising God, therefore, for all this, but especially for the death and resurrection of Christ; and praying, that the Spirit promised may come upon the elements presently set forth, and make them the Body and Blood of Christ; that they, who receive them with living faith may be filled with the grace of it.

§ 3. I acknowledge, that the repetition of the creation and fall of man, the calling of the patriarchs and giving the Law, is all silenced or left out in the Latin Canon\(^8\) (that is, that canonical prayer, which this sacrament is consecrated and communicated with). Neither can I say, that it is extant in the Ambrosian\(^b\), or any form besides, that may appear to have been ancienly in use in any part of the western Church.\(^i\) Though I have reason enough to conceive, that it was used from the beginning, and afterwards cut off for the shortening of the service; because of the great consent that is found among forms used in the eastern parts, and because we see, how the psalms and lessons retained in them, are abridged of that length, which by the Constitutions of the apostles and other ancienter records of the Church may appear to have been used in former ages\(^k\).

§ 4. But there can be no reason to say, that the leaving out of all this, being so remote a ground of the present action, makes any difference in the substance and effect of that prayer which it is done and performed with. And the rest, being the same in all forms that remain extant, enables me to conclude, that the prayers of the Church, which the eucharist is to be consecrated with, were from the beginning prescribed, not for so many words, but for the substance of them; not in writing, but by silent custom, and tradition

\(^8\) See above, c. iv. § 10; and Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 42; and Bona, Rer. Liturg., lib. ii. c. x. § 2. p. 555.


\(^i\) See a brief account of the changes in the eucharistic Canon, from Durandus, and others, in Field, Of the Church, Pref. to Append. to Bk. iii. pp. 188, 189. Ox. 1628.

\(^k\) See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., as quoted before in § 2. note f; and ibid. c. x. § 11—13.
received by the Church from the apostles: and ought to continue the same to the end of the world in all Churches.

§ 5. There is a little objection to be made against this, from that which Walafridus Strabo\(^1\) and other Latin writers\(^2\) concerning the offices of the Church have reported from some passages of St. Jerome\(^3\) and St. Gregory the Great\(^4\):—that St. Peter at the first did consecrate the eucharist with the Lord’s prayer only:—which if it be true, all this falls to the ground; and the form of consecrating the eucharist hath proved so uniform merely by the consent of after ages, and will remain subject to be changed again, seeing that the Lord’s prayer may for the substance of it be rendered into other terms and conceptions as many ways as a man pleases. But there is, I have shewed you? a mistake in the meaning of these passages, intended only in opposition to that variety of psalms and lessons and hymns and prayers, which afterwards were brought in to make the celebration of the sacrament more solemn: in regard whereof they say, that St. Peter consecrated only with the Lord’s prayer, not with any of those additions for solemnity’s sake, when he consecrated by that “thanksgiving” or “blessing” which our Lord consecrated the sacrament at His last supper with; adding only, instead of all other solemnities, the Lord’s prayer, which the consecration is still concluded with in all ancient forms. For when the order and occasions of assemblies were not settled, but the offices of Christianity were to be ministered upon such opportunities as they could find out for themselves; it is no marvel, if St. Peter himself might be obliged to abate all but merely what was requisite.

§ 6. And, truly, I may here seasonably say, that I conceive the Lord’s prayer is justly called by Tertullian\(^9\) “oratio legitima,” or “the prayer which the law” (that is, the precept of our Lord in the Gospel—“When ye pray, say thus”\(^10\)) “prescribed:” not as if he would have them serve Him with no other prayer but this, but that they should always use this

---

1 See above, c. iv. § 25. note g.
2 E. g. Honorius, Gemma Animae, c. Ixxvi: quoted by Card. Bona, De Reb. Liturg., lib. i. c. v. § 3; Op., p. 343. And Durandus, &c., in Field, Of the Church, Pref. to Append. to Bk. iii. p. 188.
3 See above, c. iv. § 35. notes g, h.
4 See ibid., note c.
5 Ibid.
BOOK as a set prayer, whatever other occasions they might have of
addressing themselves to God with other prayers. For ac-
Accordingly I do observe, that in all prescribed forms, upon
what occasion soever, not only of celebrating the eucharist—
(which assemblies have therefore been called κατ’ ἐξοχήν
"missæ" in Latin, from the dismission of them, as in Greek
συνάξεις from the gathering of them, whereas the Latin
word "collectæ," which answers it, is extended to other as-
semblies)—but other more daily and hourly occasions (ac-
ccording to the premisses concerning five hours of prayer in
the day in St. Cyprian's time, which since have come to
seven), there is always a room for the Lord's prayer; as if
the service of God were not lawful according to the precept,
"When ye pray, say thus," unless it be used. Which is that
which I shall advise them of, who either exclude it as un-
lawful, or forbear it as offensive; that they may consider,

* See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iv. § 3. notes p._n
* See above in c. xxi. § 56.
* Corrected from M.S.; "seven, that there," in orig. text.
* One Francis Johnson in a book entitled Of the Ministry of the Church
of England (n. p. or d.) may serve as a
specimen of the Sectaries' opinion of
the Lord's Prayer. He says (p. 188),
that "this is a most absolute form and
rule of prayer, and that the right use of
it is to conceive and form all our
prayers according to this rule, and not
to be bound to use this number of words,
as many now a dayes in their ignorance
and superstition do imagine:" proceeding
to argue, among other topics, that
the apostles did not teach their disciples to "say over the Lord's Prayer" (ibid., p. 189), and that "if the saying over of
these or of any stinct words were true
prayer, then might a man have his
prayers by rote, or carry them in his
pocket, or buy them at the bookbinder's
shop, &c."—This is partly borrowed
from Grotius (in Matth. vi. 9), "Non
præcipit Christus verba recitari (quod
e nec legitimus apostolos fecisse, quamquam
id quoque fieri cum fructu potest), sed
materiam precum hicne promovere."—
Meric Casaubon replied to this profanity in 1660 in a vol. entitled "A
Vindication of the Lord's Prayer as
a Formal Prayer, and by Christ's in-
stitution to be used by Christians as
a Prayer: against the antichristian
Practice and Opinion of some men:
wherein also their private and un-
grounded zeal is discovered, who are
very strict for the observation of the
Lord's Day and make so light of the
Lord's Prayer:" written on occasion of
"a strange affair done publickly
unto Christ, or if you will more pecu-
nially, to the Lord's Prayer, in the
chief church of Oxford, by one that
had them (under warrant) the
chief government of that famous Uni-
versity:" viz., by Dr. John Owen,
Vice Chancellor and Dean of Christ-
church, who "when some preachers
concluded their own" prayer with the
Lord's Prayer, "which was seldom
done by any, especially the presby-
terians and independents (because it was
looked upon forsooth as formal and
prelatical so to do), would with great
snarling and scorn turn aside or sit
down and put on his hat" (Wood,
Athen. Oxon.).—Hammond mentions
the omission of the Lord's Prayer by
the Puritans, Copy of Some Papers Past
at Oxford betw. the author of the Pract.
Catechism and Fr. Cheynell, in Ham-
mond's Works, vol. i. p. 183.—Thomas
Fuller also, in his Triple Reconciler,
thought it necessary to employ his third
lecture on the "controversy, whether the
Lord's Prayer ought not to be used by all
Christians" (p. 109, sqq., Lond. 1654):
and to answer the "cavils" brought by
the sectaries, one of which is the blas-
phemous assertion, that "Christ made
how they count themselves members of Christ's Church, waving that which the whole Church hath practised in obedience to this precept, for conformity with the enemies of His Church.

§ 7. There is yet another sort of prayers, which are offered to God at the celebration of the eucharist, according to St. Paul's command, for all estates and orders of men, whether in the world or in the Church, and for all their necessities: in [1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.] regard whereof I shewed you afore, that the eucharist is counted a sacrifice for the Church or rather for all mankind (as the high-priest, when he went into the holy of holies, according to Philo, prayed for the whole world); representing the intercession of Christ for the same, now at the right hand of God, which the Church in His name by celebrating this sacrament executeth and commemorateth upon earth. And the form hereof, I can easily say, by the same reason, is for matter and substance, though not for so many words and for the conceptions it is expressed with, prescribed according to St. Paul's command by the custom of the Church, received by tradition from the apostles. For when I have once named the necessities of all orders and estates without or within the Church in general, supposing what Christianity requires Christians to pray for, as well in behalf of the enemies of God's Church as of the members of it; I conceive I have named the substance of these prayers: the particulars whereof you may see in our English litanies to be the same, that the most ancient writers of the Church witness to have been used after the exposition of the Scrip-

* * *

it in His minority, before He was arrived at His full perfection" (ibid. p. 130). There is also a tract by John D'Espagne, maintaining "the Use of the Lord's Prayer against the objections of the Innovators of these Times." Svo. Lond. 1646. Barrow and Greenwood the Brownists set the example of rejecting the Lord's Prayer, according to Pagitt's Heresiography ('f Brownists, § 20. p. 78). And the Directory itself (as Jer. Taylor says) "does by implication undervalue the Lord's Prayer, for it never enjoins it, and does but once permit it." Much the same doctrine as Johnson's is to be found in the Dictionary of the Holy Bible by a Presbyterian Secession Minister, John Brown of Haddington, in 1768: see vol. ii. p. 311. of the "fifth genuine edition" of his book, in 1807. And more strongly still in the Lectures of Dr. Andrew Thomson, pp. 397, 398. Edinb. 1828, also a Presbyterian Minister, quoted in a note to Bp. Sage's Presbytery Examined, Works, vol. i. pp. 354, 355. Edinb. 1844. * Corrected from MS.; "his," in original text.  
7 Above, c. v. § 10.  
8 Quoted ibid. note e.  
9 See ibid. and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., ca. iii. § 27, iv. § 45; and Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb., c. x. § 59—70.  
BOOK III.

§ 8. And from hence I hope to resolve that question, which I have proposed in another place, and no man yet hath taken in hand to answer;—why as well in the ancient Latin as well as eastern liturgies (as also by the testimonies of St. Augustin and others it appeareth, that) these prayers are twice repeated at the eucharist.—The reason being this:—that, first, those who offered the creatures of which the eucharist is consecrated, and by which offering the assembly of the Church was maintained, might testify, that they do it out of devotion to God, hoping by so doing to obtain at His mercy, not only their own, but the necessities of all other orders and estates, by virtue of the sacrifice of the cross, which at present they intend to commemorate and repeat; which notwithstanding, the elements being consecrated, and the Body and Blood of Christ, once sacrificed on the cross, here and now represented, they offer to Him the same prayers again, presenting Him, as it were, the same sacrifice here and now represented, for the motive inducing Him to grant the said necessities. And, therefore, [I*] have reason to account this service the most eminent service that Christians can offer to God, and those prayers the most effectual that they can address unto Him; as being proper to that Christianity, in virtue whereof they hope to obtain their prayers, and of nothing besides.

§ 9. That which remains of this point, is only the consideration of those prayers, which are made at those assemblies of the Church which pretend not to celebrate the eucharist;—how they may appear to be prescribed by Christianity. Where I shall need to say nothing of such prayers as are to be made by Christian assemblies for the necessities of all orders and estates, whether within or without the Church; because I have already spoken of them, when they are made upon occasion of celebrating the eucharist: the difference between that occasion, and other occasions which the Church may have to frequent the same

---

* Quoted in Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 28.
* Quoted ibid. § 29.
* Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 61—66.
* Quoted ibid. § 60. note q, § 62.

notes r. s.
* S. Ambrose, quoted ibid. § 60. note p, § 63. note u: and see others, ibid. and § 28, 29.
* Added from MS.
prayers, when the eucharist is not celebrated, inferring no difference in that which is prescribed to the Church, or by the Church, either in the matter or form of the same.

§ 10. As for the prayers which every assembly maketh for itself, concerning the common necessities of all Christians as such (which I conceive were first called "Collecta," because the assembly ended in them and was dismissed with them, from "gathering" the same, as the mass hath the name in Latin "Missa" from dismissing it, as I observed afore): I shall need to say as little, having shewed, by what authority all Christians are to be limited in such things as have been left unlimited by our Lord and His apostles. For the necessities of Christians as Christians become determinable (if any thing concerning them become questionable) by the same authority that governeth every Church, upon such terms as it ought to govern the same. But if any cause appear (as many ages since there hath appeared necessity enough), why particular Churches should be ruled in those forms by synods, that is, by the common authority of more and greater Churches, for maintaining unity in the whole (which the form of Church service may be a great means to violate, as we know by lamentable experience); it remains, that the same means be employed for maintaining unity in this point, which God hath provided for maintaining the same in all cases.

§ 11. So that, supposing, that in process of time, whether by direct or by indirect means, the Church of Rome hath gained so much ground of the whole western Church, as to conform their prayers, and in a manner the whole order of Divine service, to the pattern prescribed by it (which I take to have been the case at the Reformation with all the western Church): it cannot be alleged for a sufficient cause of changing, that the Church of Rome hath no right to require this conformity by God's law; but the question must be, whether the uniformity introduced by the same, be so well, or so ill, for the prejudice or advancement of Christianity, that it shall be requisite for the interest thereof to proceed to a change without the consent of [that m] Church. Which if it be [so],

1 Above in § 6.
2 Above, c. xxi. § 30.
3 "Of reforming the Church of England without the consent of the whole," substituted in MS. for the words, "of changing."
4 Corrected from MS.: "the," in orig. text.
5 Corrected from MS.: "true," in orig. text.
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then whatsoever hath been objected to the Church of England upon this title as agreeable to the form used by the Church of Rome (not as disagreeable to Christianity), is to be damned, as ignorantly and maliciously objected, for to make division in the Church without cause.

§ 12. These same reasons will serve to resolve, how necessary it is, that those prayers, wherewith the rest of ecclesiastical offices, baptism, confirmation, penance, the visitation of the sick, and marriages, are celebrated, be of a certain form, and prescribed by the authority of the Church.

§ 13. It were a thing strangely unreasonable for him, that hath considered that which I have said in the second Book o,—how our Christianity and salvation is concerned in the sacrament of baptism, and how much the disputes of religion that divide the western Church depend upon the knowledge of it,—to imagine, that all those, who must be admitted by the Church to the ministering of it, can be able to express the true intent of it in such form of words, as may be without offence and tend to the edification of God’s people in a thing so nearly concerning their Christianity. Rather it may justly be questioned, whether they, that take upon them to baptize and consecrate the eucharist, not grounding themselves upon the authority of the Church,—supposing the faith of the Church expressed in such a form as the Church prescribeth, but their own sense concerning the ground and intent of those sacraments,—do any thing or nothing: that is, whether they do indeed minister the sacrament of baptism, necessary to the salvation of all Christians, or only profane the ordinance of God, by professing an intention of doing that which is not indeed that sacrament, under pretence of celebrating it: whether they do indeed consecrate the elements, to become sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ, and so communicate the same to those which receive; or only profane those holy mysteries of Christianity, and involve His people in the same guilt, by pretending to celebrate so holy an office, and in effect doing nothing, as not knowing what ought to be done, nor submitting to those that do. A consideration very necessary in regard of those, who forsake the baptism which they received in their infancy in the Church of England, to be baptized again by new dippers.

o Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. ii., sq.
§ 14. For it is true, the Church hath admitted the baptism of heretics for good, but not of all heretics. Of those, whose baptism St. Cyprian excepts against, Epist. ad Jubaianum, it is manifest, that the Church, voiding the baptism of the Samosatenians by the canon of Nicea, the baptism of other heretics by the canons of Arles and Laodicea, must needs make void the baptisms of the greatest part; being evidently further removed from the truth which Christianity professeth, than those whose baptism the said canons disallow. And though it is admitted, according to the dictates of the School, that these words—"I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost"—contain a sufficient form of this sacrament: yet that holdeth upon supposition, that they who use it do admit the true sense of this word "I baptize;" intending thereby to make him a Christian, that is, to oblige him to the profession of Christianity, whom they baptize.

§ 15. Which what reason can any man have to presume of in behalf of those, who renounce their baptism once received in the Church of England, to be baptized again? For all reason of charitable presumptions ceaseth in respect of those, who root up the ground thereof by schism and by departing from the unity of the Church. And besides that we do not see them declare any profession at all, according to which they oblige themselves either to believe or live (which is reason enough to oblige others not to take them for Christians, not demanding to be taken for Christians by professing themselves Christians); we see the world over-spread with the venom of the enthusiasts, who, accepting of the Scriptures for God's word, upon a persuassion of the dictate of God's Spirit, not supposing the reason for which they are Christians, do consequently believe as much in the dictates of

---

\* See above, c. x. § 31; and c. xix. § 6.
\* Epist. lxxiii. pp. 198, sq.
\* Quoted in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 19, note g.
\* Quoted ibid. note l.
\* Quoted ibid. note k.
\* This refers to the Independents or Congregationalists: see below in the Conclusion, § 13. And for what Thornide thought of the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly, i.e. of the Presbyterians, ibid. § 11.
\* Corrected from M.S.; "vermin," in orig. text.
the same that are not grounded upon the word of God as upon those that are: so that the embracing of the Scriptures makes them no more Christians than Mahomet's acknowledging Moses and Christ in the Alcoran makes him a Christian*. For whosoever is persuaded, that he hath the Spirit of God, not supposing that it is given him in consideration that he professeth Christianity (supposing therefore the truth thereof, in order of reason, before he receive the Spirit), may, as well as Mahomet in the Alcoran, frame both the Old and New Testament to whatsoever sense his imagination, which he takes for God's Spirit, shall dictate.

§ 16. This reason, why it is necessary to follow the forms which the Church prescribes, is more constraining in celebrating the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, as more nearly concerning the Christianity and salvation of Christians; but yet it takes place also in the rest of those offices, whereby the Church pretends to conduct particular Christians in the way to life everlasting. He that supposes that which I have proved,—how necessary it is, that every sheep of the flock should acknowledge the common pastor of his Church, that the pastor should acknowledge his flock, upon notice of that Christianity which every one of them in particular professeth;—though he may acknowledge, that originally there is no cause why every bishop should not prescribe himself the form of it in his own Church; yet, supposing that experience hath made it appear requisite, for the preservation of unity by uniformity, that the same form should be used, must needs find it requisite, that it be prescribed by a synod greater or less. At such time as public penance was practised in the Church, when the penitents were dismissed before the eucharist with the blessing and prayers of the Church; can it seem reasonable to any man; that any prayers should be used in celebrating an action of that consequence but those which the like authority prescribeth? So much the more, if it be found requisite, that the practice of private penance, and of the inner court of the conscience, be maintained in the Church. For how should it be fit, that every priest, that is trusted with the power of the keys in this court, should exercise it in that form which his private fancy shall dictate? Of ordinations I say the

* See above, c. xxii. § 27.
same as of confirmations; of the visitation of the sick, and of marriage, as of penance: only considering, that it is not likely, that the reason, whereupon the celebration of marriage is an office of the Church (deriving from those limitations which the precept of our Lord hath fastened upon the marriage of Christians), should be so well understood by all that are to solemnize matrimony, as to do their office, both so as the validity of the contract, and so as the performance of that office which the parties undertake, doth require.

§ 17. In fine, having shewed, that the service of God upon the regular hours of the day is a custom both grounded upon the Scripture and tending to the maintenance and advancement of Christian piety; it remains that I say, that the form and measure of that devotion, which all estates are to offer to God at those hours, cannot otherwise be limited to the edification of all, than by the determination of the Church. They, that please themselves with that monstrous imagination, that no Christian is to be taught what or how to pray, till he find himself enabled by the Spirit of God, moving him to pray; will easily find, that they can never induce the greater part of Christians to think themselves capable of discharging themselves to God in so high an office, as the sense of their Christianity requires. They that observe the performance of those who take it upon them, shall find them sacrifice to God that which His law forbiddeth; the matter of their prayers not consisting with our common Christianity. For, of a truth, it is utterly unreasonable to imagine, that God should grant inspirations of the Holy Ghost for such purposes as our common Christianity furniseth. And, therefore, the consequences of so false a presumption must be either ridiculous or pernicious.

§ 18. Now if any man say, that he admits not the premisses upon which I infer these consequences; it remains, that the dispute rest upon those premisses, and come not to these consequences. Only let him take notice, that I have shewed him the true consequences of my own premisses; which he must reprove as inconsistent with Christianity, if he take upon

---

*a* "Take deriving neutrally or absolutely in grammar." Added in margin in MS.

*b* See above, c. xiii.

*c* Above in c. xxi. § 56, 57.
him to blame the premisses for any fault that he findeth with their true consequences. And, to say truth, as the substance and matter of Christianity is concerned in all these offices (though in some more, in some less), and by consequence in the form of celebrating them, so the unity of the Church is generally concerned in the form of celebrating them all; in as much as any difference, insisted upon as necessary, and not so admitted by others, is in point of fact a just occasion of division in the Church. And, therefore, all little disputes of these particulars necessarily resort to the general;—whether God hath commanded the unity of the Church in the external communion of the members thereof, or not. Which having concluded by the premisses, I conceive I have founded a prejudice, peremptorily overruling all the petty exceptions, that our time hath produced to dissolve this unity; which ought to have been preferred before them, had they been just and true, as none of them proveth.

CHAPTER XXIV.


I would now make one controversy more (how much soever I pretend to abate controversies), than hitherto hath been disputed between the Reformation and the Church of Rome; because, though we hear not of it in our books of controversies, yet in deed, and in practice, it is the most visible difference between the exercise of religion in the two professions, that you can name. For what is it that men go to church for, but to hear a sermon on one side and to hear a mass on the other side? And yet, among so many books of controversies, who hath disputed, whether a man is rather to
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go to church to hear a sermon, or (not to hear a mass but) to receive the eucharist? This is the reason indeed, why I dispute not this controversy (because the mass should be the eucharist, but by abuses crept in by length of time is become something else), until I can state the question upon such terms, as may make the reason of reformation visible. Whether the celebration of the eucharist is to be done in a language which the people for the most part understand, not in Latin, as the mass, supposing the most part understand it not,—is first to be settled, before we enquire, what it is that Christians chiefly assemble themselves for; though the question concerns not the eucharist any more than the other offices of God's public service, only as the eucharist, if it prove the principal of them, is principally concerned in it.

§ 2. I am then to confess, in the beginning, that those of the Church of Rome have a strong and weighty objection against me, why they ought not to give way, that the service of the Church, though in a form prescribed by the Church (as I require), should be celebrated in the vulgar languages, which every people understand. The objection is drawn from that which we have seen come to pass. For the service of the Church, the form and terms of it, being submitted to the construction of every one because in English, hath given occasion to people (utterly unable to judge, either how agree-

4 See below, c. xxv.

* Jacobus Ledesma, De Divinis Scripturis passim non legendis, cc. xvi, sq. pp. 121, sq. Colon. 1571, gives as his reasons, "quibus ostenditur non expedire ut sacram vel Divina officia vulgari sermone passim celebretur," 1. that the unity of believers and of the Christian religion would thereby perish; 2. "ex variis causis harenaeus ac errorum quae inde nascerentur; 3. ex eo quod esset quoque magnum ignorantiam et imperitiae causa in republica Christiana, 4. ex varietate, incertiudine, et multitudine versionum," 6. from other inconveniences, upon which he enlarges, alleging (p. 157), that "hece Scripturam et Divinorum officiorum prophaneatio verius quam translatio nobis... effecit autores, sartores, lanios, buiulos, fartoires, et pistoros, subita metamorphosi, apostolos, doctores, prophetas; imo, quod ridiculum magis est, sitrices et sartrices et lanias et baiulas ac pistrices, prophetissas, apostolas, doctrices."—Much the same arguments are to be found in Hosius, Dialogus de Sacro Vernaculo Legendo, in fin. lib. de Expresso Dei Verbo, Op., tom. i. pp. 662, sq. Colon. 1584.—But the most violent controversialist on the Roman side appears to be the convert William Reynolds, in his insane book entitled Calvinus-Turcismus (which is neither more nor less than an assimilation of Protestantism with Mohammedanism), lib. iv. c. 7. pp. 866, sq. Antv. 1597.—So also the Rhemists on 1 Cor. xiv.—Bp. Christopherson's arguments on the subject, in Queen Mary's reign, are quoted in Wordsworth's Eccles. Biography, vols. i. p. 149. note, iii. p. 88. note.—And on the subject generally, see Usher's Hist. Dogmatica Controversiarum Inter Orthodoxos et Pontificios de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis, Works, vol. xii. pp. 146, sq.
able matters excepted against are to Christianity, or how necessary the form [is] to the preservation of unity in the Church), first to desire a change, then to seek it in a way of fact, though by dissolving the unity of this Church. For he that maintains, as I do, that whatsoever defects the form established may have, are not of weight to persuade a change in case of danger to unity; and, secondly, that those, who have attempted the change, have not had either the lot or the skill to light upon the true defects of it, but to change for the worse in all things considerable: must needs affirm, that otherwise they could never have had the means to possess men's fancies with those appearances of reason for it, which have made them think themselves wise enough to undertake so great a change. And, truly, there is nothing so dangerous to Christianity as a superficial skill in the Scriptures and matters of the Church: which may move them, that are puffed up with it, to attempt that for the best, which it cannot enable them for to see that so it is indeed; whereas they, who hold no opinion in matters above their capacity (because concerning the state of the whole), are at better leisure to seek their salvation by making their benefit of the order provided. Seeing, then, it cannot be denied, that the benefit of having the service of God prescribed by the Church in our vulgar English hath occasioned so great a mischief as the destruction of it, it seems the Church of Rome hath reason to refuse children edge-tools to cut themselves with, in not giving way to the public service of God in the vulgar languages: unless it could be maintained, that no form ought to be prescribed; which is all one as to say, that there ought to be no Church, inasmuch as there can be no unity in the faith of Christ, and the service of God according to the same, otherwise.

§ 3. Now, that you may judge what effect this objection ought to have, we must remember St. Paul's dispute; upon another occasion indeed, but from the same grounds and reasons, which are to be alleged for the edification of the Church in our case. God had stirred up many prophets in the Church of Corinth, together with those who celebrated

1 Added from MS.
the mysteries of Christianity in unknown languages, and others that could interpret the same in the vulgar; partly out of an intent to manifest to the Gentiles and Jews His own presence in His Church (including and presupposing the truth of Christianity), but partly also for the instruction of the people (novices in Christianity for a great part) in the truth of it, and for the celebration of those offices wherewith He is to be served by His Church. It came to pass, that divers, puffed up with the conceit of God's using them to demonstrate His presence among His people, took upon them to bring forth those things, which the Spirit of God moved them to speak in unknown languages, at the public assemblies of the Church; who might indeed admire the work of God, but could neither improve their knowledge in His truth, nor exercise their devotion in His praises, or those prayers to Him, which were uttered in an unknown language. This is that which the apostle disputeth against throughout the fourteenth chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians; making express mention of "prayers, blessings" (which I have shewed to be the consecration of the eucharist) and "psalms" (vv. 14, 17, 26), and concluding (vv. 27, 28), that no man speak any thing in the Church, though it be that doctrine, those prayers or praises of God, which His own Spirit suggesteth, unless there be some body present that can interpret. Which, what case can there fall out for the Church, which it reacheth not? For, you see, St. Paul excludeth out of the Church even the dictates of God's Spirit, evidencing His presence in the Church by miraculous operations, unless they may be interpreted for the edification and direction of the Church. What can he then admit for the service of God in the name of His Church, or for the instruction thereof, which it can neither be instructed by, nor offer unto Him for His service? Nay, what cause can there be, why the Church should meet, according to St. Paul, if there be nothing done that is understood? What cause can be alleged, why there should be a Church, that is, a body, and an authority to order that body, if there be no office for which it should assemble? because that, which it understandeth not, is no such office. For I have laid this for a ground, that the society of the Church subsisteth for the service of God at the
common assemblies of the Church in the unity of the same Christianity*; so that, though it may be alleged, that the unity of Christianity may be preserved by the society of the Church though the service of God be not understood, yet the end for which it is preserved is not compassed, when the service of God is not performed by those, who understand it as Christianity requireth. Certainly it is a question to be demanded of those of the Church of Rome, why they do not preach to the people in Latin, as well as they celebrate the rest of God's service in that language, if they be content to submit themselves to St. Paul's doctrine? For whatsoever reason they can allege, why that in the vulgar and the rest in Latin, will rather serve to demonstrate, that it would be more visibly ridiculous, than that it is any more against St. Paul's doctrine. But is it any more to the benefit of God's people toward the obtaining of their necessities of God, that they should assemble to offer Him the devotions which they understand not, than not to assemble, or offer none? For whatsoever may be said, that the devotions of those, who do understand what they do, are available to the benefit of those, who do not, will hold nevertheless, though they were not present, nor pretended to do that which the congregation doth; provided that they have as good a heart 219 to do that which the congregation doth, as they have being present at it: unless we suppose, that God values their hearts because they are there, more than He would value them being elsewhere.

§ 4. Nor can I possibly imagine, what can be said to all this, but only in abatement of that ignorance in the Latin of the Church service, which the nations of the western Church may be supposed to attain to; whether by custom of being used always to the same form, or because the vulgar languages of Italy, Spain, and France, being derived from the Latin, may enable even unlettered people to understand that, or the most part of that, which is said in Latin at the Church service. Which is the reason, why the Jews after their return from captivity, having changed their mother Hebrew into the vulgar tongue of the Babylonians and Chaldeans

*a See above, c. i. § 2.
*b Corrected from M.S.; "understand it not as," in folio edition.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

(being indeed derived from it, with less change than the Italian from the Latin), maintained notwithstanding the service of God in their original Hebrew, so far as we are able to understand by the circumstances produced elsewhere. And though at this present some parts of it are rather Chaldee than Hebrew, yet they are now in such a condition, that a great many of them are not able to attain either that language or the Hebrew, but speak and understand only that language where they are bred, the service which they use in their synagogues remaining in the Hebrew. And the Greeks at this day, having got a vulgar language as much differing from the ancient learned Greek as the Italian from the Latin, notwithstanding cease not to exercise the service of God in the learned Greek, which they understand not. Which the western nations and northern may continue to do with as little burthen as they voluntarily undergo, lest they should give the minds of rude people cause to make more doubt than they see, upon a change which they see.

§ 5. And, truly, I do think this consideration of preserving unity in the Church of such weight, that I do not think it was requisite, when the Latin tongue began to be worn out of use by little and little through the breaches made by the German nations upon the western empire, that the service of the Church should straightway be put into the languages of those nations, who were every day changing their languages and learning the Latin; or rather framing new languages by mixing their own with the Latin. Neither will I undertake to determine the time and the state, in which the Church first becomes or became obliged to provide this change, for the same reason. For it is evident, that it had not been possible to preserve correspondence and intercourse between all these nations, with the maintenance of unity in that Christianity, which while this change was making they had received, had not the knowledge of the Latin among them made it reasonable to continue the use of it in the Church service.

1 Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. vii. § 12—23.—Bellarm., De Verbo Dei, lib. ii. c. 16, Controv., tom. i. p. 139. D, alleges this as an example in his own favour, after Ledesima.
§ 6. But as the case is now, that a total change of the Latin into new languages hath been accomplished; and that the greatest part of Christian people by many parts are by no means able to learn what is done at the service of the Church, confining it to the Latin: I must needs count it strange, that the example of the modern Jews in their synagogues, or those miserably oppressed Christians in Turkey, should be alleged; as to prove, that there is nothing to oblige the whole Church to provide better for all Christians, than those Churches do for their people, or the Jews for their synagogues, when we dispute what ought to be done. We should rather look to the original practice of Christendom (which there may be reason to entitle unto the apostles, and consequently the changes that may have succeeded, to a defect of succeeding ages, failing and coming short of their institutions), than allege the practice of the Jews (which the Christians have so little cause to envy, that they may well conclude them to be a people forsaken of God, by the little appearance of religion in the offices which they serve God with), or the necessities of ignorant and persecuted Christians, for a rule to Churches flourishing with knowledge and means of advancing God’s service.

§ 7. If from the beginning, when by the means of those, who spoke Greek and Latin, or other languages used within the empire, from whence the tidings of the Gospel came, other nations had received the service of God in those languages, wherein the Churches of Rome, Constantinople,
Alexandria, or Antiochia, or possibly other Churches from which their Christianity was planted, did celebrate it; they might with some colour of reason have argued, that so it ought to continue in the western Church. But since it appeareth, that the service of God hath been prescribed in the Arabic, the Syriac, the Ethiopic, the Coptic, the Slavonian, the Russ, and other foreign languages: what can a man infer from the practice of the Church of Rome, not allowing the Saxons in Britain, the Germans in Almain, and the north and eastland countries, the Slavonians in Pole and Boheme, and other parts, the service of God in their mother-tongues, towards the disputes of this time, that they ought not to be allowed it, but the enhancing of the pope's power; requiring of those, who acknowledge the same, absolute conformity in things altogether needless to the unity of the Church, the true end of all due power in the Church. For were conformity in this point necessary to the unity of the Church; had the power of the Church of Rome, and of the pope in behalf of it, been such, by virtue of the first instituting of it, as might have required it: why then was it not required from the beginning, that the service of God through the whole empire should be celebrated in Latin, being the language which the mother Church of the mother city did use, and far more frequented then in Greece, than now in the west, which is forced to use it?

§ 8. Seeing, then, it appeareth, that there is nothing at all to be alleged for so great an inconvenience, but that which I have alleged for it, and which I acknowledge to be truly alleged and justly, but not justly admitted; it remaineth, that the Church is provided by God of other laws, the observ- vation whereof is and would be a cure to the danger alleged from the change of the public service of God into the vulgar languages. For this danger proceedeth from nothing but from the false pretence of absolute and infallible authority in the Church; which is indeed limited by the truth of that Christianity whereupon the Church is grounded, and for the maintenance whereof it subsisteth. For though this pretence may be a mean to contain simple people in obedience to any thing which shall be imposed, so long as they know not any thing better that they ought to have; yet, if con-
science be once awaked with reasons convincing, that the
to authority instituted by God in His Church is abused to the
prejudice and hindrance of the salvation of God's people, it
is no marvel, either that they should neglect all their interest
of this world to seek themselves redress, or that they should
mistake themselves in seeking it, and think the redress to be
the destroying of all authority in the Church. So that the
preventing of danger by the necessary reformation of abuses
in Church matters, must not be thought to consist in pre-
tences, as inconsistent with the common good of the Churches
as with the truth of Christianity, but in submitting to those
bounds, which the grounds of Christianity evidently esta-
blisheath; and which, unless Christianity make people more
untractable than all the crudeness which they are born and
bred with makes barbarous nations and wild beasts, the
sense of those mischiefs, which difference of religion hath
brought in and maintained in Christendom, must needs have
disposed them to embrace and to cherish for the future
avoiding of the same.

§ 9. In the next place, supposing the eucharist, as the rest
of the service, to be celebrated in a language vulgarly under-
stood, we are to debate, whether the eucharist require com-
mination, or whether the private masses now allowed and
countenanced in the Church of Rome be of the institution of
our Lord and His apostles. Nor shall I need to use
many words, to free the term of private masses from the ex-
ception which is sometimes made;—that all masses are pub-
lic actions of the Church, repeating the sacrifice of Christ
crucified to the benefit of His Church. For, seeing the term
of a "private mass" signifieth a thing visible,—the celebra-

\[\text{[No authority for private masses in Scripture.]}\]


tion of that eucharist, whereof nobody but the priest that
221 consecrates it doth communicate;—I ask no man leave to
use the term, signifying no more by it, but putting the rest
to debate, whether, as de facto in the Church of Rome, so
de jure according to the institution of our Lord and His
apostles, the sacrifice of Christ crucified is and ought to be
either repeated or represented and commemorated* by cele-
brating the eucharist, so as nobody but the priest that con-
secrates to communicate; or whether the institution of our
Lord require, that Christians communicate in the eucharist
which they celebrate. A dispute, wherein nothing that is
said in the Scripture concerning the order and practice of
our Lord and His apostles can leave any doubt? For though
there may be mention of celebrating the eucharist where
there is no mention of communicating in it (which is an
argument merely negative, not from the Scripture, but from
this or that scripture, and of no consequence to say, St. Paul,
1 Cor. xiv. 14—17, 1 Tim. ii. 1—6, mentioneth the celebra-
tion of the eucharist, not mentioning any communion, there-
fore nobody did communicate); yet are we far from the least
inking of any circumstance, to shew, that there was this
sacrament celebrated, when there was none but he that con-
secrated it to communicate. Nay, if we regard the institu-
tion—"Do this in remembrance of Me,"—referring as much
[Lukexxii.
to "take, eat, and drink," as to the "blessing" or "thanks-
19; 1 Cor.
giving," whereby I have shewed that our Lord did consecrate;
xi. 24.]
if we regard St. Paul, affirming, that "the bread which we
[1 Cor. xi.
bless, and the cup which we drink, is the communion of the
21, 22.]
Body and Blood of Christ," 1 Cor. x. 16; and reproving the
Corinthians, because the rich prevented the poor, and suf-
fered them not to communicate in their oblations, out of
which the eucharist was consecrated, as I shewed afore†: we
shall be bold to conclude, that, so far as appears by the
Scripture, all that did celebrate did communicate; as all that
assisted did celebrate, if that be true which I proved afore‡,

* Corrected from MS.; "commend-
† See Bp. Jewel's Sermon at Paul's Cross, Works vol. i. pp. 23, sq.
‡ Above, c. iv. § 6, sq.—See also Cassander, Liturg., c. xxviii.; Op. p. 59.
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that the prayers of the congregation is that which consecrates the eucharist, to wit, supposing God's ordinance.

§ 10. The same appears by Justin Martyr, and other ancientest records of the Church, that describe this office. But I cannot better express the sense of the Church in this point, than by alleging the decretal Epistles of the popes before Innocent the First or his predecessor Syricius; which, being forged by Isidore Mercator [above?] seven hundred years after Christ, as hath been discovered by men of much learning, do notwithstanding contain this rule, that he who communicates not, be not admitted to the service of the Church: which he that forged them would never have fathered upon the ancient popes, had it not been evident to all that were seen in the canons of the Church, that it was of old a matter of censure to be present at celebrating the eucharist and not to communicate in it; a thing evident enough by many canons of councils yet extant, and foisted

* Quoted above, c. iv. § 12.
* See above, c. iv. § 13—24.
* Blondel's Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus Vapulantes ( seu Editio et Censura Nova Epistolarum Omnium, quas plissimis Urbis Romae Præmulibus a B. Clemente ad Syricium, &c., nefando anu, infelici eventu, Isidorus cognomento Mercator supposuit, Franciscus Turrianus Jesuata adversus Magdeburgensium de ergens in aculeato stylo defendere conatus est, " &c. &c.) 4to. Genev. 1628, is the great authority on this subject: and see Cave, art. Isid. Mercator.
* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 39. note k.
* Corrected from MS.; "some," in folio edition.
into those decretals to no other purpose, but to make men believe in after ages, that those canons were made to prosecute and to bring to effect those things which the popes had decreed afore; as if their authority had been always the same as it was at the time of this forgery.

§ 11. Now it is well enough known, what pretences have been made, and what consequences drawn, from the speculation of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross repeated or represented by this sacrament, to persuade Christendom, that the benefit thereof in remission of sins and infusion of grace and all the effects of Christ's passion is derived upon God's people by virtue of the mere act of assisting at the sacrifice, which hath been called opus operatum or the very external work done, without consideration, without knowledge, without any intention of doing that which he is to do in it; that is, of concurring every one for his share to the doing of the same: supposing always, that this sacrifice consists in substituting the Body and Blood of Christ to be bodily present under the accidents of the elements, the substance of them being abolished and ceasing to be there any more; and not in offering and presenting the sacrifice of Christ crucified, here now represented by this sacrament, unto God, for obtaining the benefits of His passion in behalf of His Church.

§ 12. And this opinion I may safely say I know to be still maintained, because I have heard it maintained, though (as I suppose) by the more licentious and ignorant sort of priests:—that it concerns not the people to consider, to know, to intend to join their devotions, to the effecting of that which this sacrament pretends; but only to mind their own prayers, assisting and accompanying that which the priest doth with those affections which they came to church with. But can I therefore say, that this is the doctrine of that Church, because it allows such things to be taught and said without punishment or disgrace? Surely he, that peruses, not only


b See above in c. ii. § 30. note a, and c. v. § 24—26. notes t—b.
the testimonies which Doctor Field has produced in the Appendix alleged afore, to shew that the true understanding of the sacrifice of the eucharist was maintained in the Church even till the Reformation, together with the opinions of many divines of credit in that Church, and instructions of catechisms, and devotions, that have been published since the Council of Trent, shall easily conclude, that it is allowed though not enjoined by the Church to oppose this palliating of abuses in the Church by opinions so prejudicial to Christianity. And without doubt those, who pretend no more than to excuse the Church in not reforming the abuse of private masses by saying, that the Church commands them not nor forbids any man to communicate at any time but rather exhorts them to it, are far from saying, that the people are no further concerned in the mass than to assist it with their bodily presence and the general good intentions and affections which they come to church with, employing themselves in the mean time at their own devotions: though it is much to be feared, that this opinion is far the more popular; the opposition which the Reformation hath occasioned, and the countenance given by the see of Rome to those who are the most zealous and extreme in opposing the heretics, bearing down the endeavours of more conscientious priests to maintain more Christian opinions in the minds of their people.

* In the Pref. to this Appendix, Dr. Field is occupied in proving by copious citations, that "the Church, in which our fathers lived and died," was "a Protestant Church:" 1. in not admitting private masses; 2. in not admitting the half communion of laymen; 3. with respect to "the new real sacrifice of Christ" in the Eucharist, which constitutes the Romish doctrine of "the propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead," therein made; lastly, with respect to the Romish corruptions introduced into prayer for the dead and intercession of saints.

* Above, c. v. § 36.

* "Optaret quidem sacrosancta synodus, ut in singulis missis fideles adstantes non solum spirituali affectu sed sacramentali etiam eucharistiae perceptione communicaret, quo ad eos hujus sanctissimi sacrificii fructus uberior proveniret." Conc. Trident., Sess. xxii. (A.D. 1562) De Sacr. Missam, cap. vi.; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv, p. 854. C. And see the Commentary of Jacobus Catalanus on the Rituale Romanum, lib. i. tit. iv. c. 2. § 10. tom. i. pp. 269, 270. Rom. 1750: urging other authorities for this, as e.g. that of S. Charles Borromeo in a Council at Milan. Catalani begins by acknowledging, that "addubitari neguit quin olim communio populi intra missam (he is commenting on the rubric, that it shall be "intra missam, nisi quandoque ex rationabili causa post missam sit facienda") "post communione sacerdos celebrans fieri debuerit, nullusque sacris mysteriis interesse permittetur nisi qui offerre poterat atque de oblatis participare, ut veterum sacerdorum rituum peritissimus Joannes Bona Cardinalis notavit" (see above, § 10. note a).
§ 13. In the mean time it is visible, that the resolution of this point dependeth upon the true reason of offering the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross in celebrating the sacrament of the eucharist: which I have shewed to consist in presenting unto God the sacrifice of Christ crucified, represented here now by the elements sacramentally changed by the act of consecrating into the Body and Blood of Christ by those prayers, whereby the congregation, which celebrate this sacrament, intercedeth with God for their own necessities and the necessities of His Church. For if the virtue and efficacy of these prayers be grounded upon nothing else than the fidelity of the congregation in standing to the covenant of baptism (as, if Christianity be true, it consists in nothing else); and if the celebration of the eucharist be the profession of fidelity and perseverance in it: what remaineth but that the efficacy of the sacrifice depend upon the receiving of the eucharist? unless the efficacy and virtue of Christian men’s prayers can depend upon their perseverance in that covenant, which they refuse to renew, and to profess perseverance in it, that profession being no less necessary than the inward intention of persevering in the same. For the receiving of the eucharist is no less expressively a renewing of the covenant of baptism, than being baptized is entering into it; so that whosoever refuses the communion of the eucharist, inasmuch as he refuses it, refuses to stand to the covenant of his baptism, whereby he expects the world to come.

§ 14. I say not, therefore, that whosoever communicates not in the eucharist, so oft as he hath means and opportunity to do it, renounces his Christianity, either expressly or by construction and consequence. For how many of us may be prevented with the guilt of sin, so deeply staining the conscience, that they cannot satisfy themselves in the competence of that conversion to God, which they have time and reason and opportunity to exercise, before the opportunity of communicating? How many have need of the authority of the Church, and the power of the keys, not only for their satisfaction, but for their direction, in washing their wedding

Yet frequent communion not to be rashly enforced upon all Christians.

Yet see above, c. v. § 6—23.
garments white again? How many are so distracted and
oppressed with business of this world, that they cannot upon
all opportunities retire their thoughts to that attention
and devotion, which the office requires? How many, though
free of business which Christianity enjoineth, are entangled
with the cares and pleasures of the world, though not so far
as to depart from the state of grace, yet further than the
renewing of the covenant of grace importeth?

§ 15. Be it therefore granted, that there is a great allow-
ance to be made in exacting the apostolical rule for all that
are present to communicate. But be it likewise considered,
what a pitiful excuse it is in behalf of the Church, that it
forbiddeth no man to communicate, that is prepared as the
rules thereof require; subsisting for no other purpose, but to
procure the people thereof to be prepared for the service of
God, whereof the principal part is this office. But when it
is further allowed to be taught and said, that it concerns not
God's people to assist the office of the Church with their
actual intentions and devotions, but with their bodily pre-
sence and the general affection which they bring with them
to church; what reason can be alleged, why they should go
to church, to carry those affections to the congregations,
which are exercised at home with their particular devotions
to the same purpose? Nay, to what purpose subsisteth the
communion of the Church, if it subsist not in order to the
service of God in the public assembly of His people; the
chief office whereof is taught to be of that nature, that the
presence of a Christian is of no effect to the purpose of it?
Or what reason can be alleged, why the parts of Christendom
should not provide for themselves by restoring the primitive
practice of Christianity, without the consent of the whole;
forbidding them to provide for themselves, but not providing
for them in matters so grossly and palpably concerning our
common Christianity?

§ 16. But having cautioned, that the service of God and
the eucharist be in a language vulgarly understood, and that
for the communion, as well as for the sacrifice; it must

* "Not that the Church of Rome is
the whole Church; but they, which
change laws without consent thereof,
change without consent of the whole.”
Added in margin in MS.—See above,
c. xx.
further be provided, that this communion be complete in both kinds in which the sacrament is celebrated, not barring the people of the cup, as it is the custom in the Church of Rome to do. And, truly, there is not so much marvel at any thing in difference, as there is, why it hath been thought fit to make the cause of so great a breach. For the precept running in those terms, which take hold of them who are obliged by it, that is, of the whole Church, consisting of clergy and people both alike (because I have shewed, that “Do this in remembrance of Me,” concerns the whole Church, by the prayers whereof it is consecrated); how will it be possible to make any human understanding capable to comprehend, that, when our Lord saith, “Take, eat, drink, do this,” the people shall stand charged only with part of it?

§ 17. Indeed, had there been any limitation of the Lawgiver’s intent expressed, either by way of precept, as this lies, or by the practice of the Church, originally under the apostles and generally throughout Christendom; there might have been pretence for dispute. And it must not be denied, that there have been those, that have attempted to shew that the apostles so used it, even in the Scriptures: but by such

\[\text{(Luke xxii, 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24.)}\]

\[\text{(Scripture plain for it, notwithstanding the pre-}\
\text{tences urged to the contrary.)}\]
BOOK III.

means, as if they meant not indeed to prove it for a truth, but to shew, how willingly they would gratify those who would be glad to see it proved, whether true or false; and do therefore sort to no other effect, than to make it appear, that their desire to prove it out of the Scripture was far greater than the Scripture gave them cause to cherish. For were "breaking of bread" put a thousand times in the Scripture for celebrating the eucharist (as sometimes it is put, Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7; at least, for those suppers at which the eucharist was celebrated): what would this avail, unless we could be persuaded, that, as oft as breaking of bread is put for eating, there we are to understand that there was no drink? or unless we could understand by one and the same term of "breaking bread," that all priests had drink as well as bread, but the lay people none? Therefore, whatsoever advantage it may be (in regard it is certain, that the greatest part of the world will never be wise) to make a noise with any plea, though never so improbable, rather than be thought to have nothing to say; men of judgment and conscience must needs take it for a confession, that there is no ground for it in the Scriptures, to see things alleged so far from all appearance of truth.

§ 18. As for the practice of the Catholic Church, I may very well remit all that desire to inform, and not to scan-

[And so also the practice of the Catholic Church.]

dalize themselves, to those things which Cassander hath

(with a) much learning collected, as sufficient to make it ap-

sentiunt omnes, tam Catholici quam sectarii; nec enim negare potest, qui vel levissima rerum ecclesiasticarum notitia imbutus sit. Semper enim et ubique ab ecclesiis primordii usque ad saeculum duodecimum sub specie panis et vini communicarunt fideles: coripitque paulatim ejus saeculi initio usus calicis obsolescere, plerisque episcopis eum populo interdicentibus ob periculum irreverentiam et effusionem... Hec autem mutatio facta est primum a diversis episcopis in suis ecclesiis, deside a synodo Constantinian canonica sanotione pro omnibus stabilita, nullo profecto spiritualis refectionis detrimento, ut fideles experientur; nulla Divine legis transgressionem: quia communio sub utraque specie nec Divinitus institutae fuit, nec unquam antiqui patres eam ad salutem necessarium esse docuerunt" (Bona, Rer. Liturg., lib. ii. c. 18. § 1. Op. p. 893): a passage, of which the honesty of the commencement is only equalled by the hardihood of its closing assertions. See also Bingham, XV. v. 1.


* Misprinted "which" in folio edit.
pear (if any thing, that men are unwilling to see, can be made to appear), that, as to this day there is no such custom in the eastern Church, so in the western Church it is not many ages since it can be called a custom; and that, by so visible degrees introduced, as may be an undeniable instance to make evidence, that corruption may creep into the laws and customs of the Church, though by those degrees which are not always visible.

§ 19. Indeed it is alleged, that there are some natures found in the world, that can by no means endure the taste of wine (which therefore some men call "abstemious") without casting it back again, and enduring as great pangs as men are seen to endure that are forced or couzened to eat things which they hate: so that to force such natures to receive the sacrament in both kinds, were to destroy the reverence due to it, both in them who receive it, and in them that shall see it used with no more reverence.

§ 20. It is alleged again, that Christianity goes further than wine; that is, that some Christian nations dwell in countries so untemperately cold, that wine will not keep in their countries but changes as soon as it comes. Now as no reason appeareth, why the sacrament should not be celebrated for the use of those people who cannot receive it in both kinds; neither can any reason appear, why other people, receiving it in one kind, should not receive the same benefit by it which they do.

§ 21. Last of all it is alleged, that in the primitive Church


nibus;" so that many "non possunt abaque nausea vinum gustare."

* So Melanchthon, Lib. de Usu Integri Sacramenti, Op. tom. ii. p. 136. Witemb. 1601: quoted also by Bellarm. (as in last note, C, D), to establish his own exception, that "in multis regionibus vinum non crescit, et quod aliunde adfertur, partim summo precio emitur, partim non diu conservatur;" instancing Japan, and Norway. Other citations may be found in Morton’s treatise on the Mass, Bk. i. c. 3. § 10.

* So Bellarm., as in note p, pp. 897. A, sq.: and see Cassander, as in note m, pp. 1028, sq.; and Bingham, XV. iv. 6, sq. and v. 1.
it was many times received by the people in one kind upon several occasions. For in regard that Christians could not always be present at the celebrating thereof, when there was not such means as have since been provided, especially those who were married to unbelievers; it was a custom to send them the communion, who were known to join with the devotion of the Church, though hindered to join therewith in bodily presence: as we learn by Justin Martyr's second Apology. And because, in the quality of wine, a little quantity is not to be preserved (as preserve it they did, besides other reasons, to take it fasting); therefore it was sent only in the other kind: as we find by Tertullian, writing to his wife. Again, if a man that was under penance fell in danger of departing this life, before he was reconciled to the Church by receiving the communion again (which by this one instance we may see, how much the primitive Christians abominated to do): as the law of the Church was, that they should not be refused the communion in that case; so the custom was, for the same reason, to send it them only in one kind: as appeareth by an eminent example, related from Dionysius of Alexandria by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi. 44.

§ 22. But these instances, if they be looked into, will appear to be of the same consequence, as if it should be alleged to a Jew, that, if two Jews should turn back to back, and go one of them east, the other west, till they came to

* See Cassander, as in note m, pp. 1029, 1030; and Bingham, XV. iv. 8—11.


* So Bellarmine, as in note p, p. 896. D. And see Bingham, XV. iv. 13.

* "Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustet? Et si sciverit panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur?" Tertull., Ad Uxor., lib. ii. c. 5; Op. p. 169. B: speaking of a woman's marrying a heathen husband.

* Bellarmine, as in note p, p. 899. D. See Bingham, XV. iv. 9.

* "Δούμαι στεάδασε, καὶ μεθαύτων ἀπολλάσατο τῶν πρεσβύτερων μοι τὸν κάλος καὶ ταῦτα εἶπαν, πάλιν ἐμὸν ἐδοξαζέντας πάντα ἐν τῷ πρεσβύτερῳ τῷ ἐν τῇ κάκειν ἰδέᾳ: αφιέρωσε μὲν αὐτὸν τῷ ἐνθθέντος, τοὺς ἀπαλλαττώσατε τῷ βίῳ, εἰ δύνατα καὶ μάλιστα ἐν καὶ πρότερον κατευθύνατε τόγον, ἀφίερωσεν, ἵν' ἐνελθόντες ἀπαλλάσσετε. Βροχή τῆς εὐχαρίστιας ἐπόθηκε τῇ τιμαθήθη, ἀποβρέθη καλέσας, καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτερῳ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐκπεπράξει ἐκφερείς ὁ παίς φίλος... ἀπεβρέθης ἡ παίς, καὶ ἐμα τε ἐνέχει τῆς στόματι καὶ μινδοὺ ἰδέαν καταρφείον, εὐθέως ἐπόθηκε τῷ πνεύματι." Euseb., H. E., lib. vi. c. 44. p. 246 B—D: from an Epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria to Fabius of Rome, and describing the death of one Serapion, who had sacrificed in time of persecution and sought reconciliation on his deathbed.
meet again (howsoever this may be possible to be done*),
seeing when they meet again, if the one count Saturday, the
other must needs count Sunday (as appears evidently by the
reason of the sphere, and the daily motion of the sun round
the earth*), therefore they cannot both keep the sabbath upon
the day which the Law appoints; therefore it is in the power
of the synagogue to appoint that no sabbath be kept: or be-
cause; during the forty years' travel of the Israelites through
the wilderness to the land of promise, their children were not
circumcised, by reason that they knew not when they should
be summoned to remove by the moving of the cloud that was
over the tabernacle, which they were always to be ready to
do; therefore it was in the power of the synagogue to dis-
 pense with the circumcision of male children under the Law
of Moses. Positive precepts they are all, that of circum-
cision, and that of the sabbath, as well as this of the euchar-
ist. Neither can it be said, that those ever concerned the
salvation of a Jew more nearly, than this earnest of our com-
mon salvation concerns that of a Christian. And why the
synagogue should not have more power in those precepts,
than the Church in this, nothing can be said.

§ 23. But to the particulars. Suppose some fancies may
be possessed with such an averseness to wine, that no use of
reason at years of discretion, when they come to the eucharist,
will prevail to admit that kind without such alteration in
them, as the reverence due unto it can stand with (for I have
seen the case of one, that never had tasted wine in all his
life, and yet by honest endeavours, when he first came to the
eucharist, receives it in both kinds without any manner of
offence): doth it therefore fall under the power of the Church
to prohibit it all people, because there may fall a case,
wherein it shall be necessary to dispense with some, though
not comprehended in the case? For there is nothing but
the mere necessity of giving order in cases not expressed by
the law, that gives the Church power to take order in such
cases; therefore without those cases it hath none. And so
in the case of those nations, where wine will not keep, yet
the people are Christians.

* It is perhaps hardly necessary to notice, that this was written A.D. 1666.
§ 24. For neither was the reason otherwise, supposing that
the ancients did reserve the eucharist in one kind only, for
the absent, or for the case of sudden death, to those that
were under penance. For this reservation was but from
communication to communion; which in those days was so fre-
quently, that he who carried away the Body of our Lord to
eat it at home, drinking the Blood at present, might reason-
ablely be said to communicate in both kinds. Neither can
that sacramental change, which the consecration works in
the elements, be limited to the instant of the assembly;
though it take effect only in order to that communion, unto
which the Church designeth that which it consecrateth.
And so far as I can understand the condition of the Church
at that time in these cases, there may have been as just
cause to give it then in one kind in these cases, as now to
the "abstemious," or to those nations where wine will not
keep. But shall this necessity be a colour for a power in
the Church, to take away the birth-right of Christian people
to that which their own prayers consecrate? If the power of
the Church be infinite, this colour need not. If it be only
regular, as I have shewed all along that it is, there can be
no stronger rule than that of common reason, which forbids
servants to make bold with their master's ordinances, where
no other act of his obliges. For all necessity is the work of
providence; and excuses or (if you will) justifies, where it
constrains, not where it constrains not.

§ 25. The Greek Church hath an ancient custom, not to
consecrate the eucharist in Lent but upon sabbaths and
Lord's days; on the other five days of the week, to com-
municate of that which was consecrated upon those days:
by the Council of Laodicea, can. xlix. And this com-
munication is prescribed by the Council in Trullo, can. lii.
But that they held the communion to be completed by dip-
@ping the elements consecrated afore in wine with the Lord's
prayer, it will [appear*] to him, that shall perseve that which

* Added from MS.
is found in Cassander's Works, pp. 1020, 1027. Whereby you shall perceive also, that the same was formerly done in the Church of Rome on Good Friday, on which day the same course was and is observed, and that, with an intent to consecrate it as the eucharist is consecrated; though at this day it is not so believed in the Church of Rome. For, the custom of the Church determining the intent of those prayers, whereby the eucharist is consecrated, to the elements in which it is communicated (because wine presently consecrated, being in so small a quantity, was not fit to be kept), there is no reason why the communion should not be complete: though how fit this custom is, I dispute not.

§ 26. But there is a new device of concomitance, just as [The new device of concomitance.]


* See in note c.


* The custom in question forms one of Bellarmine's arguments for half communion (De Sacr. Euch., lib. iv. c. 24. Controv., tom. ii. p. 901. B, C): assuming that the previously consecrated bread was partaken of without dipping it in wine. See Cassander's answer as quoted above in note e: and Bingham, XV. v. 1.

1 See Bellarmine, ibid., c. 21. pp. 874. C, sq.—The term 'concomitance' occurs in S. Thomas Aquinas, Summ. Theol., P. iii. Qu. 96. art. 1—3. In art. 2. ibid. Respondeo, he determines, that "sub speciebus panis est quidem Corpus Christi ex vi sacramenti, Sanguis autem ex reali concomitanti," his thesis being, that "sub utroque specie sacramenti totus est Christus." In art. 1. ad primum, he lays down, that "Divinitas vel anima Christi non sit in hoc sacramento ex vi sacramenti sed ex reali concomitanti: quia enim Divinitas Corpus assumptum nunquam
old as the withholding of the cup from the people; that you may be sure it would never have been pleaded but to maintain it: for in the Greek Church, that allows both kinds, who ever heard of it? It is said, that the blood in the body accompanieth the flesh; neither can the Body of Christ, as it is, or as it was upon the cross, be eaten without the Blood: seeing, then, that he who receiveth the Body must needs receive the Blood also, what wrong is it for the people to be denied that, which they have received already? And now you see to what purpose transubstantiation serves;—to make it appear, that our Lord instituted this sacrament in both elements to no purpose, seeing as much must needs be received in one kind as in both. And yet, by your favour, even transubstantiation distinguisheth between the being of the Flesh of Christ naturally in the Body of Christ upon the cross (for so it was necessarily accompanied with the Blood of Christ, not yet issued from it), and between the Flesh of Christ being sacramentally in the element consecrated into it. And thus it cannot be otherwise accompanied with the Blood, than because he that consecrates is commanded to consecrate another kind into the Blood; and so, he that receives the Body being commanded as much to receive the Blood, the Body may be said to be accompanied with the Blood. But otherwise, if he receive not the Blood, then is it not accompanied with the Blood as it ought to be. For, seeing the command is to receive, as well as to consecrate, several elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, it is manifest, that the Body and Blood of Christ are received, as they are consecrated, apart; under one element the Body, under another the Blood.

§ 27. Indeed upon another ground, which the Church of Rome will have no cause to own, I do conceive it may well be said, that the Body is accompanied with the Blood to them that receive the sacrament in one kind: in case it may or must be thought, that they, who in the Church of Rome
thirst after the eucharist in both kinds, do receive the whole
grace of the sacrament by the one kind; through the mercy
of God, giving more than He promiseth, in consideration that
they come not short of the condition required by their own
will or default. Which is necessarily to be believed by all,
that believe the Church of Rome to remain a Church, though
corrupt, and that salvation is to be had in it and by it:
though whether this be so or not, I say nothing here, be-
cause it is the last point, to be resolved out of the resolu-
tion of all that goes afore. For since it is no Church, unless
the grace of this sacrament be conveyed by the sacrament
ministered as the Church ministereth the same; and seeing
the precept of receiving the eucharist is positive, and im-
porteth not the promise of grace by the nature of the action
commanded, but by the free will and appointment of God:
it were injurious to the goodness of God to think, that He
denieth the promise to those, who would perform the con-
dition if they could, receiving the eucharist in one kind, be-
cause they cannot receive it in both. For to say nothing at
present, what reason may hinder him, that otherwise would
betake himself where he might receive it in both kinds;
how many thousand souls live and die in that communion
without knowing, that there is any where means to receive
it in both kinds?

§ 27. Which if it be so, then this resolution leaves the
charge where it ought to lie: not upon the people, who
suffer in it; but upon the priesthood, who enjoy by it a fruit-
less privilege above them at the charge of God's ordinance,
which suffereth the sacrilege; but especially the prelates,
whose consent and connivance maintains the abuse. For all
that hath been alleged to excuse it, may appear to a reason-
able man not to have been the reason for which it was intro-
duced: nor yet to avoid the irreverence of the wine that
may remain in the countrymen's beards;—for what is that
to women, that have none?—but to add to the clergy a pre-
eminence above the people, by excluding them from that, to
which it admitteth the priest that consecrateth. A thing
that had not needed, had the clergy known, that all the re-
verence which is justly due to them, is grounded upon the
difference between them and the people, in sobriety of car-

THORDIKE.
riage, and integrity of conscience visible in the same: and that serves not the turn, but rather turns to a contrary effect, when the people may perceive, that they betray their trust both to them and to God, by so unnecessarily abusing their office. So that the mean to recover and restore that trust and reverence due to the clergy from the people, which the maintenance of Christianity absolutely requireth, will consist in the recovering and restoring of that integrity and holiness of life in the clergy, grounded upon their renouncing the interests and engagements of this world, which their profession importeth; not in maintaining that difference, which the people may discern not to agree with our common Christianity.

CHAPTER XXV.¹

PRAYER THE MORE PRINCIPAL OFFICE OF GOD’S SERVICE THAN PREACHING. PREACHING, NEITHER GOD’S WORD NOR THE MEANS OF SALVATION; UNLESS LIMITED TO THE FAITH OF GOD’S CHURCH. WHAT THE EDIFICATION OF THE CHURCH BY PREACHING FURTHER REQUIRES. THE ORDER FOR DIVINE SERVICE ACCORDING TO THE COURSE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND; ACCORDING TO THE CUSTOM OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH.

And now there is nothing in the way, why we should not judge between the Reformation and the Church of Rome, whether the sermon or the mass be the principal office for which Christians are to assemble⁵; as the Romans once did between their neighbours of Ardea and Aricia, adjudging to themselves the land, which they were chosen to judge whether of those cities it belonged to. There had been indeed just complaint, that the people were not taught the duties of their Christianity at their assemblies in the Church: there had

¹ Misprinted XXIV. in folio edition.

m Pp. 227—272 are omitted in the paging of the folio edition, so that p. 273 follows immediately after p. 226.


⁵ Tit. Liv., lib. iii. cc. 71, 72.
been just complaint, that the service of the Church was not understood, being performed in an unknown tongue; that the eucharist was celebrated without any communion of the people; that the communion, when it was given, as rarely it was, was only in one kind. But never any complaint, that there were so many assemblies of the Church without preaching; whereas, when there is none, the Church ought not to assemble, though for the communion of the eucharist, and the service of God, which by the apostles’ ordinance it is to be celebrated with. No man living durst ever make any such complaint, nor can any man living justify it. And yet, when the change comes to be made, as if such a demand had been both made and justified, the sermon is set up instead of the mass in most places: and the Reformation is taken to be characterized as much by putting down the eucharist, or reserving it to four times a year, as by restoring the communion of it in both kinds, with the service which it is celebrated with, in the language that is vulgarly known.

§ 2. Not so the Church of England: the reformation whereof consisteth in an order, as well for the celebration of and communion in the eucharist all Lord’s days and festival days, as in putting the service into our mother-English; desiring, that there might be also a sermon, when it may be had in so good order, or so as to create no offence to God’s people or irreverence in His service, but prescribing the order aforesaid, though that cannot be attained to. Whereby it may appear, that it was nothing but the tares of false doctrine, sowed among the good wheat of the reformation in England, that hath hindered this good order to take effect in practice.

§ 3. For it were a great impertinence [in*] me to dispute here, that the eucharist thus celebrated is to be preferred before a sermon without it; no man having attempted to maintain the contrary, and the reason being so clear upon the premisses;—that as the undertaking of Christianity by baptism puts a man in possession of his title to the kingdom of

---

* Misprinted in the folio edition, "as, or so, by;" the words "or so" being misplaced from a few lines lower down, where they are wrongly omitted.

* See Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb., c. viii. § 44.

* See ibid., cc. vi. § 11. x. § 19, 93.

* Misprinted "to" in folio edit.
heaven, which the hearing of it preached only makes him capable to choose; so the renewing of his undertaking by the communion of the eucharist, and the exercise thereof by the service of God which it is celebrated with, is the means of attaining that, which the further knowledge of Christianity attained by a sermon renders a man only capable to attain: namely, the gift of the Holy Ghost, enabling to make good that Christianity which our baptism undertakes, and so to attain life everlasting. 

§ 4. I proceed here upon supposition of that which I have said in my book of the Right of the Church, pp. 98—106, to ground the difference between preaching the Gospel to those that are not Christians, and teaching those that are, upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Our Lord and His apostles, pretending (as indeed they were) to be prophets, might easily be admitted to teach the people in the synagogue, wheresoever they came; because the whole nation was to obey them by the Law, Deuter. xviii. 15, supposing them to be prophets indeed. Thus had they means to preach Christ and Christianity to the Jews, so long as the Jews, in regard of the credit, which their doctrine, life, and miracles had among the Jews, could not condemn them for false prophets. As for the Gentiles, who had not any custom to assemble themselves for the service of God, worshipping false gods: they could do no more than give them the news of the Gospel, till, having persuaded them to be Christians, they might assemble them, as they found means, both to praise God and pray to God, according to that which they either had attained to or desired to attain; and to teach them, what they had further to learn, to make their praises of God and prayers to God the more Christian. He, that understandeth this case by the Scriptures of the New Testament, must conclude, that all preaching is to make men Christians; that the praises of God and prayers to God (comprehending the eucharist) are the exercise of Christianity: the one, the next means to attain salvation; the other, only the means to attain that means.

§ 5. So that this dispute also resolveth into that of my

\[ The \text{ dispute re-solveth into } \]

\footnote{viz. of the orig. edition:—c. iii. § 13—43.}
second Book; whether we are justified by believing that we are justified and predestinate, or by professing and living as Christians. For supposing the state of salvation to be obtained by so believing, and that, so as not to be forfeited any more; it is very reasonable to run infinitely after sermons, till a man finds himself settled in so believing: but so, that then he shall believe that, which he can have no reason, supposing the Scriptures, to believe. Nor shall the frequenting of sermons serve to shew any reasonable motive to believe. But the very act of hearing a man speak out of a pulpit, by the glass, must be taken for the means appointed by God, by which, when He sees His time, He will determine the elect to believe, leaving the reprobate in their unbelief; though perhaps after they have slept out more sermons than the other have done. So the opus operatum of hearing sermons, according to this opinion, succeeds instead of the opus operatum of hearing masses, according to the corrupt practice of the Church of Rome. And in this change the work of reformation, according to this opinion, must consist. But then it will be necessarily consequent, that they, who have attained this faith, give over hearing sermons for the future; and not only sermons, but prayers, and all other offices of God’s service, and assemblies for the same: according to the opinion of that sect, that now thinks themselves above ordinances. Which sect before ever it appeared, I had understood by a person of integrity and knowledge, that there was a difference of opinion among those who frequented and maintained sermons besides the order of the ecclesiastical laws in England; some thinking it a means of faith to confer of the sermon after it is done, others laughing at so silly a mistake, as thinking to attain the state of salvation by reason and free-will, not by God’s mere grace.

§ 6. Whereby it appeareth, that whosoever, as I do, makes the preaching of the Gospel (that is, not speaking out of a pulpit, but shewing the reasons which God’s word proposeth to move men to be true Christians) the means which God’s Spirit useth to bring a man to the state of grace, is obliged to grant, that it is no otherwise the means to maintain a man

---

* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. vii. § 7; &c.
* See Bk. I. Of the Pr.

of Chr. Tr., c. ii. § 8.
in that state, than as it is the means to maintain him a good Christian: and that, his Christianity in the first place consisting in the public service of God, to which he becomes engaged by being baptized into the Church, the offices thereof are the immediate means of salvation, to which, as well as to the offices concerning other men and ourselves, all teaching of Christians immediately tendeth; as all preaching, to unbelievers, at a distance.

§ 7. Now let no man think, that I take any pleasure in censoring the proceedings of foreign Churches; which I could willingly have passed over in silence, had not a pernicious affection of being like them, carried those, that liked not this order, to destroy the very being of the English Church; out of a desire to change the virtues of it for their over-sights. For now I must say,—whatsoever offence it may cause,—that when it had been well pleaded, that the communion of the eucharist ought to be restored in both kinds, with the service of God in a known language, and that order ought to be taken, that preaching might be frequented for the instruction of the people; to infer thereupon for a law, that there be no orders for holding any assembly of the Church without preaching, was to cure the abuse of private masses by degrading the eucharist from the pre-eminence that it holdeth above all other offices that God can be served with by a Christian: and that, without colour from the Scripture, without precedent from any practice of the Church.

§ 8. There have been indeed pretences among us, that the word, which giveth efficacy to the sacraments, is the word preached, meaning thereby a sermon spoken out of the pulpit. And from hence hath proceeded the affectation of christening sermons; as if that were the word whereof St. Augustine saith, "Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum." Nay, this preaching afore meat in a long discourse instead

---

* For Thorndike's feeling towards the foreign Reformed bodies, see Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xiv. § 3; and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. 56—62.


* The Directory assumes this, although not in express terms enacting it. See Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. viii. § 10.

* See Review &c., ibid. § 11.

* See quotation from Calvin above in Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. vii. § 11. note n; and that from S. Augustin, above, c. iv. § 22. note f.

* In Wood's Athen. Oxon., vol. iii. p. 980; in the Life of Joseph Caryll, is a
of thanksgiving, what is it but a mark of that sense which they give St. Paul, when he saith, that the "creature is sanctified by the word of God and prayer," for the food of Christians, 1 Tim. iv. 5? And when sermons are so affectedly called "the means," to wit, of saving us; is it not manifest, that they attribute unto sermons that, which St. Paul, Rom. x. 8—15, and the apostles elsewhere, attribute to the preaching of the Gospel, whereby a man becomes convict, that he ought to become a Christian, without which no Christian will grant any man can be saved?

§ 9. Whereby we may see, what consequence slight mistakes in the very signification of words may and do produce. For having shewed an evident difference between preaching the Gospel to those who as yet believe not, and teaching those that are become Christians the further knowledge of their Christianity: I may take for granted, that it is a mistake, when the difference is not made between preaching to an assembly of Christians, and declaring the Gospel to unbelievers; whom the apostles could not deal with upon any supposition of Christianity, but only upon the force of those motives which they shewed them to embrace it; to whom therefore the only means of their salvation was the knowledge of those motives. And though all Christians, when they come among unbelievers, are bound to preach Christ to them, that is, to declare unto them the reasons why they ought to be Christians, so far as they are able to do it without prejudice of Christianity; yet to preach it as the apostles preached it, planting withal the Church, in which God should be served according to Christianity, is that which no private man can do, without authority received by the Church from the apostles. From which authority, all that is afterwards done in serving God by the Churches so planted, must receive that warrant, upon which Christians may ground themselves that it is agreeable to the will of God. And

strange story of Stephen Marshall the Independent, when at Holdenby in attendance upon the Parliamentary Commissioners sent to King Charles I.—"'Tis said that Marshall did one time put himself more forward than was meet to say grace, and while he was long in forming his chaps, as the manner was among the Saints, and making ugly faces, his Majesty said grace himself and was fallen to his meat, and had eaten up some part of his dinner before Marshall had ended the blessing."

* Corrected from M.S.; "the words" in folio edition.
upon these terms it is to be granted, that sermons preached
in the assemblies of Christians are the means of their salva-
tion; because that the allowance of the Church groundeth
a presumption, that they are according to Christianity. But
if this be wanting, though it is not necessary that they should
be contrary to God’s word, yet, because there is no presump-
tion, that they are so as God hath provided they should be,
they are not to be accepted for God’s word: though they,
who preach them, would make men believe it.

§ 10. And this is now the condition of the people of Eng-
land. It is well enough known indeed, that the Presbyte-
rians have propounded a new form of doctrine⁴; according
to which, had it been received, there would have been rea-
sonable presumption for plain Christians, that their sermons
must needs proceed. But it is as well known, that it is ex-
cepted against in every part of it by those, who joined with
them against the Church of England; as he, that will take
the pains to compare that which I write here with it, may
know, what it is that I except against in every point of it.
How they satisfy their people, to pay them for preaching
upon a supposition, which they know is contested on both
these hands, as well as by the Church of Rome; let them
see to it, whom I have thus warned. As for those that are
not Presbyterians, it is plain, that the people have no other
ground to presume, that they preach the word of God, but
only that they maintain the Bible to contain God’s word,
and that they are taken by those that send them for godly
persons. The one whereof is common to all heretics: the
other requires a ground, whereupon those that send them
may be taken for godly persons themselves, and then how
they come to be satisfied of those whom they send; both
liable to more peremptory difficulties than their life-time
will serve to void. Whereupon I infer, that there is no
ground to presume, that it is God’s word that is preached,
where the authority of the Church interposes not.

§ 11. And therefore it is lamentable to see, how this miser-
able people are intoxicated with the conceit, that they want

---

⁴ Scil. the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the two Catechisms, published by authority of the Assembly of Westminster, A.D. 1645. The Directory was published in 1644.
not the word of God nor the means of salvation, so long as
they can go and hear a man preach in a pulpit; without con-
sideration what he professeth to teach for Christianity.

§ 12. One thing I desire here may be considered. It hath [Jesuits
been not only commonly said, but maintained by the writings
of sober and knowing persons, that very many Jesuits have
been and are still employed in preaching the extravagant
positions of this time, on purpose to gain opportunity and
means to infuse into men's minds, what they find effectual
to make them their proselytes. I confess it is none of my
sense. For I conceive I shew the principle, upon which all
these extravagances have a natural and reasonable depen-
dence. But I demand, where is the provision for simple
souls, when wise men are not satisfied, that Jesuits are not
admitted to preach?

§ 13. It is to be considered, that preaching is necessarily
an office that requires a facility in speaking, which all the
world knows goes not always along with a right understand-
ing. Where there is both good understanding and a faculty
of speaking, it is manifest, if there be not a good intention,
they are both as a sword in a madman's hand, instruments
do to mischief with. I will silence the mention of all that we
have seen. The wars of the League in France, the troubles
of the United Provinces in the business of Arminius; who
can deny, that the pulpit inflamed both? Whatevser the

* See a letter from Abp. Bramhall (then in exile) to Ussher in 1654, first
published in Dr. Parr's Life and Letters of Abp. Ussher (printed in 1685), and
from thence in Ussher's Works ed.
Elrington, vol. xvi. pp. 293—296; and
Bramhall's Works, vol. i. pp. xcv—
xcvii. Oxf. 1842: and see Elrington's
Life of Ussher, pp. 262—265; and
Baxter, in his life of himself, Reliq.
Baxter., Bk. i. Pt. ii. p. 373, there
quoted. For evidence of such reports
in print when Thorndike wrote, see
Strype's account of one Faithful Cum-
min and others, in 1657, in his Life of
Parker, &c., Bk. iii. c. 16. pp. 244, sq.
Lond. 1811: Camden's Annal. Eliz.,
ad ann. 1568, p. 131. ed. 1639: Heylin,
And so also P. Du Moulin, Vindication
of the Protest. Relig., pp. 58—60. Lond.
1664. In Baxter's Quakers' Catechism,
4to. Lond. 1655, is an account of cer-
tain Franciscans disguised as Quakers.
And see also Stillingsfleet's Unreason-
ablness of Separation, Preface: and
371—380. Oxf. 1836; who quotes one
David Russen, Fundamentals without
Foundation or a True Picture of the Ana-
baptists, for proofs of the same thing.
iv. p. 310 note, 3rd edition, in the Life
of Dr. Hammond, a strange story is
quoted to the same purpose from a
pamphlet published in 1680—2 (which
is also Strype's authority), called Foxes
and Firebrands, or a Specimen of the
Danger and Harmony of Popery and
Separation, by Dr. Robert Nelson and
one Robert Ware. See also Latbury's
State of Popery and Jesuitism &c.
c. vi. pp. 129, sq. Lond. 1838; and
Rushworth, as quoted by him: and
some other authors quoted by Words-
worth as above, vol. iii. p. 358. note.
apostle St. James, in the third chapter of his epistle, hath
ascribed to the tongue for good or for bad, belongs to it in
the pulpit as elsewhere. And, therefore, it is in itself an
institution of doubtful effect, to set men up to shew their
elocution in the pulpit; though under pretence of making
our common Christianity recommendable by the means of
it: and that, supposing them to admit the sense of the
Church for the bounds of that which they are to deliver for
the sense of the Scripture; but, supposing no bounds, utterly
pernicious. For seeing no caution can exclude controversies
from rising; neither is there any such mischief as division to
the Church, nor any such means as preachers' tongues to
inflame it. And will any common sense allow, that all
audiences of Christians can be provided of men of under-
standing and eloquence, rightly informed of the whole in-
terest of Christianity? If any such thing could be supposed,
it would not be for the best. The satisfaction indeed of the
more civil audiences requires no less. For to appoint men
to go to church to hear a sermon, by hearing whereof a man
neither learns that which he knew not afore, nor can be
moved (by otherwise expressing that which he knew afore)
to delight in it more than he did afore; what is it but that
which the sons of Eli did, 'to make the offering of God stink
in the nostrils of the people?' For the time of seduction and
error, they may have such a stroke with their people, as to per-
suade them, that the loathing of bad sermons is a fruit of the
corruption of our nature, which opposes God's truth. But
whom God gives grace to consider what I pretend to be
God's truth, they, finding that to be true which I shall say
by and by, must find the name of God to be only the pre-
tence of faction and interest. In the mean time, the satis-
faction of the more civil audiences will not stand with the
edification of the main body of Christians. The condition of
the world changeth not by men's being Christians. There
are idiots, and there are civil men, and men of learning,277
among Christians as well as divines, and always will be.
That which satisfies the lesser part, will not edify the greater
part. And that is it the Church ought to aim at. Better the
more refined should want their curiosities, than the whole
body their necessaries. The plain sort of Christians (who
for number, how much they exceed the rest, I refer myself to common sense; for weight, their souls being as precious to God as the souls of princes) cannot edify by that which satisfies the more learned. They understand no deduction of reason, no figures of language. Tell them the grounds of Christianity; they are convicted. Tell them what these grounds oblige them to do, for the end which they evidence; they are convicted. Tell them, that for the interest of our common Christianity they are to come to church to hear the same said again in more eloquent terms, or more curious conceits; they have no reason to be convicted of it: they have reason to suspect, that there is some interest besides the common interest of Christianity in it. Tell them that which remains, that they are to come to church for the grounding, for the enlarging of their Christianity, by the understanding of the Scriptures; supposing that they know what is necessary to save all Christians by the Church, and by being made Christians by the Church, well and good: if they think not, that they are to give ear to whatsoever instruction may advance them in the knowledge of our common Christianity, I think them not good Christians. This for the whole Bible. And supposing that difference between the Law and the Gospel, which I have settled in the first Book*, they may advance in the knowledge of Christianity by the preaching of those who understand it. But not distinguishing that which is necessary from that which is not necessary, by supposing that which is necessary; they may hear sermons all their life long, and not know wherein their salvation consists (a thing found by experience, when there was a rule of doctrine agreeable to the Scriptures): and, not knowing the ground there laid forth, upon which the Old Testament bears witness to the New, they may gain nothing by hearing sermons all their life long, but mere dissatisfaction in the grounds of our common Christianity. Whereas, going into the Scriptures with those two principles, and the humility of Christians, they may teach themselves that edification, which they ought not to expect from those that acknowledge them not.

* So the text should apparently stand; "supposing that, that they," in folio edition; and the M.S. seems to correct it into, "supposing, that that they," &c.

† Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. xii. § 6, sq.; xiii. § 1, sq.; &c.
§ 14. As for the present order, which suppresseth all assemblies for the service of God when there is no preaching; it is manifest, that (I will not say, no understanding, no eloquence, but) no lungs or voice (for of a truth this order makes the service of God a work rather of the lungs and of the voice, than of any thing else) can furnish entertainment for the assemblies of the Church with that which is worth the hearing, so oft as it is fit for the people of God to assemble for His service. This makes the business, for which the greatest part now goes to church, to be no more the service of God; but to get matter of discourse or debate for the sabbath, as they call it, how well the man preached, or how well he prayed. For whereas they were wont to object against the Church, that it was not praying but reading prayers, which was ministered to the Church (as if attention of mind and devotion of spirit could not as well go along with him that reads, as with him that is to study what to say when he prays); now the censures that pass upon men's prayers do shew, that the hearers' minds cannot be employed in praying, when they are taken up with judging how well the prayer they hear is made. Much more justly may the same be said, if it be considered, how a man is obliged to discern what the matter of the prayer is, whether it be [free]\(^a\) from blasphemy, heresy, slander, rebellion, or not: lest, before he be aware, he join in such horrible crimes by saying Amen to their prayers\(^1\); which he is no other way secured to be free from the same.

§ 15. Now it may be considered, that the prayers which usher sermons in and out, not by the order of the Church of England, but by the faction that destroyeth it, though they exclude the service of God out of the Church upon pretence of praying as the Spirit indites, yet are indeed no less provided aforesaid than the prayers of the Church; varying a little from time to time, as occasion may require, to make the people believe that they are ex tempore dictates of the Spirit. So that the change, which many men call reformation, consists in this;—that the people's devotions are now confined to that, which every one that dare mount the pulpit

\(^{[Both the prayers and the sermons of the secretaries, sources of disorder and of error.]}\)

\(^a\) See above, § 7. note y.

\(^1\) See e.g. the quotation in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. § 8. note q.

\(^b\) Added from M.S.

\(^1\) Corrected from M.S.; "prayer," in folio edition.
dare say; instead of that, which the Church upon mature deliberation had appointed to be said. But if it be thus in prayers, which are always for substance the same: what shall we say of sermons, the substance whereof changeth according to the compass of the Scripture, and all the points of it, which the texts upon which men take their rise occasion them to entreat? Experience, in the decay of that reverence and devotion, which the public service of God is to be performed with, may easily point a man of common understanding to the source of it, in those false and weak suppositions, upon which the order or rather the disorder of the present change standeth.

§ 16. Instead whereof, therefore, acknowledging that there was just cause at the time of the Reformation to complain upon the want of preaching and instruction of the people, I do and am to maintain, that there was never any pretence, that the communion of the eucharist, and the service of God that it is to be celebrated with, ought to give way, and to be excluded the assemblies of Christians; to bring in that rule, which is now in effect a chief point of the change that is made with us that "without preaching no assembly for God's service." And thereupon, though I desire, that the more solemn service of God, when the eucharist is celebrated, may have a sermon for part of it (as I have shewed, both by the Scriptures and by the primitive practice of the Church, that the use was under the apostles and in the next ages): yet, that the order prescribed by the Church of England for the celebrating of the same, when and where there is not means for a sermon, such as ought to be had, is not to be deserted upon any pretence of frequenting sermons.

§ 17. As for more ordinary occasions of assembling for the service of God, having proved afore, that they ought to be frequented for the celebrating of other offices of God's service besides preaching, I take it for proved, that the order prescribed by the Church of England for the celebrating of God's service upon such occasions, is no way to be deserted, but means to be sought for the frequenting of it: acknowledging withal the zeal and the joy, which St. Paul expresseth

* See above. § 7. note y.
* Serv. of God at Relig. Assembl.
for the further edification of those Churches to whom he directeth his Epistles in that Christianity which they had received (1 Cor. i. 5—7; Eph. i. 17, 18; Phil. i. 9; Col. i. 9; Rom. i. 11, 12), as a strong motive to the Church to procure preaching as frequent, as it can be procured and maintained without these offences; [and] that the same St. Paul encourageth and directeth frequent and ample use of those miraculous graces which God granted the Churches of that time unto that purpose (1 Cor. xiv. 1—31, Eph. iv. 7—16); but supposing always “the spirits of the prophets” to be “subject to the prophets, because God is not the God of unquietness but of peace, as in all Churches of the saints” (1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33); and that there is “one body and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling,” the “unity of” which “Spirit” is to be “preserved in the bond of peace” (Eph. iv. 3, 4), by virtue of that order, which God had settled in His Church for preserving unity in it, declaring His meaning by bestowing the most eminent graces upon the most eminent persons of His apostles, by means whereof the spirits even of prophets became subject to greater prophets for avoiding of unquietness and preserving of peace: as St. Paul further declareth, when he addeth by and by (1 Cor. xiv. 36, 37), “What? came the word of God out from you, or came it to you only? if any man think himself a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge the things I write to you to be the commandments of the Lord;” which is to say, that all, even prophets, are to be subject to the apostles, and by consequence to none but them, who have received commission from the apostles. For how shall any order be settled to maintain unity in the communion of God’s service upon any other principle, but that, upon which the Corinthians are obliged to rest in this [rank and quality]? Which, therefore, being settled by order from the apostles, is from thenceforth trusted with the teaching of God’s people, and no man further than he is trusted by the same.

§ 18. Neither is it any marvel, that in the Church of England, after orders conferred, after possession of a church,
license of preaching is granted by the bishop: because there are divers offices, as well concerning the cure of souls, as the service of God in the Church, to which men may be appointed by the laws of the Church, who are not to be trusted with preaching, even to their own people, but upon express submission to the bishop's correction in behalf of his Church. For if sufficient power be reserved the bishop to provide for his flock, it will be in him to provide instruction for them, by such persons as he shall think fit to trust; and if it be not in him so to do, the fault is in the laws, abridging his power of making a cheerful account to God for his people. Howsoever, from hence it may appear, how ridiculous a thing it is to judge of the instruction a bishop affords his flock, by the sermon himself preaches; unless it could be thought, that his lungs and sides could reach all his people. For his fidelity in trusting such persons as are to be trusted with teaching his people, and his care in watching over the performance of their trust, extendeth alike to all, and maketh his clergy his instruments in feeding his flock. And whatsoever may have decayed in this order through the Church of England, the restoring thereof by wholesome laws, as well ecclesiastical as civil, had been and is the reformation of Christianity; not the rooting up of the very foundations of the Church, out of zeal to extirpate the order of bishops. And since the licentiousness of preaching what any man can make of the Bible, hath made so fair a way for so few years to the rooting up of Christianity with the Church; what will there be to secure the consciences of God's people, that they may safely go to church, and trust their souls with the means of salvation that are there to be found, but the restoring of God's Church: that is to say, of that authority, which He by His apostles hath provided for the determining of all things concerning His public service; supposing the

*See the canons in Gibson, tit. xiv. cc. 2, 4.—"To receive the bishop's licence to preach" was pronounced "the mark of the beast" by one of Foxe's martyrs; a speech quoted with approbation by Smectymnuus in their Vindication of the Answ. to the Humble Remonstrance, p. 53. Lond. 1641. See also Lambert's doctrine on the subject, in Foxe, vol. ii. p. 332. ed. 1684.

* A "non-preaching Bishop" is the object of Smectymnuus's denunciations, p. 67. Lond. 1641 (as of the Puritans generally): who alleges there, that "the most (of Bishops) are so farre from preaching that they rather discoun- tenance, discourse, oppose, blaspheme it."
profession of that faith which the whole Church hath maintained from the beginning, as received from our Lord by His apostles? Which if it be true, the same reason will oblige all men to provide the means of salvation for themselves; that is, to follow them of their own choice, without direction or constraint of the laws in the mean time.

§ 19. I do not conceive it becomes me to say what ought to be, as I conceive it behoves me to say what ought not to be. This I will say,—having proved, that the praises of God and prayers (much more the eucharist) are principal, in comparison of preaching, which is subordinate,—that the assemblies of God’s people ought to be more frequent for them, than they can be for hearing of sermons, as I have shewed by the premisses. St. Paul commands to “pray continually;” and David saith, “The praises of God shall be always in” his “mouth:” not expressing the assemblies of God’s people, but inferring that which I have said of the daily service of God in public in my book of the Assemblies of the Church, chap. vii.

"μακροθυμία καὶ σέβημα". And it is as easily answered, that here is nothing to the purpose. Instance in the preaching of the word refers to unbelievers. To induce them to be Christians, though out of season, is always seasonable. Long-suffering and meekness in examining, rebuking, exhorting of Christians, privately, may be [unseasonable]; publicly, if not according to order, must needs be unseasonable. Men seem to imagine, that there were pulpits and churches and audiences ready to hear the apostles preach, before men were Christians. When they were, they shall find, that means of meeting was provided by Christian people, according to their duty; the order, appointed by them and their successors; that they sat upon their chairs in teaching.

* Above, § 6.  
* Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c.  
* Added from MS.
challenging the authority by which they taught; the people, 280 sometimes standing, sometimes allowed to sit down. None but deacons preached standing, when the order and discipline of the primitive Church was in force. To deal with those that were not Christians, St. Paul must go out into the piazza or to the exchange, to Gentiles; to do that which they did in the synagogue or in the temple, to the Jews, Acts xvii. 17, ii. 46. In preaching to Jews, it was their advantage to observe the orders of the synagogue. And yet he, that shall peruse that which I have said in the book aforenamed, shall never say, that those assemblies were principally for preaching, which the apostles made use of to preach to the synagogue. When they had ordered the assemblies of churches, what have you in their writings to recommend frequent preaching, but St. Paul’s order in the use of those miraculous graces given the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xiv.: unless it be drawn into consequence, that St. Paul preached till midnight, Acts xx. 7; as if the act of an apostle, being to depart, were a precedent to the order of the Church. But I have shewed you in the foresaid book, chap. x. that the eucharist hath a share in the use of the said graces and the work of the said assemblies, as also hymns of God’s praises. And in 1 Cor. xi. you read very much of the eucharist, as also of praying and prophesying, that is, praising God by psalms (as I have said there, chap. v. 4); without any mention of preaching. If “the doctrine of the apostles” be joined with “breaking of bread and prayer,” Acts ii. 42; if “the elders that labour in the word and doctrine” be preferred by St. Paul, 1 Tim. v. 17: you have a solemn instruction concerning prayers and the eucharist, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, as also exhortations to frequent it, Hebr. xiii. 15; without any mention of preaching. In fine, there is nothing in the Scripture to question the ground which I settled afore.

\* See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. iv. § 3—6: Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 9—12: and Bingham, XIV. iv. 24, 25.
\* Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 70. And see Bingham, II. xx. 11, 21.
\* Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. ii., iii.

THORDIKE.
§ 20. As for the practice of the Church, I will go no further than Gennadius, De Dogmatibus Eccles., cap. liii.¹, neither commending nor blaming those that communicate every day; though it were easy to shew, how the rest of the fathers agree or disagree therewith. For that supposeth the daily celebration of the eucharist; whereas who ever heard of daily preaching all over the ancient Church? For that the order thereof was to assemble for the praises of God and prayer, and for instruction by reading the Scripture, more frequently than the boldest pulpit man could preach; neither is it questionable for matter of fact, nor for the consequence, in obliging them, that would reform and not destroy, to follow the example, supposing the premisses.

§ 21. One thing more I desire may be considered. All the affectation of preciseness in keeping the Lord’s day will never induce any people, endued with their senses, to do that, which the Jews by the law of the sabbath, whilst it was in force, stood obliged to do; namely, to dress their meat the day before, that so neither themselves nor their servants might be obliged to violate the rest of the sabbath. If this precept oblige Christians to hear preaching for the means of salvation, how are servants dispensed with to be absent from preaching, who cannot be dispensed with for resting on the sabbath? For though Christian servants may dress meat on the Lord’s day; yet, as they are not dispensed with for serving God on the Lord’s day, so, if the service of God on the Lord’s day necessarily requires preaching, they must be also preached to on the Lord’s day. But if, being catechized in their Christianity, they may serve God by praying and praising God, and by hearing the instruction of the Scripture read, advance in the duties of Christianity;


² See above, c. xxxi. § 8. According to Sigerius, De Rep. Hbr., lib. iii. c. 8, the Jews on the Sabbath were obliged to such rest, "ut ne ignem quidem domestici usus causa succenderent." — Heylin (Hist. of Sabbath, P. II. c. viii. § 8. p. 255) affirms, that some in his time would "not suffer either baked or rost meat to be made ready for their dinner on their Sabbath day." In the Westm. Directory (art. on Sanctification of the Lord's Day) it is merely enacted, that "the diet on that day be so ordered, as that neither servants be unnecessarily detained from the publick worship of God, nor any other person hindered from the sanctifying that day."
then may they do the duty of Christians to God at church, as well as to their masters at home the duty of Christian servants, without hearing sermons on the Lord's day.

§ 22. In a point so unlimited, wherein a private man's opinion is not to be law, I find no better ground for reasonable terms than that, which the practice of the Catholic Church, reported by Gennadius, intimates. For it is not to be gathered from Gennadius, that there was means to receive the eucharist every day everywhere; because neither can it be imagined, that there was ever any time, since the empire turned Christian, when there was means for all Christians to be present at it, much less to communicate. On the other side, the relation of Gennadius supposing, that the celebration of the eucharist was maintained, when preaching neither was nor could be maintained: it followeth, that by the custom of the Catholic Church Lord's days and festivals (the celebration whereof all Christians were always concerned in) are to be kept by celebrating the eucharist, when they cannot be kept by preaching and hearing sermons; and that there can be no better order that God may be served by all sorts of Christians, than (where there is provision, and where the custom is) that all Christians may communicate on Lord's days and festivals; and when, for reasons left to themselves, they do not communicate, they may with their spirits as well as their bodies assist the celebration of it: remitting the custom which Gennadius his resolution supposes (the celebrating the eucharist every day), to the greater churches of the more populous cities and places.

§ 23. But whereas the apostolical form of Divine service makes the sermon a part of it, and at Corinth St. Paul orders many of those spiritual graces to concur to that work (which at assemblies on extraordinary occasions was sometimes practised by the primitive Churches, as I have shewed there): it were too great wrong to common sense, to extend this to all assemblies of Christians in villages; and not consistent, either with the necessities of the world, or the interest of Christianity, in frequenting those offices most,

---

b See above, § 20. note f.  
Ibid., c. iv. § 24, sq.; and c. v. § 1 Serv. of God at Relig. Assembl., 1, sq.
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which are principal in God's service. Laying down then that tyranny, which constrains all, that have cure of souls, to speak by the glass every Lord's day twice, which shuts all the service of God out of doors, saving a prayer to usher it in and out; the interest of Christianity will require, that at and with the celebration of the eucharist all Christians be taught the common duties of Christians by them who are to answer for their souls: not to please the ear with sharpness in reasoning or eloquence in language; but to convince all sorts, what conversation the attaining of God's kingdom requires of them, who believe, that He made the world, that He sent our Lord Christ to redeem it, that by His Spirit He brings all to confess and shew themselves Christians, and, in fine, that by our Lord Christ He shall adjudge those that do so to everlasting life, and those that do otherwise to everlasting death.

§ 24. For the rest, it is not my purpose to undervalue the labours of St. Chrysostom, St. Augustin, Origen, St. Gregory, or whosoever they are, ancient or modern, that have laboured the instruction of their people, even by expounding them the Scriptures out of the pulpit; supposing they expound them within the rule of our common faith. But upon the account in hand only I say, that, if they withdraw Christian people from serving God by those offices, which the order of the Church makes requisite according to the premisses (which I am sure enough none of the ancients ever did), their labours are not for the common edification of the Church, but for maintaining of parties in the Church. The celebration of Lord's days and festivals, and times of fasting, necessarily furnishes opportunity, both for all curates, to furnish their people with that instruction which they owe them as answerable for their souls, and for those whom God hath furnished with more than ordinary graces of knowledge or utterance, to advance our common Christianity by advancing the knowledge of Christians in the Scriptures. But the office of a pastor necessarily requireth an exact understanding of the nature of human actions in matters of Christianity, whether concerning believing or working, not to be attained without the study as well as the experience of a man's whole life. And, therefore, to oblige them, who are to provide necessary
food for the souls of their flock, to be always gathering the flowers of the Scriptures, to make them nosegays of, will be to starve them for the want of that knowledge, which the common salvation of all necessarily requires, that the more curious may have entertainment of quelques choses. And therefore, for the rest, Christian people are to think themselves obliged to come to church, to serve God by prayer and the praises of God, to learn instruction out of the Scriptures by hearing and meditating upon the lessons of them, on far many more hours and days and occasions, than there can be for preaching of sermons.

CHAPTER XXVI.


There remains some difference, as well concerning the ceremonies and solemnities; as the order and circumstances of God's public service; which, I foresee, cannot be voided without presuming upon some conclusions for grounds, which hitherto are not resolved. For the chief of those difference[s] concerneth the charge of idolatry upon the Church of Rome, in those prayers to the saints departed, in that worship of images and relics of saints, in that adoration of the eucharist, which they maintain and practise. Also, those prayers which are made for the deliverance of souls from purgatory-pains, is no small part of the controversies which concern the public service of the Church. Whereas, among ourselves, it seems yet to be in dispute, whether any ceremonies at all are to be used in the public service of God: the

---

1 Misprinted XXV., in folio edition.
2 Corrected from MS.; "the Magicians," in folio edition.
pretences of this time having extended the imagination of idolatry so far, as to make the ceremonies and utensils of God’s service idols, and the ceremonies which they are used with, idolatriesm.

§ 2. For the voiding of which difficulties, I cannot find so near a course, as in the first place to dispute, wherein the nature of idolatry consisteth, and what the very being of an idol includeth, requireth, and presupposeth. In the next place, I shall dispute of the state of souls departed hence before the general judgment, rather than of the place or places in which they are bestowed: as being too obscure, and not for this purpose, which speaketh to common understandings; though the new state of things in dispute constrain it to use those terms, the novelty whereof will make it obscure to most of them whom it concerneth. After that, of ceremonies generally in the public service of God;—what is the end of them, and what use may and ought to make them receivable (or rather recommend them) to God’s people for that purpose. If God make me able to dispatch these propositions with any satisfaction to my own judgment, I shall not doubt to conclude, without any great difficulty, that which may remain in dispute concerning the differences proposed.

§ 3. To begin then, first, to enquire, wherein the nature of idolatry consisteth, and what the crime therefore requireth, or supposeth: I do not find, what exception can be made to that signification of the word, which defineth it to be the giving of Divine or religious honour or worship to a creature; taking “Divine” and “religious” both for one and the same; that is, understanding that religious honour or worship which is also Divine, in case it may appear, that there is or may be some religious honour or worship which is not Divine. But, this being only the signification of the word (that is to say, the description of that which the word idolatry expresseth

m The Preface to the Directory is extravagant enough to term the Prayer book an “idol” to “superstitious and ignorant people.”

n Voss., De Orig. et Progr. Idololatr. (seu De Theol. Gent.), lib. i. c. 3. pp. 9, 10. 2nd ed. Amst. 1688, distinguishes two sorts of idolatry: one properly so called, when “ubi Dei cultus praestatur falsu numeri;” the other less properly, when “falso cultu Deus versus coll exstimitur.” To which he subjoins a third and merely metaphorical sense, viz., that in which covetousness is so called in Scripture.
of the laws of the Church.

to him that begins to consider it), I cannot tell, whether those, that use the terms of "Divine" and "religious honour," do consider the importance of those terms which themselves use.

§ 4. For "Divine honour" or worship is that honour or [What is meant by "Divine honour.|] worship, which is due to God alone, in regard of His incomparable excellence above all His creatures, to which therefore it remains utterly incommunicable. And I have cautioned, that "religious" signifies the same: religion being that part of justice which gives God His due; which no man can do, that honours Him and worships Him not with that honour and worship, which is utterly incommunicable to any of His creatures.

§ 5. Now all honour, and all worship, is either the opinion and conceit that a man hath of the excellence and worth of that which he honoureth and worshippeth, or the effect of it: whether inward, in that reverence wherewith he submitteth himself, his soul, his heart, and mind, to it; or outward, in those bodily motions and gestures, or other actions, where- with man is wont to express and signify the apprehension which he hath of the excellence of that, which he honoureth and worshippeth. So that, supposing in a man an uncorrupted opinion of the incomparable distance, that indeed is found between God and the most excellent of His creatures, it is no more possible for him to attribute the honour due to God alone to that which he conceiveth to be a mere creature, than it is possible for a man in any other case to act against that judgment which presently dictates what he ought to do. For the present apprehension of the excellence of God above all creatures, necessarily includeth and inferreth a decree, resolving his judgment to honour Him as such: honour being the opinion of excellence, as I said; and the reverence which it produceth, being inseparable from that opinion by any means, but the understanding of him that considers it. It is therefore utterly impossible, that a man should attribute that honour which is due to God alone unto any creature, standing the opinion, that no creature is comparable with His excellence. For that were at once to have an apprehension, opinion, or conceit, that God's excellence is incomparably above that of any creature, and yet the same with
it; inasmuch as we suppose all honour and worship to consist in this opinion of excellence.

§ 6. Indeed, if we speak of the outward acts of honour and worship, true it is, and easy to be seen, that a man may and must honour God with those expressions, which may and perhaps ought to serve him to signify the honour, which he worshippeth some creature with. But those acts are not properly honour or worship, but the signs of it; and are called honour and worship by the same denomination ab extrinseco (or, if you please, the same figure of speech), by which signs are called those things which they signify. Wherefore it is not only no inconvenience, but absolutely necessary to come to pass, that these signs should be many times equivocal; that is, themselves the same, when the honour and respect signified by them to be attributed to God, holds that distance from that, which by them is attributed to the creature, which is supposed between God and the creature. For all philosophers and divines know, how much difference there is between the conceptions, which men apprehend by the same terms of wisdom, justice, and goodness, when they are attributed to God, and when they are attributed to His creatures: though I dispute not here-upon, whether equivocal or not; because nothing to the purpose, whether so or not, so long as it is no inconvenience, that in regard of the distance between the conceits so signified they be called equivocal in that sense which the subject matter will bear. Now that equivocation which words are subject to, when attributed to God and to His creatures, because of the distance of the conceit which they signify; the same are all motions and gestures, all actions, or other marks of honour and worship, necessarily subject to, when they are exhibited to God and to the creature both. Suppose, for the purpose, a man pray to God on his knee, or prostrate on his face, as the ancient people of God used to do; and the custom of the country oblige him to kneel to the prince, or to fall flat before him upon his face, as the custom of the

---

* See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. vii. § 1. notes v, x; and c. xiv. § 2.

† See Abp. King's Essay on the Origin of Evil, c. i. sect. iii. (4to, Lond. 1731), originally in Latin; and Sermon on Divine Predestination, &c., 8vo. Lond. 1728: and both edited by Edw. Law, Lond. 1732: and the anon. reply to the latter, entitled Vindication of the Divine Attributes, 8vo. Lond. 1710.
Persians required: shall any man be so mad as to say, that
it is idolatry to give a petition to a prince upon his knee?
Surely, if there were no other means for other men to dis-
cern, whether his intent be to honour him as a prince or as
God, I should not only grant, but challenge, that other
men are to rest in doubt of it; nay; perhaps, to take it indeed
for idolatry, in case he expresseth not his intent to have been
otherwise. But where the custom of the place makes that
distinction that is requisite between God and the prince, and
the man’s profession conformeth to the opinion and practice
of the place; to suspect a man of idolatry in such a case
were that degree of madness, to which the jealous seldom
attain. For suppose it were possible, that he should in deed
and in heart attribute to the prince the honour due to God
alone; nay, suppose, that indeed he intended inwardly in
heart to do it, as all those did, who under the Assyrians,
Persians, Macedonians, and Romans, did commit true and
proper idolatry to their princes: I demand, what obligation
any man can have to question that, whereof God only can be
judge, remaining secret in the heart; but no man can take
any harm by, so long as it is not professed but kept secret.

§ 7. Seeing, then, that there is no outward idolatry with-
out professing to give the honour due to God alone to His
creature, as no inward idolatry without secretly giving it,
and no giving it secretly without an apprehension adjudging
the excellence proper to God to His creature: I am of neces-
sity to infer, that there is no idolatry to be committed with-
out an opinion, that the creature is God; communicating the
name and title, the attributes and perfections, and so by con-
sequence the honour and reverence due to the incomparable
excellency of God, to His creature. And this is the opinion of
all pagans, heathens, or gentiles, whose idolatry the Scripture
as well of the Old as of the New Testament taxeth: and the
Law maketh a capital crime for all Israelites; but the Gospel
hath converted all nations, besides God’s people, from prac-
tising. For had not the inward sense of all nations, besides
God’s ancient people, been corrupted by the deceitfulness of
sin, to the imagining of other gods besides the true one, from
that light, which convicteth all men of the true God; it had
not been possible they should have fallen away from the wor-
ship of God to idols. This is that, which St. Paul calleth the
"holding of the truth prisoner in unrighteousness," Rom.
i. 18: when those, who stood or might stand convict by the
light of reason remaining in them, that there is but one God,
fountain, and ruler of all creatures, to Whom all men must
give account of their doings, were led along by custom to
worship the creature instead of God, attributing unto it the
excellence of God. And how "in unrighteousness," is plain
enough to any man, that shall consider, that the true God,
searching the inward thoughts of all hearts, demandeth
account of the most secret intentions of the heart for His
own service: whereas those imaginations, which men set up
to themselves to be honoured for God, they are well assured
can demand no such account at their hand; or, rather,
whereas the devil (striving to derive upon himself the honour
of God by suggesting unto man the worship of the creatures,
which they are known to be incapable of and therefore re-
doundeth upon him that seduceth them to it) is willing to
allow those whom he seduceth, the liberty to wallow them-
selves in uncleanness and unrighteousness, yea, and to accept
it at their hands for the service of their false gods, because,
being enmity unto God, it is indeed his service. For it is to
be acknowledged, that the Gentiles, though corrupted with
the worship of idols, had in them light enough to discern the
true God, and His providence over all things, and the ac-
count which He will take in another world of all things: as
St. Paul, Rom. i. 18—32, at large chargeth; and Tertullian,4
in his book De Testimonia Animae, evidently maintaineth by
the sayings, which he produceth, frequented in the mouths
of the Gentiles. But it is withal to be maintained, that,
being thus bribed by the devil with license to sin, and will-
ing to persuade themselves that they were in the right,
they welmed it under the bushel of their concupiscences;
persuading themselves, that they were righteous enough,

4 The purpose of Tertullian in his
64—66) is to establish the doctrines of
the Unity of the Godhead, of Prov-
dence, and of the Last Judgment, from
the unintentional testimony borne by
the mass of the Gentile world to those
truths:—"Consists in medio, Animae,"
&c.: "sed non eam te advoco, quam
scholis formata... sapientiam ructas;
te simplicem et rudem et impolitam
et idioticam compello, qualem te ha-
bent qui te solam habent, illam ipsam
de compito, de trivio, de textrino totam:
imperita tuis mihi opus est, quoniam
aliquantulum peritem nemo credit."
whilst they served their imaginary deities. Be it therefore resolved, that all idolatry, when it is formed (for I speak not of the degrees by which mankind might be seduced to it), necessarily includeth and presupposeth a conceit of more gods than one; which being once admitted, there can no reason be given, why not numberless, as well as more than one.

§ 8. To all this I see but one objection made, though from many texts of Scripture: for all comes to this inference;—that it is idolatry to worship the only true God in or under an image representing Him to man's remembrance; and, therefore, that the nature of idolatry requireth not the imagination of more gods than one.

§ 9. This is first argued from the first idolatry of the Israelites after the Law, in making the golden calf and worshipping it. For the people having said, when they saw it, 285 "These are thy Gods," or "this is thy God, O Israel, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt;" Aaron addeth, "Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord," Exod. xxxiii. 4, 5; using [טֹּרִ֣י הָיוֹת] that name of God, which the Scripture never attributeth to any but the true God: whereby it seemeth, that Aaron and the people intended to represent the true God, That had brought them out of the land of Egypt, by this image, and to worship Him under the same.

§ 10. And Jeroboam, when he set up his calves, proclaimed in the same terms, "Behold thy Gods" (or "behold thy God," understanding the words to be said severally at Bethel and at Dan), "O Israel, Which brought thee out of the land of Egypt."

§ 11. And, indeed, there are so many circumstances seeming to argue, that Jeroboam intended not to call away the people from the worship of the true God that Abenezra the Jew upon Exodus xxxii., and Monce[i]us, and others, as below, § 11. notes t—u.

* So Calvin, Instit. I. xi. 8, 9: limiting idolatry to this—"quod homines Deum sibi adesse non credunt, nisi carnaliter exhibant Se presentem;"—and assailing the "miseros prettextus" alleged in behalf of image-worship, that "Non reputantur pro Diis imaginibus." So also Monceius, and others, as below, § 11. notes t—u.

* Abraham Aben Meir Aben-Ezra, Comment. in Pentateuch., Hebr. fol. Neap. 1488. It has not been translated.

1 Aaron Purgatus sive De Vitulo Aureo Libb. Duo; simul Cheruborum Mosis, Vitulorum Jeroboami, Theraphorum Micae, formam et historiam, multaque pulcherrima alia eodem spec.
BOOK  man, of late years, in a book on purpose called Aaron Pur-
gatus (seconded very lately by Gaffarell in his Curiosities,
translated since into English, alleging a Persian author,
whom Grotius also seemeth to follow in his Annotations
upon Exod. xxxii.,) have made it their business to prove,
that neither he, nor Aaron before him, intended any other,
than to worship God before the representation of one of the
Cherubims, which God had commanded to be made to over-
shadow the ark of the covenant. For, indeed, there is a
great deal of reason to maintain, that those living creatures,
consisting of four faces (whereof one was the face of an ox,
heifer, or calf, which Ezekiel in the first, second, third, and
ten chapters of his prophecies describeth, drawing the
throne of God’s majesty”), were no other than the cherubim,
which Moses according to the pattern shewed him in the
mountain had caused to be made over the ark: which is
also to be said of the seraphim with six wings, which the
prophet Essay saw about God’s throne, Esa. vi.; and is ex-
pressly said of the four living creatures, which St. John sees
(Apoc. iv. 6—8.) encompassing God’s throne. They con-
ceive then, that Aaron and Jeroboam intended no more but

tantia explicantes: auctore Francisco
Monemio, Fridervalliano Atrebatio: 8vo.
Atreb. 1606: reprinted Lips. 1689, un-
der the title of Antiquitates Biblicae.
It was dedicated to Pope Paul V.: and
answered by one R. Visorius, Theolog.
Sorbon., in his Aaron Aurugati seu
Pseudo-Cherubii ex aureo vitulo recens
confati Destrictio, 8vo. Paris. 1699. —
Genebrard also (Chronograph., p. 80)
is cited as maintaining the same posi-
tion with Monemius.
* Curiositez Inouyes sur la Sculpture
Talismânique des Persans, Horo-
scope des Patriarches, et Lecture des
Estoilles, par M. J[acques] Gaffarel,
c. i. § 6—9, pp. 13—25. 8vo. 1637:
translated into English by Edmund
Chilnead, 8vo. Lond. 1650.
* Gaffarell’s authority is one “Ab-
judan Hebreu, traitant ceste histoire,
dont M. Otho avoit apporté le manu-
scrit de l’Orient” (Curios., p. 17).
* All that Grotius (in Exod. xxxii. 5)
says, is, that “Sperabant” (soil. the
 Jews) “Dei Quem celebant Spiritum
in eam imaginem venturum, sicut de
astrorum spiritibus gentes aliee sentie-
bant.” But on 3 Kings xii. 28, he is
more precise—“Volebat (Jeroboamus)
Deum colı in ea figura, que Josepho Dei
ministro, unde ortus erat Jeroboamus,
dicata olim fuerat, et que in Cherubinis
partem faciebat praecipuum: ut vel illo
aspectu populus retinerary in veneratione
posteritatis Josephi,” &c.
* Monemius, in lib. i. c. 4. pp. 46,
sq., argues, that the form of the Che-ubim over the Ark was not that of man:
in c. 5. pp. 59, sq., he considers
certain reasons of the Pseudo-Dionys-
sius Areopagita, “pro similitudinibus
Cheruborum bellinuis prae humanis:”
in c. 6. pp. 63, sq., he argues, that
“E sanctis animalibus quatuor solum
vitulum Ezechielis avo in Cherubum
agnitum; verum tria reliqua etiam
Cherubos esse tandem ipsi revelatum.”
* “Drawing the floor on which God’s
throne stands:” substituted in MS. for
the corresponding clause above in the
text. See below, c. xxvii. § 13.
* Monemius concludes (Aar. Purg.,
lib. i. c. 21. p. 255), that “Vitulum
Aarounium ex auctoribus Aarounis mente
Cherubum fuisse, vituli quidem specie
sed volucris: sederemque in usu reli-
exionis sanctae ex ejusdam sensu con-
to give the people a visible sign of God’s presence out of His own prescription to Moses: Aaron, only to satisfy the people, and to retain them to the worship of the true God, Whom he proposed to them to worship by this slight; but Jeroboam, being under the law which God had made, that His presence should no where be sought but at the place which He should choose, and that choice being executed by His appointment of Solomon to build Him the temple at Jerusalem (Deut. xii. 5—14, compared with Levit. xvii. 3—6; 2 Sam. vii. 2, 3—13; 1 Kings v. 5, vi. 11—13, viii. 29; 1 Chron. xxii. 10; 2 Chron. vii. 12). It is manifest, therefore, that he transgressed this law, and made a schism in Israel by transgressing of it; who were to remain one people in religion by the means of it, whatsoever might succeed in the civil government: but it seems nevertheless, that he intended no way to recall them from the worship of the true God. And, therefore, Joahaz the son of Jehu, not departing from the sin of Jeroboam, prays to God, and obtains deliverance from the Syrians; and his son Joas obtains an answer from God by the prophet Elizeus; 2 Kings [xiii.] 4—6, 14—19: as did his son Jeroboam by Jonas, [2 Kings] xiv. 25—27.

§ 12. And indeed, when Jeroboam is said to set up a [High Places.] house of high places, 1 Kings xii. 31; why should we make this worse than other high places? which for a time were tolerated in Israel, because it was not yet fully declared, what place God would choose; but after the temple was built, were indeed unlawful, but so that no man can conceive, that it was idolatry to sacrifice in them. For when the good kings are commended for destroying idolatry, and seeking only the true God; it followeth oft times, that nevertheless the people still resorted to the high places (2 Kings xii. 2, 3; xiv. 3, 4; xv. 3, 4; 34, 35): which would be inconsequent, if it had been idolatry to resort to the high places, though it was an evil custom that prevailed against the Law.

§ 13. Therefore the prophet Osee declares it for a curse [Teraphim in Hosea, and of Micah in the
sectum productumque." For his statements about Jeroboam above referred to, see ibid., cc. 7—10. pp. 66, sq. * See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. ii. § 15.
BOOK III. sacrifice, statue, ephod, or teraphim; Os. iii. 4. And Micah of Mount Ephraim, his mother having consecrated her money to the Lord (that is, to the true God, for it is the incom-unicable name [of] God which the Scripture there useth), and made thereof a molten and carved image, "had a house of God with an ephod and teraphim," having set them up in his house, Jud. xvii. 1—5; to wit, because he served God in the same order as He was served at the tabernacle, only before an image representing His presence, as it was represent- ed by the cherubim in the tabernacle.

§ 14. This therefore is the idolatry which the second com-mandment forbiddeth; namely, to make an image represent- ing the presence of God, and consequently to fall down and worship the true God before it: which when God declareth to be matter of jealousy to Him, He sheweth it to be the breach of the covenant of wedlock, which He had entered into with the synagogue, which she on her part was found to renounce by so doing. Though it is true, those, that ex-cuse Aaron and Jeroboam*, as if they intended only to use the same symbol of God's presence, which Moses and Solo-mon by God's order had set up at the place appointed by God, thereby to persuade the people, that it was all one whether they found God at Jerusalem or where they set them up: must say by consequence, that in so doing the covenant of God was violated by departing from that precept of His law, but with no intent to fall away to other gods, or to commit idolatry in it. For had Jeroboam's intent been to bring in false gods, what had been the difference between his sin and the sin of Omri and Ahab, of Ahaz and Man-asses, afterwards; 1 Kings xvi. 25, 30—33; xxi. 25, 26; 2 Kings xvi. 8; xxi. 3—9? For if all idolatry implieth a de-fection and apostasy from the true God to imaginary deities, was it not the same thing for Jeroboam to set up his calves, supposing that he set them up to represent such deities, as for Ahab to serve Baal, or Manasses, and the ten tribes (2 Kings xvii. 7—9), to commit the same idolatries for which the Amorites were cast out from before the Israelites? Besides

* Added from MS.
* Corrected from MS.; "for," in folio edition.
that in reason it seemeth utterly incredible, that, the Israelites having worshipped the true God till Solomon’s death,—nay, that Jeroboam himself, having received assurance of the kingdom by God’s prophet Ahiah (1 Kings xi. 26—40), as Jehu by Eliseus, with instructions concerning the house of Ahab, the execution whereof God alloweth, 2 Kings ix. 7—10, x. 30;—I say, it seemeth a thing very incredible, that those people in a moment of time, as it were, upon the publishing of Aaron’s and Jeroboam’s innovations, should change the inward sense and reverence, [withs] which in their heart they had acknowledged the true God, to yield the same to any imaginary godhead, which they by their calves might pretend to represent. Neither was it a thing any way consequent to Jeroboam’s interest, which it is plain was the only reason that moved him to innovate, to debauch the people to this point. For if he might obtain of them not to go up to Jerusalem to worship the true God there, how did it concern him to insist further with them, to worship any false god of his devising within his dominions? A thing far more difficult to draw all them to, who feared God from the heart in the ten tribes, than to induce them for fear of him to worship Him at a wrong place, continuing faithful to His kingdom.

§ 15. This is the difficulty, or, if you please, these are the difficulties, which are or may be alleged against that definition, which to the nature of idolatry requireth the belief of more gods than one; but no way tend to satisfy us of any other general reason, for which both this and other actions should bear upon them the common mark and stamp of idolatry by the penalties of it in the Scriptures. For what reason can endure to believe, that the mark and penalties of idolatry should rest upon actions of so vast a distance in nature, as the worship of the true God, and the worship of the devil for God, because that is done before an image? Let us survey the matters of fact, which we have in the Scriptures.

§ 16. Moses thus warneth the Israelites, Deut. iv. 15—19: The original of worshiping the elements of the world.

* Added from MS.
is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, the likeness of any thing that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth; and lest thou lift up thine eyes to heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, even 287 all the host of heaven, shouldest be pushed aside to worship them, and to serve them, which the Lord thy God hath imparted unto all nations under the whole heavens." It is like enough, that the first idolatry that ever was practised, was the worship of the sun, the moon, and the stars; but that it was a part of the Gentiles' idolatries, by the Scripture alone it is evident and certain. The Jews, as Moses Maimoni

\[E.g.\ Job xxxi. 26, 27.\]

relateth in the Title of Idolatry at the beginning, tell us, that out of admiration of the beauty and constant motions of those glorious bodies, men began of themselves to conceive, that it would be a thing pleasing to God to address themselves to Him by the mediation of those creatures, which they could not choose but think so much nearer to Him than themselves: that this conceit, being seconded with pretended revelations to the same purpose, brought forth in time the "offering of sacrifices to them and making of images of them," by means whereof the blessings of God might be procured through their influence. And Origen often gathereth out of those words, that God allowed the Gentiles afore the Law to worship the sun and the moon and the stars, that they might proceed no further to worse idolatries: though, so far as I have observed, he is not seconded herein by any of the fathers. Nor can he in my opinion be any further excused, than the book of Wisdom

\[\text{b See Voss., De Orig. et Progr. Idololatr., lib. ii.; and ad loc. Maim. de Idololatr., c. i. § 1. p. 4, as quoted below in note i; and Hammond, as quoted in the same note.}\]

\[\text{i Ad fin. Voss. de Orig. et Progr. Idololatr., pp. 3, sq.—This passage is quoted at length in Hammond, Of Idolatry, sect. xiv. (Works, vol. i. p. 262), first publ. in 1646.}\]

\[\text{k "'Ελισα σας καὶ στάλην καὶ ἀνείπω, ἐς τίνας τῶν τῶν ἡμῶν δυναστείας, ἀπε-}

\[\text{νεινεῖσαν τοῖς μὴ ἐξεις ἐγκαζότωσαι τὸν Θεὸν τῶν Θεῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι. Οὕτω δὲ ἔδειξαμεν κηρύρτοις ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἔν τῷ Δαυτεροορομῳ εἰς τὸν τοῦτον τούτῳ ἐχόντων, μὴ ἀναβάλεται κ. τ. λ. "Τὸ ἔλα ἔν ὑμᾶς ἑωκε Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς σου. Πᾶς γὰρ ἄνειναµα πᾶσι τοῖς θερεῖν ἓλιον καὶ σταλῆς καὶ τάνα τὸν κόσμος τοῦ ὄφρονος ὁ θεὸς, ὅπως ὧεται δεδοµένος αὐτὰ τῷ Ἰσραήλ; τῷ τούτῳ μὴ δυσαίωνον ἐν τῷ νοητῷ ἀναρρίῳ φῶν, θέληται ὁ θεός εἰσαγεῖσαι περὶ κύριος, ἀγα-

\[\text{πητός καὶ ἐν τοῦτοις ἱερασίας, καὶ μὴ πάθην ἐν τῇ ἐξωθή καὶ δαιμόνια." k. t. l. Origen, Comment. in Ioan. tom. ii. § 8; Op., tom. iv. p. 52. B—D. See also Id., Cont. Cels., lib. v. cc. 6, 7; Op., tom. i. pp. 581. D—582. C.}
doth excuse him, making the worship of the elements of the world the lightest sort of idolatries; Wisd. xiii. [1—]10.

§ 17. It is a thing agreeable to all experience, that by degrees, and not in an instant, mankind should be seduced to forget God (having had the knowledge of God at the first derived unto them from their first parents) and to take His creatures for God. But will any man therefore undertake, that, when they were come so far as to worship the sun and the moon and the stars by sacrifices and incense, and all those actions whereby the honour of God was first expressed, all this was done in honour to God, because they were conceived to be nearer Him than other of His creatures? How will he then answer St. Paul; when he saith, Rom. i. 25, that the Gentiles "changed the true God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature—παρὰ τὸν Κτίσαντα"—"besides" or "parallel to the Creator, Who is God blessed for evermore?"

For where was the "lie," but in taking the creature for God? And how could they worship and serve the creature hand in hand with God, but by degrading God into the rank of His creature, and advancing the creature into the rank to which God was degraded by their false and lying conceit? How could they express this honour by actions formerly appropriated to the service of God, had they not first been seduced in the conceit of that honour which they robbed God of to give it His creatures?

§ 18. But it is a thing certain and palpable in the idolatries of the Gentiles, that they deified dead men, by attributing unto them the names of the heavens, the sun, the moon, the rest of the planets, and other constellations, of the air, the earth, the waters, in fine, of the world and the elements of it; so that idolatry was committed both to the men and to those worldly bodies at once. In this case, will any man be so wilful as to hold still, that these worldly bodies were no otherwise honoured, than in relation to God as His creatures; whenas it appeareth, that the honour due to God alone was studiously procured for dead men, by insinuating ridiculous persuasions into the minds of people seduced to think that

1 See Voss., as above quoted, lib. i. cc. 10, sq.; tom. i. pp. 39, sq.
= "No idolatry was committed to dead men deified in the planets or constellations." Added in margin in MS.
they were deified in those bodies? Wherefore it is not to be denied, that those creatures were advanced to the honour of God by degrading God into the rank of His creatures; as if there might as well be more gods than one, as more creatures of a kind than one. Again, when Moses warneth them of making the image of any creature, can any man doubt, that his reason is, lest it should be worshipped with the same honour, which immediately he forbids the sun and moon and stars to be honoured with? And could the mere privilege of being God's creature move any man to take any before another, and to make an image of it, that under it he might honour God that made it? Or was it requisite, that first men should conceive an excellence in the creature, which if expressed with the same actions whereby they honoured God, of necessity it must be taken for the same which they attributed to God? And what is that but the opinion of more gods? Can any man find fault with that which the fathers have so frequently objected to the Gentiles, that the gods whom they worshipped were dead men; seeing before his eyes, in the records of the Romans, Macedonians, and Persians, during the time of historical truth, that their princes were, of course as it were, deified and worshipped as gods after their death? And was all this done in relation to one true God, Whose graces they had been the means to convey to so great a part of mankind? Or in despite of that light of one true God, which, though enshrined in their breasts, they suffered to be overwhelmed with that ignorance which custom had brought to pass? Is it possible to imagine, that the Egyptians should tremble at those living creatures, or those fruits of their gardens, which they honoured for their gods; if they had taken them for creatures of one true God, Whom they intended to honour by and under those His creatures? Or was it necessary, that they should further conceive the godhead in one city to be enclosed in this creature, in another in that; and thereupon find themselves obliged to honour the same for God?

*a Juven., Sat. xv. 1—11. See Ruperti ad loc.; and Voss., as before, lib. iii. c. 74. tom. i. pp. 560, sq.—Ruperti alleges, from Jablonski, "Animalia tam viva quam inanimata Deorum tament symbola sui esse."

*b Juven., ibid. 36—38.
§ 19. In fine, doth not the Scripture in many places plainly declare that, which I pointed at in proposing my argument, that the idolatry of the Gentiles was the worshipping of devils instead of God? Why the Israelites are commanded to sacrifice no where but before the tabernacle, the reason is given Levit. xvii. 7; "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring:"
—Deut. xxxii. 17; "They sacrificed unto idols, which were not God; to gods whom they knew not; to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not." Sacrificing to new gods, they sacrificed to devils:—Psalm cvi. 36—38: "And they served their idols, which were a snare to them; yea, they sacrificed their sons and daughters unto devils; and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and daughters, whom they offered to the idols of Canaan, and the land was defiled with blood." Offering their sons and daughters to the idols of Canaan, they offered them to devils. And St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 19—21: "What say I then? that an idol is any thing; or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing" (as afore, viii. 4, "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is but one God")? "but I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils: ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and the table of devils." Having said, that "an idol is nothing," and that "things sacrificed to idols are nothing," because they are sacrificed to that which is nothing, and that, because there is but one God; how doth he infer, that things sacrificed to idols are sacrificed to devils? Surely, idols are "nothing," because there is but one God; in regard they pretend to be gods, that is to say, images of gods, whereas indeed there can be no more gods but one. And if this were all, since "nothing" can have no effect, sacrificing to idols (being nothing) could not pollute the sacrifices; as some Christians alleged to prove, that they might eat of things sacrificed to idols. But because, in sacrificing to nothing, the devil steps into God’s place, having caused that nothing to

* See Voss., as above, lib. i. cc. 6—8. tom. i. pp. 20, sq.
be taken for a god, and maintaining that conceit by the same ways which he raised it with; therefore, all, that communicated in serving those idols (which all did, that communicated in the feasts which they made of those sacrifices), communicated in the worship of devils. Whereby it is evident, that idolatry presupposeth an erroneous opinion of a false godhead, under which the devil suborneth himself to be worshipped; whom did men take for that which Christians take him for, they would be far enough from worshipping him for God.

§ 20. And herewith agree eth the reason of idolatry in the worshipping of images. For by the premisses it is evident, that idolatry is more ancient than the worship of images 289. And perhaps the truth is, it came not in till the custom came up to worship dead men for gods: which, as I said afore, I believe was later than the worshipping of the elements of the world; though I go not out of my way to prove it, nothing obliging me so to do.

§ 21. Now it appears by Varro in St. Augustin, De Civitate Dei, iv. 31, that the Romans had subsisted above one hundred and seventy years before they had images. But let no man therefore imagine, that they were not idolaters during that time. For it is evident, that there is no record of learning so ancient among the Gentiles, as their idolatries. Only the Scripture recordeth time before the same. The words of Varro, there recorded by the said St. Augustin, tell us truth in that business;—that those, who brought in images, "errorem addidisse, metum dempisse"—"increased error, abated religion." For it is not strange, that a knowing man, as Varro was, should bear witness to that truth, which the Gentiles "imprisoned in unrighteousness," by acknowledging an "error" in the multitude of their gods;
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which was by that time grown so ridiculous, that a child, should it have spoken what reason indited, might have re-
proved it. This "error" then, Varro saith not that it sprung
from images, but that they were the means to increase it;
thought to the abatement of religion, which could be but
counterfeit, when men took upon them to make their own
gods.

§ 22. But was it thus with the Romans only? Was not [The
the case the same with the Grecians also, before sculpture
and picture and other ways of imagery were devised; chiefly
for the advancement of this error, as the wise Jew (Wisdom
xiv. 18—21) and divers of the ancient fathers of the Church
(as St. Augustin, De Civitate Dei, xviii. 24*, In Psalm. c[x]iii.*)
do often allege. Why do we read then in Pausanias 2 his
most excellent survey of Greece, that of old time they wor-
shipped stones, only sharpened at the top, for their gods?
Could they have found in their heart so to do, had they not
formerly imagined a deity, which they meant to remind
themselves of by so gross a mark rather than image? But
is not this madness an evidence, that they came by degrees
to the representation of those deities, which they had im-
agined afore, and sought only means to have them always
present?

§ 23. Joseph Scaliger, in that learned appendix to his [ThePha-
book De Emendatione Temporum*, sheweth us, that the
nicians.]

* "Etiamsi posteriora tempora deos homines mortuos non instituere, ta-
men ab antiquis institutos colere ut deos et habere non desierent: quin
etiam simulacra, que veteres non ha-
bebant, aequant omnes atque impia
superstitionis illicebrem, id efficienti-
bus immundis in eorum corde deemon-
ibus;" &c. Id., ibid., lib. xviii. c. 24;
ibid., p. 507. B.

1 "Species membrorum, quam na-
turaliter in animantibus viventem vi-
dere atque in nobismetipsa sentire
consuevimus, quanquam, ut illi (Pa-
gani) assuerunt, in signum aliquod fabre-
facta atque eminenti collocata suggestu,
um adorari atque honorari a multi-
dine coeperat, parit in unoqueque sor-
didissimum erroris affectum, ut quo-
niam in illo signo non invenit vita-
lem motum, credat nomen occultum;"
&c. "Hinc et mala demonia ad pos-
sidenda gentium simulacra talis homi-
num affectus invitat, quorum pror,
dentium varia fallacia mortiferi semi-
nuntur et multiplicantur errores." Id.,
In Ps. cxiii. Enarr., Serm. ii. § 3; Op.
tom. iv. p. 1261. C—E. There is noth-
ing to the purpose in the Enarratio
in Ps. ciii., quoted by mistake in the

text.

* "Εστήκασι δὲ ἐγγύτατα τού ἀγάλ-
ματος τετράγωνοι λίθοι τριάκοντα μα-
λιστα ἄριμον. Τούτων σέβεσθαι οἱ
φαρείοι ἔκακοι τοῦ δύος ὡμοί ἐκεί-
νοιτές. Τὰ δὲ οἱ παλαιότεροι καὶ τοῦ
πάντων "Ελλησίων, τιμάδα θεῶν ἀνωτάτων
αγαλμά-
των ἐχον ἀργον λίθων." Psal., Achaica,

* "Melius scribitor baritus. Ita vo-
cabant Deos, quos specie lapidis adora-
bant. Philo Bybliensis: "Ετε 

ταύτης θεος ὦ χάλκιον, λίθους

ἐμψύχους μηχανημάτων." Quam omnú
Phenicians had the like custom of having rude stones for the symbols of their gods. And no marvel. For by the act of Jacob's pouring oil upon the stone at Bethel it appeareth, that the fathers themselves used such records of the true God and of His worship, which idolaters afterwards imagined their false gods to be present at. And thereupon no marvel, that the Law prohibited [them] afterwards, Levit. xxvi. 1: seeing it is evident by the writings of the Grecians and the Romans, that, idolatry increasing, it became an ordinary custom to make every stock and every stone a monument of that worship, which every superstitious fool thought he had cause there to tender to his god, by pouring oil upon it; as Jacob did, Gen. xxviii. 18: [or] by dedicating garlands, or the like; as Tibullus* hath expressed in these verses,

"Et veneror, seu stipes habet desertus in agris,
Sive quis exiguus flores sertis lapis;"

with infinite more authors* to that purpose.

§ 24. And can any man doubt, that the idolatries b of the Persians were not as bad as these; though they had neither statues nor pictures c. Surely those heathen philosophers found it otherwise; who, being weary of the empire under Justinian because of the ill countenance they found there in favour to Christianity, and betaking themselves into Persia, as Agathias d in his second Book relateth, found themselves quickly weary of it, in regard of those barbarous customs, as they understood them, which the idolatries of the Persians had introduced. Thus much for certain; that worship,
which the fire was served with by the Persians, was not that, CHAP.
which could be tendered in honour of God That made it, as XXVI.
conceiving it a prime creature.

§ 25. So that, considering these things without prejudice, [Idolatry
we must needs stand convict, that idolatry in general is more ancien
than the worship of images; though particular idola-
tries must needs be advanced by it. And in that instance,
that the wise Jew propoundeth for the beginning of idolatry, vanced by
Wisdom xiv. 14—17; when a prince, having lost a dear son,
causeth the image of him to be made for his comfort and re-
membrance of him, which is propagated by the honour done
to his image: not that he means, that all idolatry came from
this beginning (for certainly it would have been utterly
senseless to have expected this from men possessed of the
belief of one true God till that time); but because this might
become the beginning of that idolatry, that was performed
to the deceased, among those, who, having once admitted the
belief of more gods than one, and in particular worshipping
dead men, could give no reason why they should do less for
them than for others. And if it were possible for the devil
to induce men to worship the creature for God, it is not
strange, that by pretended apparitions, revelations, and mira-
cles done about these statues or images, he should maintain
in them a belief of the presence of that imaginary deity,
which they intended thereby to represent and record in the
statue or image; which must needs be a powerful means to
multiply those ceremonies and solemnities, wherewith they
pretended to honour the deity there inclosed. Certainly
for this reason it was, that among the Greeks and Romans
the consecrating of a temple was the setting up and dedicat-
ing in it the statue of that deity, in honour whereof it was
built. So you see it every foot in Pausanias. And in the
life of Alexander Severus it is related, for a singularity of

† E. g. Τὸ δὲ ἱερόν ἐν ταῖς Ἀλαλο-
μανῶν ἡμῆλθον τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦτο, ὅτε ηὗρο
μάλατος τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἔνανθισθήσεως, ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ
ἐναντίον τῆς ἁρμοδίας, ἐν τῷ τοῖς ἔνανθισθησθήσεως;
Arnold's notes); where the name of the
god appears to be used for the name
belonging to him.

See, Alexander Severus, "Circumstances of the
riots were violent, human sacrifices of the
Adrian’s curiosity in following all religions, that he built in
every city a temple without any statue in it; which he had
intended for our Lord Christ, had he not been advised, that
all the world would turn Christians if he should take that
course. And though it is rather thought that Adrian in-
deed did intend them for temples to himself, yet still that
holds, which the history addeth, “Quae hodie, idcirco quia
non habent numina, dicuntur Hadriani;”—that “they are
called Adrian’s, because they have no godhead;”—which the
heathen believed them to have, so soon as the statue of that
god was set up whose the temple was to be. And this is not
questioned, that Alexander Severus intended that our Lord
Christ should be worshipped as one of their gods; which
would have made Him as much an idol as their gods: as
the same emperor did indeed (worshipping as well Christ
and Abraham, as the deified emperors, Orpheus, or Achilles,
among his closet gods), as his life relateth. Thus much is
to be noted, that Maimoni, where he relateth the beginning
of idolatry (as I alleged afore), acknowledgeth, that it was
mightily promoted by revelations, apparitions, and miracles,
pretended to be done by the stars or elements of the world
at such monuments of their presence as had been provided;
which, since God’s truth imputeth to the devil, the worship of
those creatures was no less the worship of the devil, than
sacrifices offered to the dead.

§ 26. And all this is further confirmed by the idolatry of
magicians; which, for Balaam’s sake, I hold unquestion-
able. For having shewed before, that Balaam, though he
knew there was a God, Which was able to defeat all his witch-
craft, did nevertheless address himself to his familiars by of-
fering sacrifices to obtain of them the cursing of Israel, which

---

dicuntur Adriani: quae ille ad hoc para
rase dicebatur; sed prohibitus est ab ilia. qui consultantes sacra reperearent
omnes Christianos futuros, si id optare
evenisset, et templum religua deserenda.”
Bas. 1517.

b See last note.

1 "Usus vivendi sidem hic fuit:
primum .. matutinis horis in larario
suoi (in quo et divos principes, sed op-
timos electos, et animas sanctiores, in
ques et Apollonium, et quantum scrip-
tor suorum temporum dicit, Christum,
Abraham, et Orpheum, et hujusceodi
deos habebat) ad majorem effigies rem
Divinam faciebat.” Id., ibid., p. 318.

k Maimon., De Idololatr., c. 1. § 3,
4; ad fin. Voss. ut supra, pp. 6, 7.

1 Corrected from MS.; “these,” in folio edition.

m Voss., as above, lib. i. c. 6. tom. i.
p. 23. lib. iii. c. 47. ibid. pp. 488, 489.

n Bk. ii. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxi.
§ 18, 19.
he knew could not be obtained without the leave of their God, Whom he acknowledgeth under the same name which His people never communicated to any besides; shall it seem strange, that people weary of their Christianity, because it easeth them not of the little discontentments of their estate in this world which they meet with, should either formally or by due construction renounce the benefit of it, by contracting for some curiosities, which they desire, but their Christianity hath appointed them no means to procure? or that, renouncing God and Christ in the same manner and degree as they contract for those things, they should translate the honour, which the little religion, that can allow such a contract, leaves in him that cannot deny a God and yet serves Him thus, unto the devil, from whom they expect their desires? Especially, the experience of all nations, Christians, Jews, and pagans, acknowledging those acts, which themselves though worshippers of devils counted unlawful, because upon contracts tending to the mischief of mankind: and the evidence of the sabbaths and solemnities of witches, in these times of Christianity, being no way to be baffled by such reasons, as tend to take away all reason for the punishing of witches, which the law of Moses establishes; though nothing hinder the alleging of such, as may make men wary, what evidence they accept in cases more private and secret.

§ 27. In the life of Pythagoras by Jamblichus, cap. [Of the magic of Pythagoras.] xxviii., there are divers and sundry feats of his doing reported; which to Christians, that know the difference between clean and unclean spirits, cannot seem to have been done otherwise than by familiarity with unclean spirits: which he might easily learn by his travels among the Egyptians and Chaldeans, nations, among whom as well magic as idolatry had been both bred and advanced; if we believe either the Scriptures, or the writings of pagans, as well as of Christians. And truly it is manifest, that the being and office of angels about God was known to him and to his


† Such as that he made the river Nessus speak to him, that he was at Metapontum in Italy and Tauromenium in Sicily on the same day, &c. &c. Jambli., De Vit. Pyth., c. xxviii.; pp. 113, sq. ed. Kuster. Amst. 1707.—See also above, Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. § 41, sq.
followers⁹; but without any distinction between the good and the bad, which the Scripture only teacheth.

§ 28. Which is also to be seen in the writings of Plato⁶, where δαίμονες and δαίμων is never taken in any ill sense; as necessarily it is by all them, who acknowledge apostate angels. Neither is it possible for any Christian to make any other interpretation of that familiar, which Socrates in Plato⁴ affirmeth that he was always attended with (called Socrates his demon or genius), than of a deceiving spirit; unless it could stand with Christianity to believe, that God granted the assistance of His Spirit or angels to pagans, and that so constant, as is not to be found of any of His prophets.

§ 29. It is true indeed, that there are many things in Plato⁶, which learned men do compare and reduce to the rule of the Christian faith concerning the Holy Trinity blessed for evermore. But he, that compares "the mind of God—the word of God—the idea of God—the spirit of God—the wisdom of God—νοῦς—λόγος—θεός—πνεύμα—σοφία," which Plato delivereth, with that fulness of the Godhead, that πληρωμα, which Saturninus and Basilides pronounced to be worshipped by their followers, in Irenæus⁸ and Epiphanius⁷; considering withal, that the angels (which are not distinguished from God by Plato⁶, according to that infinite distance which is to be acknowledged between God and His creatures) were by most sects of the Gnostics⁸ ad-


⁶ See above, BK. II. Of the Civ. of Gr., c. xii. § 10.


⁸ See BK. II. Of the Civ. of Gr., c. xii. § 2, 5, 10; xv. § 4: and notes there.
mitted into that fulness of the Godhead, which the several sects of them worshipped: will have reason to believe the fathers of the Church, when they make the philosophers "the patriarchs of the heretics"; and that the divinity of Plato was a tradition derived by Pythagoras from the familiarity which he had with unclean spirits, seeking to refine the gross idolatry of the Gentiles into a more subtle way of worshipping the devil.

§ 30. Which, being imitated by Simon Magus and his followers—(of whom Menander professed magic, as Basilides and Marcus also did); and the monuments of the Basilidians' magic are extant to this day in the hands of antiquaries, as you may see in Baronius his Annals, and the life of Peireski written by Gassendus, and still more plentifully in a later book, on purpose to expound the monuments of the Basilidians' god, called Abraxas)—in those several fulnesses of the Godhead, which the several sects of them taught and worshipped, brought forth that worship of angels, which St. Paul condemned, Col. ii. 8—19; whether as belonging to the fulness of the Godhead, or as revealers of it. Especially if it be considered, that the deriving of the original and beginning of evil from a principle belonging to that fulness of the Godhead which each sect of the Gnostics acknowledged (a position common to them all), is also a part of Plato and Pythagoras' his philosophy: which the Stoics also (from whom the heretic Hermogenes in Tertullian deriveth it) were tainted with, as well as with the opinion of fate, utterly
inconsistent with the worship of the true God; as Aristotle and Epicurus his philosophy (free enough from familiarity with unclean spirits) is with denying of providence at least in human affairs, which the eternity of the world necessarily produceth.

§ 31. Neither is the heresy of Cerdon and Marcion, which succeeded the Gnostics, any thing else but Pythagoras his position,—of a principle of good, and another of evil,—applied to the supposition of Christianity, though such as they thought good to admit.

§ 32. As for that of the Manichees, we may as well allow Epiphanius, deriving it from one Scythianus, a rich merchant from Arabia to Egypt: who, having also learned their magic, writ four books to maintain Pythagoras his two principles; and, going unto Jerusalem to confer with the Christians there, who maintained one true God, and getting the worse, betook himself to his magic, and exercising the same on the top of a house was cast down from thence and died.

His disciple also and slave Terbinthus, whom he left his heir, going into Persia to confer with the priests of Mithras about the same purpose, and being worsted, betook himself to his master's magic, and got his death as his master had done. Thus saith Epiphanius: and that Manes, marrying his widow, by his books and by his wealth became author of this sect; only, that having got the books of the Old and New Testament, he used what colours they would afford him, to entitle his device to Christianity, for the seducing of Christians.

§ 33. But whoso considers what Master Pocock hath produced out of the relations of the Saracens concerning the religion of the Persians, pp. 146—150, whatsoever contest his predecessors might have with the Persians, must acknowledge the heresy of the Manichees to come from the idolatry of the Persians; the divines whereof acknowledge a principle

---


s Id., ibid., pp. 620. C—621. A.

t Id., ibid., § 3—6. pp. 621. A—622. B.

of darkness opposite to a principle of light: as we read also in Agathias expressly, lib. ii. 7, that the religion of the Persians is that of Manichees.

§ 34. And these considerations, here put together upon this occasion, may well serve, as I conceive, to satisfy us, that it is no marvel the pagan Greeks and Romans should be so brutish as to worship stocks and stones, having among them those wits, that have left such excellent things of God, and of man’s duty to God, upon record: seeing it appears, that the most divine of them were no otherwise taught, than as it might best serve the devil’s turn, to detain them in the more subtle idolatry of magicians, the rest being tainted with such positions as stand not with the worship of one true God; so that it is no marvel, if they complied with the vulgar idolatries of their nations, to him that considers that which I have written in the Review of my book of the Right of the Church in a Christian State, p. 167, to shew, that the followers of Plato and Pythagoras in the first times of Christianity, as they were themselves magicians, so were great instruments to promote the persecuting of Christianity. Which is also the true reason, why the Gnostics, having devised every sect a way of idolatry proper to themselves, did indifferently counterfeit themselves Jews, Christians, or pagans, for avoiding of persecution, or for gaining of proselytes; eating things sacrificed to idols, in despite of St. Paul, and taking part in the idolatrous spectacles and sights of the Gentiles, as Irenæus with the rest of the fathers witnesseth.

§ 35. These particulars I have thus far enlarged, to make a full induction of all the ways of idolatry mentioned in the Scriptures (wherewith all the writings of the Jews, pagans, and Christians, exactly agree): by which induction it may appear, that all the ways of idolatry, which the Scripture mentioneth, do presuppose the belief of some imaginary and false godhead, properly called an idol as imaginary and without subsistence (though that name is no less properly attributed to the image of it, than the image of any thing is

---


b See quotations in Bk. i. ibid., notes q—t.

called by the name of that which it representeth); because of the intercourse, by which the means of such images those that worshipped them had with the author of such imaginations, even the devil, thinking they had it with their imaginary deities. And the worshipping of those deities, whether before and under such an image or without it, is that which is called idolatry in the Scriptures. For though the word εἰδωλον may generally signify all images, and can have no bad sense in the usage of heathen writers, because they could never think amiss of the images which they thought represented their deities; yet, when Christianity had brought in a belief that it was the devil whom the Gentiles worshipped under those images, the word idol, being appropriated to them, must needs bear a sense of that which the Christians detested. Just as I said even now of the word δαλμων or δαιμονων, that it must needs bear another sense to the ears of Christians, than it could among the heathen poets or philosophers.

§ 36. This language St. Jerome useth, when, in his translation of Eusebius his Chronicle num. mdcclxiv. he saith of Judas Maccabaeus, "Templum ab idolorum imaginiibus expurgavit,"—that "he purged the temple from images of idols;" supposing the difference, which I make, between imaginary deities and their images. And St. Augustin, In Lib. Jud. Quest. xii. speaking of the case of Gedeon;—"Cum idolum non fuerit, id est, cujusdam dei falsi simulacrum"—"seeing it was no idol, that is to say, the image of any false god."


4 Above, § 28.

* Pp. 293—296 (both inclusive) are omitted in the paging of the folio ed.: so that p. 297 follows next to p. 292.


& § 2; Op. tom. iii. P. i. p. 607. B.
§ 37. Which if it be true, it will no way be possible to exempt the case of Aaron or Jeroboam from that reason of idolatry, which this induction enforceth; or to imagine, that it could be the same crime in them to worship the true God under an image, as in the Gentiles to worship the elements of the world, dead men, imaginations, in effect the devil, under the like image. "They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image; thus they turned their glory into the similitude of a calf that eateth hay:" saith David, Psalm cxi. 19, 20, of this act of the Israelites. "They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things;" saith St. Paul, Rom. i. 23, of the Gentiles: who, as I have shewed, did truly intend to worship those creatures for gods. And therefore [1] must conclude, that, whatsoever Aaron might pretend to represent to the Israelites by this calf, that they intended to worship for God. And when the Israelites "joined themselves to Baal-Peor, and ate the offerings of the dead" (Psalm cxi. 28, Num. xxv. 3—8); and Moses commandeth to "hang up" the princes, and the judges to "slay every one his man that were joined to Baal-Peor:" Phineas, out of his zeal to God, executeth his command (not out of a private inspiration, whereof nothing could appear, as hath fondly and perniciously been imagined), and killeth a prince among the Israelites. But when Moses coming down from the mount saw the calf made, he caused the Levites to revenge the fault by slaying three thousand of those that were guilty of it; Exod. xxxii. 25—30. And is it possible for any man to believe, that the same punishment is assigned by God to the offering of sacrifices to a dead man, as to the offering of it to the living God under or before an image? Not that I intend to say this of Aaron; or what his intention might be in complying with them, and avoiding their mutiny, without ever embracing in his heart that idolatry, to which he pretended to concur with them (nor will I much contend with him, that shall say he chose that figure which might represent something concurring to that worship of God, which Himself had commanded): but the act of them, that muti-

---

2 Above, § 16. 1 See above, § 11.
What the case of Jeroboam.

§ 38. As for Jeroboam, it is most truly alleged, that nothing obliged him to demand of the Israelites to worship any false god, or to require of them more than Aaron had done upon their motion, concurring himself to their idolatry. But then I must say also, that by setting up his calves, and constraining the people to resort to them for that worship, which the Law obliged them to tender to God, he certainly knew, that he must needs occasion the greatest part of the people to worship another god besides the true God; howsoever some of them might do that, which Aaron had done, in concurring with the rest of their people. And perhaps the truth is, that Jeroboam for this reason made choice of the same image, wherein Aaron had offended afore. But otherwise the appearance of the idolatry of the Gentiles in the act of Jeroboam, that is, in the service tendered his calves, is evident in the Scripture. Otherwise how should the prophet Ahiah charge him, that he had set up other gods and molten images and groves (1 Kings xiv. 9, 15, 16), as by Jeroboam’s own sin? And Baasha, that “walked in the way of Jeroboam” (1 Kings xv. 34), as did also Omri after him (1 Kings xvi. 26), are said to have “provoked the Lord God of Israel to anger with their vanities” (1 Kings xvi. 13, 26). And Abia reproaches Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii. 9.) and his party, that they “had made them priests after the manner of the nations and other lands; so that whosoever cometh to fill his hand with a bullock and seven rams, may be a priest of no gods.”

§ 39. For what are “vanities,” or “no gods,” but imaginary deities: as St. Paul saith, that he preached to the Gentiles to “turn from those vanities unto the living God,” Acts xiv. 15. And the prophet Jonas, in his prayer, ii. 8: “They, that observe lying vanities, forsake their own mercy.” And בָּרָכָה in David, Psalm xxxi. 7,—“lying vanities,”—is the same that St. Paul’s “lies,” when he saith the Gentiles “changed the truth of God into a lie, in worshipping the creature besides the Creator, God blessed for evermore:” Rom. i. 25. So also Deut. xxxii. 21; 2 Kings xvii. 15; Jeremy ii.
5, viii. 19, x. 15, xiv. 22. And why should the prophet Osee object, viii. 6;—"The workman made it, therefore it is not God, but the calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces;"—had not the calf been taken for God? And again, Os. xiii. 2: "They say unto them, Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves." For that this kissing was a sign of worshipping that which was taken to be God, you have from Job, xxxi. 26, 27; "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in her height, and my heart hath been seduced, and my mouth hath kissed my hand." The sun and the moon being at a distance, because they whose hearts were seduced to think them gods could not kiss them, they kissed their hands to them, in sign that they honoured them for gods; therefore they, that kissed the calves, whom they might come nigh, did it in sign that they honoured them for gods. As the answer of God to Elias saith; "I have reserved Myself seven thousand men, ... all the knees that have not bowed unto Baal, all the mouths that have not kissed him:" 1 Kings xix. 18. And therefore it seemeth very probable, that these calves are also called Baalim by the said prophet: when he saith (Osee xiii. 1, 2), "When Ephraim ... offended in Baal, he died: and now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, and idols according to their own understanding, all of it the work of craftsmen: they say of them, Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves." The author of Tobit is, for his antiquity, more to be credited in the understanding of the Scriptures than all the conjectures we can make at this distance of time; and he saith, that the ten tribes went up to offer "sacrifice τη̇ς βααλ τη̇ς δαμαλεις" (Tobit i. 5)—"to the heifer Baal." Whereupon it is thought, that St. Paul also, when he quoteth the answer of God to Elias, 1 Kings xix. 18,—"I have reserved Myself seven thousand men that have not bowed the knee to Baal,"—in the feminine gender—"τη̇ς βααλ," Rom. xi. 4, referreth to the feminine substantive, "τη̇ς δαμαλει βααλ." And if these

---

calves were of the nature of Baalim, it cannot be denied, that they signified imaginary godheads, such as the Baalim were.

§ 40. Wherefore, when it is objected in the first place¹, that Aaron proclaimed a feast to the Lord by the name of the true God, and that both he and Jeroboam said, “This is the God that brought thee out of the land of Egypt;” I answer with the Wisdom of Solomon, xiv. 21, that idolaters “did ascribe unto stones and stocks the incommunicable name of God.” Which if it can be said of the Gentiles, that knew not the incommunicable name of God; the Israelites, which used it, must needs attribute it to those imaginary deities, which they advanced to the rank of the only true God. And truly St. Stephen, Acts vii. 39—41, describing this act by no other terms than those whereby the Scripture expresseth the idolatries of the Gentiles, prosecuting with an allegation out of Amos v. 25, thus:—“Then God turned and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets; O ye house of Israel, did ye offer Me slain beasts and sacrifices for the space of forty years in the wilderness? nay, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch and the star of your god Rempham, figures that ye had made to worship them.” Which it seems is to be understood all during their travel in the wilderness; because St. Stephen, charging them that they sacrificed not to God in the wilderness, seemeth to press it further by naming to whom they did sacrifice. And what “tabernacle” doth he charge them to have “taken up,” but that which the priests “took up” to carry in the wilderness? Which being the tabernacle of the true God, they, by intending to worship Moloch in it, made his tabernacle. So that it cannot be strange, if they attribute the name of the true God to those, whom turning idolaters they held as true gods as He.

§ 41. I will not dispute, why they chose the figure of a calf. Let who please allow the reasons alleged². If I did not find idolatry in the acts of Aaron and Jeroboam, I might

¹ Monæmius, Abr. Purg., lib. i. c. 8.  = See above, § 9—14.
² p. 74, lib. ii. c. 2. pp. 260, 261.
easily be rid of all these objections otherwise. For if Aaron and Jeroboam did not commit idolatry, how is it idolatry to worship God under an image? But finding the marks of idolatry in them, I must needs acknowledge in them the reason of all idolatry, according to the Scriptures. Supposing Aaron intended only a symbol of God’s presence, consecrated by Him in His tabernacle, Jeroboam to follow his example; those, that were set upon apostasy by the instigation of the “mixed multitude,” that came with them out of Egypt (Exod. xii. 38), and set them on murmuring for flesh (Num. xi. 4), “turning back in their hearts to Egypt” (Acts vii 39), that is, to the idolatries which they had practised there (Ezek. xx. 7), may well be thought to have set up the calf which the Egyptians worshipped. But I need not build on conjectures, having shewed, that idolaters might exercise their idolatry, even towards a symbol of God’s own service.

§ 42. Neither is it any marvel, that Jehu should honour Josaphat’s posterity, because he served God; 2 Chron. xxii. 9 (though that may be imputed to the time, when he had not yet declared to follow the sin of Jeroboam): and his posterity seek God and His prophets, having never tied the people to worship any false god, but only done that, which by necessary consequence (at least, if we count what in discretion must needs come to pass, according to the common course of human affairs) must needs produce idolatry. And supposing they set up the idolatry of the Egyptians, they might as well have recourse to God and His prophets in their necessities, as Ahab humbled himself at the word of Elias (1 Kings xxi. 27); how far soever we may suppose that he went in acknowledging the true God: for the same will as easily be said of Jehu and his posterity.

§ 43. Now it seems to me a thing most certain, that high places were tolerated between the dividing of the land and the building of the temple*: whether because the precept of the Law was not yet in force, God having yet declared no settled choice of any place for His service, as He saith to 

David, 2 Sam. vii. 6, 7; or because, soon after the tabernacle

* See above, § 12. note c.

\[T \times 2\]
was settled in Shiloh, the ark was taken by the Philistines, and so the tabernacle desolate, as the Jews understand it. For who can allow that Gideon, a judge stirred up by God's Spirit, should set up a high place for God's worship against His law: Judges vi. 34, viii. 27. For the mention of an ephod there, viii. 27, is but to say, that the order of God's service in those high places was according to the order of the tabernacle.

§ 44. But what occasion of idolatry these high places did give, we may easily gather by the Law, Levit. xvi. 5, 7; which declareth, that, when they were not tied to the tabernacle in the wilderness but offered their sacrifices "in the open fields," they "sacrificed to devils." For being beset round with idolatrous nations, that confined the deities which they worshipped to their temples and images, it is no marvel if they were tainted by the same, not to understand the true God, Whom they worshipped in the tabernacle, to be every where as much present as in the tabernacle. The true worshippers of God "in spirit and truth" under the Law, understood it well enough, with Gideon; neither is it any marvel, being then licensed and in use, if he conceived it might be for the service of God to set up a high place in his city. But by the event we see, what advantage the worse part hath, to turn that which is well meant to ill uses; when the people fell so soon to idolatry upon that occasion, that it "became a snare to Gideon and his house." And surely, when Moses was in the mount with God, and the presence of God was not seen about the tabernacle, is not this that which the people allege to Aaron, to "make them a god?" as professing not to believe that Moses his God was among them, but finding it necessary, that God Who brought them out of Egypt should go before them: Exod. xxxii. 1, 2.

§ 45. And so, Jeroboam setting up a new place of God's presence, and the whole nation having admitted the presence of the God of Israel to be confined to Solomon's temple, it followed, that the grosser sort of people, who could not distinguish the omnipresence of God from the conceits of the idolatrous nations which they were encompassed with, appropriating several gods to several countries (as the Syrians thought the power of God to reach to the mountains and not to the...
valleys, 1 Kings xx. 23), must needs take it for another god, that Jeroboam set up for the God That brought Israel out of Egypt; and, conforming to His law, worship Him under that conceit. For when St. Stephen, having related how Solomon built God a house, addeth straight,—to correct the mistake of the Jews to whom he spake,—"Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands, as saith the prophet; Heaven is My throne, and earth is My footstool, what house will ye build Me, saith the Lord? or what is the place of My rest? hath not My hand made all these things?" Acts vii. 47—50:—he sheweth plainly, that the vulgar conceit of the Jews came far short of the doctrine of the prophets in this point, and that this was then a great hindrance to the Jews' Christianity, which vulgarly publisheth that, which only the worshippers of God "in spirit and truth" understood under the Law; as Barnabas also, in that epistle, which the ancientest of the fathers have acknowledged, and is lately set forth, declareth.

§ 46. Now for the text of the Judges, concerning that [Whether the second commandment forbids all images, or only images made to represent a Godhead.] For the word לוח, or "carved image, the likeness of any thing," &c. For the word לוח by the original of it signifying all carved work, it may be thought, that God intends by these words to prohibit all use of carved work among His people. Not as if v. 8.

* The epistle of S. Barnabas is in great part a commentary on the spiritual sense of the Law: as, e.g., "νούς ἀνθρώπων ἐν θεοῖς πολλοῖς, καὶ τῶν μὴ τρώγειν, καὶ σατάνας δὲ έν πνεύματι σάλας. (Epist. S. Barn., § viii. p. 33. ed. Menard.)


 Moncensius, Aar. Purg., lib. i. c. 18. pp. 217, sq., argues, that "Ephodem et Teraphs Michæ, ut nomine, in forma et usu, cum Ephode et Cherubis Mosaicis convenisse." The word לוח is used in Exod. xx. 4, and Judg. xvii. 3: and is translated in both places in the Eng. Ver., "graven images."

 Grotius (ad Exod. xx. 4) argues for the absolute prohibition: Eutius, Gerhard, Rivet, Vasques, are cited in Poli Syn. (ad loc.), as maintaining the qualified prohibition.
the making of a carved image were idolatry, but to avoid the occasions of idolatry; which, as I have said, that art though it introduced not, yet it increased. And therefore it followed; "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God." For jealousy forbids as well the means of adultery, as adultery. But if we suppose the signification of the word ἄγαθος extended by use beyond the original of it, it may import only such statues as are made to represent a godhead imagined afore; and then the letter of the precept forbids no more than to make any carved work for the image of God. According to the first sense, the making of the cherubims over the ark falls within the precept; and is to be taken for a dispensation of the lawgiver in the matter of a positive precept, which his own act only rendered unlawful. But according to the latter, being not included in the matter of the precept, there needs no exception to render it lawful. The same is to be said of the brazen serpent. Whether of these opinions is true, I need not here dispute. Only, as I began to say afore, I say further, that during the time that high places were licensed, it can be no inconvenience to grant, that there was the like furniture provided for the service of God there to that which was prescribed in the tabernacle. For upon what ground that people thought it commanded by God there (in which there could be no just occasion of idolatry), upon the like ground and to the like purpose it might be taken up in the high places. Though that reason, which had moved God to prohibit high places after the place of His worship should be settled (Levit. xvii. 5—7), might always endanger them to go astray; as the story of Gideon shews. For though, so long as they understood the ground upon which and the intent to which they were used, they remained secure; yet, forgetting it, by the deceitfulness of error they were subject to be seduced.

§ 47. The fact of Micah, then, hath two of those handles, which Epictetus his Manual mentions. It may be taken, as if he meant only to make a high place for the service of
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

the only true God, according to the Law; the carved work which he furnished it with, being only instead of the furniture of the tabernacle. Which is the case of Gideon, as I stated it afore. For when the prophet Osee threatens the ten tribes, that they shall dwell a long time "without ephod or teraphim:" he does not mean it for a punishment, that they should be restrained of the idolatry which they practised to the calves; but he signifieth, that the cherubim of the temple (where they ought to have served God, and where it would be the blessing of that promise which the Law tendereth to serve God) have the name of teraphim common to them with the calves; though those the objects of idolatry, these the instruments of God's service. For, on the other side, the fact of Micah may be so taken, as if he intended to set up a carved image of an imaginary godhead, to be worshipped for the only true God. And this intent seems to me the more probable of the two. For there stands upon it the mark of a thing done against God's law;—Judg. xvii. 6; "In that day there was no king in Israel, every man did what seemed right in his own eyes:"—which of the case of Gideon originally could not have been said. And besides, that Micah could not have any of the tribe of Levi to minister in this high place, but was fain to take his son in the mean time, till he lighted upon a wandering Levite, whose necessity might debar him to any employment; this also seems an argument, that his "house of gods," which he furnished with "ephod and teraphim," Judg. xvii. 5, was erected to false gods. For that his mother had consecrated her money to the incomunicable name of God [Judg. xvii. 3], is easily answered by the same, that hath been said to the cases of Aaron and Jeroboam. But my opinion remains never a whit prejudiced, though these arguments seem insufficient, and though it be said, that the worship of the true God was that which Micah hereby intended. For still the

7 Above, § 43.
8 "Theraphim—μορφόφωματα (simulacra), quae Cherubinorum habuisse formam censet Hieronymus ad Marcellam, et 1 Sam. xxii. et 2 Sam. vi. 14: quomodo accipiendum etiam videtur Osee, iii. 4." Grotius, ad Judic. xvii. 5.—"Est autem (Theraphim) non men per se medium: ideoque significare potest non male imagines falsi cultus, ut in Labanis historis et alibi, sed et ipso Cherubino, ut hic notavit Hieronymus," &c. Id., ad Ose. iii. 4.—Monecusius, Aar. Purg., lib. i. c. 18. p. 218, refers to the passage of Osee.
same alternative will have recourse, which takes place in Jeroboam's case: either his intent was the service of the true God;—and then, though we suppose that he sinned against the precept of the Law (Levit. xvii. 5), yet he sinned not the sin of idolatry;—or his intent was the service of some imaginary godhead;—and then he committed idolatry according to my opinion, notwithstanding that he used the name of the only true God in the business.

§ 48. As for that which is objected, that according to this opinion there would be no sufficient reason for that difference, which the Scripture maketh between the sin of Jeroboam which made Israel to sin, and the idolatries of Ahab and others.]

[1 Kings xvi. 25, 30—33; xxii. 25, 26: 2 Kings xvi. 3; xxii. 3—9.]

...
common discretion of men, that are able to judge in such matters, evidences, that, supposing such a law, it must needs and will come to pass.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE PLACE, OR RATHER THE STATE, OF HAPPY AND MISERABLE SOULS, OTHERWISE UNDERSTOOD BY GOD'S PEOPLE BEFORE CHRIST'S ASCENSION THAN AFTER IT. WHAT THE APOCALYPSE, WHAT THE REST OF THE APOSTLES DECLARE. ONLY MARTYRS BEFORE GOD'S THRONE. OF THE SIGHT OF GOD.

I come now to the nicest point, if I mistake not, of all that occasions the present controversies and divisions of the Western Church; the state of souls, departed with the profession of Christianity, till the day of judgment: the resolution whereof, that which remains concerning the public service of God, the order and circumstances of the same, must presuppose.

§ 2. This resolution must proceed upon supposition of that, which the first Book hath declared concerning the knowledge of the resurrection and the world to come under the Old Testament, and the reservation and good husbandry in declaring it, which is used in the writings of it.

§ 3. The consideration whereof mightily commendeth the wisdom and judgment of the ancient Church, in proposing the books which we call Apocrypha for the instruction of the catechumeni or learners of Christianity. For these are they, in which the resurrection and the world to come, and the happy state of righteous souls after death, is plainly and without circumstance first set forth. I need not here repeat the seven Maccabees and their mother, professing to die for God's law in confidence of resurrection to the world to come.

* Misprinted XXVI. in folio edition. § 32. note q.
4 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 12, sq.
* See references above, in c. xxii.

" See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxxi. § 16.
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(2 Mac. vii. 9, 11, 23, 36); nor the apostle, Hebr. xi. 35—38, testifying the same of them, and the rest that lived or died in their case. But I must not omit the Wisdom of Solomon; the subject whereof, as I said afore, is to commend the law of God to the Gentiles, that instead of persecuting God's people they might learn the worship of the only true God. For this he doth by this argument:—that those, who persecute God's people, think there remains no life after this, but shall find, that the righteous were at rest as soon as they were dead, and in the day of judgment shall triumph over their enemies (Wisdom ii. iii. 1—8. v.); from hence proceeding to shew, how the wisdom of God's people derives itself from God's wisdom, Who so strangely delivered them from the persecutions of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, for a warning to those that might undertake the like; in particular the kings of Egypt, under whom this was writ and the Jews most used the Greek. The Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, pretending to lay down those rules of righteous conversation, which the study of the Law, the offspring of God's wisdom, had furnished him with, is not so copious in this point; though the precepts of inward and spiritual obedience, and service of God from the heart, which he delivers throughout, can by no means be parted from the hope of the world to come, being grounded upon nothing else. And he proposeth it plainly from the beginning; when he saith, "He that feareth God, it shall go well with him in the end, and at the day of his death he shall be blessed." The very additions to Daniel are a bulwark to the faith of the Church; when it appears, that the happiness of righteous souls after death is not taken up by any blind tradition among Christians, but before Christianity expressed for the sense of Daniel's fellows in those words of their hymn, "O ye spirits and souls of the righteous, bless ye the Lord, praise Him and magnify Him for ever." And whatsoever we may make of the second book of Maccabees, the antiquity of it will always be evidence, that the principal author of it, Jason of Cyrene,

---

\[Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxxi. § 17.\]
\[See ibid., § 17, and 27.\]
\[Josephus, Philo, Judas the Essene, and Simon Maccabaeus, have been severally conjectured to be the author of the abridgment of Jason's book so called: see Calmet, art. Maccabees.\]
could never have been either so senseless or so impudent, as
to impose upon his nation, that prayers or sacrifices were
used by them in regard of the resurrection, if they believed
not the being and sense of human souls after death; 2 Mac.
xii. 43.

§ 4. Proceed we to those passages concerning this point,
which the Gospels afford us, and consider how well they
agree herewith. I will not here dispute, that our Lord in-
tended to relate a thing that really was come to pass, but to
propose a parable or resemblance of that which might and
did come to pass; when He said, Luke xvi. 19, &c., "There
was a certain rich man, that was clad with fine linen and
purple, and made good cheer every day," &c. But I will
presume upon this,—that no man, that means not to make a
mockery of the Scriptures, will endure, that our Lord should
represent unto us, in such terms as we are able to bear, that
which falls out to righteous and wicked souls after death;
if there were no such thing as sense and capacity of pleasure
and pain in souls departed, according to that which they
do here.

§ 5. I will also propose to consideration the description of
the place, whereby He represents unto us the different estate
of those whom it receiveth:—"And in hell, lifting up his
eyes, being in torments, he sees Abraham from afar, and La-
zarus in his bosom;"—and afterwards; "And besides all this,
between us and you there is a great gap fixed, so that those
who would pass from hence cannot, nor may they pass from
thence to us." For I perceive it is swallowed for Gospel
amongst us, that Dives, being in hell, saw Lazarus in the
third heavens: whereas the Scripture saith only, "ἐν τῷ ἕδην"


† "Certant veteres novique interpretes id quod hic sequitur historianae
sit an fabula. Mihhi videtur scriptor
Responsionum ad Orthodoxos non male
solvere hunc nodum: sive enim nec fab-
bulam esse proprie nec historiam, sed
ἐστιν τὸν ποιούσαν. Iota solent autem
eloquentiae magistri appellare narra-
tionem qua res vera coloribus verisimi-
libus depingitur...... Sed illud hic
addendum est, quæ de statu post hanc
vitam dicuntur, ea omnia depingi figura-
ris expressis ad exemplum vitae mor-
talis."

‡ So e. g. Fiscator, ap. Poli Syn. ad
loc.; and Fulke, ad loc., assumes it.
But even Suicer, sub voce ὑδην, affirms
that the word is never used in Holy
Scripture for the place of torment. And
Grotius, stating that "hic unicus, ni
fallor, in S. Literis locus est quo moti
plerique τῶν τόπων τοῦ βασιλείαν proprie
dici putarunt," proceeds at length
to refute the interpretation. See
Usher, Answ. to Jesuit's Challenge, c.
xiii. pp. 317, sq.
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"in the invisible" place of good and bad souls; for so the process of the parable obliges us to understand it, seeing it would be somewhat strange to understand that "gap," whereby the place of happy souls is here described to be parted from the place of torments, to be the earth and all that is between the third heavens and it. The Jews at this time, as we see by the Gospel, believing, according to the testimonies alleged, that righteous souls were in rest and pleasure and happiness, wicked in misery and torments, called the place or state of those torments Gehenna: from the valley of the sons of Hinnom near Jerusalem, where those that of old time sacrificed their children to devils burnt them with fire; the horror of which place, it appears, was taken up for a resemblance fit to represent the torment of the wicked souls after death. In like manner, God's mercy in using means to bring them back to the ancient inheritance which our first parents lost by rebelling against God, they could not use so fit a term to express the rest and happiness of blessed spirits in the world to come, as by calling the place of it "paradise." But that the place of this rest was the third heavens before the sitting down of our Lord Christ at the right hand of His Father, I am yet to learn, that there is any syllable or tittle in the holy Scripture to signify, that the people of God understood, at such time as our Lord delivered this parable: so that there can possibly be no reasonable presumption, that the word ᾱ̀γνoς, here used, not in reference to the body, which goes to corruption in the grave, but to the soul or spirit, should signify the same with Gehenna, in opposition to "Abraham's bosom;" neither the original signification of the word, nor the circumstance of the parable, nor any opinion received then among God's people, so limiting the signification of it. But that "the bosom of Abraham" should signify the place of rest which God had appointed for the righteous, the reason is plain: the hospitality of Abraham being renowned in the Scripture, and the happiness of the world to come being usually represented to the people of God at that time under the resemblance of a feast; whereof Abraham is made the master, when his "bosom" is made the place to receive and refresh Lazarus. There is therefore no reason, why the "bosom of Abraham,"
and "paradise," should not signify the same state or the same place to the apprehension of God's people at that time. But there is also no reason, why §375 in the parable should not extend to comprehend both Gehenna and paradise in the sense of those to whom our Lord addresses this parable.

§ 6. For neither is it any way necessary,—when the good thief prays, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom," and our Lord answers, "To-day shalt thou be with Me in paradise" (Luke xxiii. 42, 43),—that "paradise" should here be understood to signify the third heavens ("the way into which was not yet laid open, standing the first tabernacle," saith the apostle, Hebr. ix. 8; and again, [Hebr. x. 20,] which "new and living way" our Lord Jesus "hath dedicated," or "hasted for us, through the veil, that is, His flesh"): unless we abuse ourselves with an imagination, that words can signify things which could not be apprehended out of them by those to whom they were said.

§ 7. For as for St. Paul, who was "ravished into the third heavens," that is, into paradise (2 Cor. xii. 3, 4): I conceive I need not insist upon an exception, which there is no issue to try; to wit, that St. Paul speaks of several raptures, one into the third heavens, the other into paradise. For, to speak freely, it seems no more than reason to grant, that St. Paul was ravished to the presence of our Lord Christ. But I must needs insist, that the word "paradise" could not signify the same thing to St. Paul after the ascension of our Lord, as to the hearers of our Lord afore it.

§ 8. As for the words of the same St. Paul—"Having a desire to depart and to be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23),—whether they do confine the spirit of St. Paul departed to the place of our Lord Christ's bodily presence in the third heavens, I will not conclude; till I have considered more of those scriptures, which may concern the same purpose.

* "More Hebræorum distinguitor caelum sive mundus supremus a paradiso. Caelum illud supremum promittitur piis post resurrectionem: post mortem et ante resurrectionem paradiisus ille locus gloriam, hic solatii." Grot. ad 2 Cor. xii. 4.—And so also id. ad Luc. xxiii. 43.
* "Eesse cum Christo—At si animas servavit in aliquo loco extra caelum, frustra hoc desiderabat Paulus; Christi tus enim in caelis est." Bellarm., De Sanct. Beatit., lib. i. c. 3; Controv., tom. i. p. 1920. D. —Grotius (ad loc.) merely says—"Id est, in Christi custodia, quoad partem potiorum. . . Nihil hinc de loco definiri potest."
§ 9. And indeed the Apocalypse, as it is the last of the New Testament, so seemeth to declare more in this matter than all the rest of it before had done. For when upon the opening of the fifth seal, Apoc. vi. 9—11, the souls of martyrs, having demanded vengeance upon their persecutors, were clothed with long white robes, and bidden to expect the fulfilling of their numbers; and, after that, the hundred and forty-four thousand of the twelve tribes, that were to be preserved from the said vengeance, were sealed: it followeth, Apoc. vii. 9, 14[—17],—“After that I looked, and behold a great multitude, whom no man could number, of every nation and tribe and people and language, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, and clothed in long white robes, with palms in their hands;”—and to shew who they were;—“These be they, who come out of the great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and have blanched their robes in the Blood of the Lamb: therefore they are before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple, and He that sitteth upon the throne overshadoweth them; they shall not hunger nor thirst, nor shall the sun fall on them, nor any heat; for the Lamb That is in the midst of the throne feedeth them, and guideth them to living wells of water, and God wipes away all tears from their eyes.”

Here you have the souls of the martyrs “before the throne of God,” “overshadowed by Him that sitteth on the throne,” Who “wipeth away all tears from their eyes.” And again, Apoc. xiv. 1—5, where the hundred and forty-four thousand that were sealed appear again upon mount Sion, and the voice of harpers is heard, singing to their harps a new song, “before the throne and before the four living creatures and elders,” which “no man” but the sealed “could learn.” it followeth;—“These are they that have not been defiled with women, for they are virgins; these are they that follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth; these are redeemed from among men, as first-fruits to God and to the Lamb; nor was any deceit found in their mouths, for they are unspotted before the throne of God.” Here [the] hundred and forty-four thousand appear upon mount Sion, hearing only the song which the harpers sing to their harps. And, therefore, those “that were not defiled with women,” that
"follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth," that "are unspotted before the throne of God," are the harpers, not those that were sealed. The same martyrs' souls, that appeared before in long white robes, with palms in their hands, now appear singing the song of triumph to their harps. For so it followeth, v. 13, after denouncing the "fall" of "Babylon," and vengeance of God upon those that "worship the beast:"—"I heard a voice from heaven say to me, Write, Blessed are the dead that from henceforth die in the Lord; even so, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours, and their works go along with them."

§ 10. Well might Tertullian restrain this to martyrs, for the consequence of the text mightily enforceth it. The Lamb indeed is seen on mount Sion with those that are sealed: but it is never said, that they are "before the throne," but only they who appear in heaven, that is, the martyrs, whose song of triumph they hear and learn; which needed not have been said, if they were represented as of one company.

305 And perhaps it is said, that they "follow the Lamb whithersoever He goes," because they followed Him to His cross, suffering that death for Him, which He had suffered for us; and that "they are virgins," because not stained with the pollution of false gods. For, truly, when it is said, that "guile was not found in their mouth;" we cannot understand any thing more proper than the profession of the Christian faith, for which they died. For of whom can it be more properly said, that "guile was not found in" his "mouth," than of him, that dies rather than transgress that which he undertook at his baptism, to profess the name of Christ unto death? He, that likes not this, will be obliged to grant, that virgins also have the state of martyrs by this prophecy. For besides all that hath been said to shew, that in all this prophecy, save the twenty-four, none but martyrs appear in heaven before God's throne (unless we say,

---

1 See Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. § 33, 34.
that here virgins also are seen among the martyrs; whereas, in the beginning of the seventh chapter, order is taken for the sealing of those, that should escape the vengeance of God, in Judæa, being Christians and servants of God (who in the beginning of the fourteenth appear again with the Lamb upon mount Sion); but the martyrs' souls appear in heaven before the throne, both in the fifth and in the seventh (besides what I argue here by consequence drawn from the meaning of the fourteenth): it would be a thing inconsequent to the text and grain of the prophecy, to say, that the servants of God, who are preserved "by the name of God sealed on their foreheads" (Apoc. xiv. 1, vii. 3) from that destruction which involves the persecutors of Christianity, should appear in the same company and rank with the martyrs; among whom are those that are slain in the city of Jerusalem (Apoc. xi. 7—9), of a several condition from those that are preserved alive.

§ 11. Compare we herewith the doctrine of St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 1—4:—"For we know, that, if this earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens: and for this we groan, desiring that our dwelling from heaven be vested upon us; if so be we shall not be found naked, having put it upon us: for we that are in the tabernacle groan, as grieved, not because we desire to be stripped, but to be invested, that the mortal may be swallowed up of life." The whole text of this discourse manifestly imports, that St. Paul expects the resurrection as the accomplishment of his hope; not groaning for the day of his death, to have his soul stripped from his body, but to have it invested with a heavenly tabernacle, made by God, his glorified body, which bringeth life, that swalloweth up the mortality of this. As also he saith, Rom. viii. 23, that "we, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, expecting the adoption, even the redemption of our body;" where the resurrection is the adoption of those who rise again to be sons of God: according to the word of our Lord, Luke xx. 36; "For neither can they die any more, for they are equal to angels; and being children of the resurrection, are children of God." It is true, it
appears by St. Paul, that he was no further certified as then of the counsel of God, than to make it a question, whether he and the Christians of his time should be found alive by the Lord Christ at His coming to judgment. For therefore he says with an "if;"—"If we shall not be found naked of our bodies, when we put on glorious bodies:"—though he had said afore, that, if this body be dissolved, we shall have a heavenly body for it. And so, 1 Cor. xv. 52; "The dead shall rise incorruptible, and we shall be changed." And, 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17: "We, that are left alive unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent those that are fallen asleep;"—again; "We, that are left alive, shall be ravished with them in the clouds into the air to meet the Lord; and so shall be always with the Lord." So that the thousand years, which it is revealed to St. John that the Church shall endure after the fall of Babylon and the judgment exercised upon the whore (Apoc. xx.), is a further revelation of God's will and pleasure for the subsistence of Christianity with the world; how much soever He hath determined it shall endure more, than He hath there declared. But, notwithstanding, seeing that St. Paul, though uncertain thereof, suspends the accomplishment of his and our happiness upon the resurrection; most manifest it is, that the stripping of our bodies by death is not the term of God's promise, according to St. Paul.

Wherefore, when it follows,—"Having therefore always con-
[2 Cor. v. 6-8.]
fidence, and knowing that dwelling in the body we are pil-
grims from God (for we walk by faith, not by sight), we de-
sire with confidence rather to travel out of the body, and to
dwell with God;"—supposing that St. Paul expected this change by Christ's second coming, before he died, he con-
dicts not himself, when he refers it to the resurrection; which,
if we think that he assigns it unto the mean time, we make
him to do. Therefore St. John, 1 Epistle iii. 2: "Beloved, we
are now the children of God; but it is not yet manifest what
we shall be; yet we know, that when He" (or "it") is made
manifest, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."
Sons of God because sons of the resurrection, we saw before [Luke xx. in our Lord's words; sons of God because adopted to His 36.]

"Cum apparerit—nempe illud quod erimus." Grot., ad loc.
Spirit, we have here in St. John. But as St. Paul made our adoption to be "the redemption of the body;" so (Eph. iv. 30), "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," saith he, "by Whom ye are sealed to the day of redemption:"—and i. 14, speaking of the same Spirit,—"Who is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchase." As our Lord saith also, Luke xxi. 28; "Lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh:" speaking of His second coming. If, therefore, neither our "adoption" and "redemption" nor God's "purchase" be complete before we rise again, whether we read in St. John, "When He shall be made manifest," or, "When it shall be made manifest," what we shall be, the resurrection is the time. For if we be not like angels till the resurrection, as our Lord says; much less like God, or like our Lord Christ, as St. John says.

§ 12. As for the term of "seeing God," upon which the school doctors have stated the controversy of the saints' happiness in the meantime; it is a thing evident enough, that the speech is borrowed from the comparison between Moses and other prophets, Num. xii. 6—8; where God saith, He will deal with other prophets by a vision or a dream, but with Moses face to face. And yet St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, comparing the knowledge of God by faith with the knowledge of God by sight, [expresseth it thus; that] "We see now by a glass in a riddle, but then face to face; now we know in part, then shall I know as I am known:" which St. John calls, "as He is;" for sure God knows us as we are. Nay, he saith there, that Moses beheld נוֹר הָיְהִין; which the Greek seems to translate "τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Κυρίου," signifying that glorious appearance, witnessing the presence of God, which Moses communed with mouth to mouth, "ἐν ἐλθεῖν καὶ οὐ δι’ αἰνηματος" —"by sight" (for we have no better English for St. Paul's "ἐν ἐλθεῖς," 2 Cor. v. 7), "not by riddles." Whereby it appeareth, [that] the knowledge of God, which blessed souls have, is described by St. Paul in the very same terms, in which the knowledge of God which Moses had is described by God. And yet none of those school doctors believes, that Moses saw God.


† "strncmp κατὰ στόμα λαλῆσαι αὐτῷ (Μωυσῆ) ἐν ἐλθείς, καὶ ὁ δι’ αἰνηματος, καὶ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου ἐδεί." Numb. xii. 8. LXX.
as the blessed shall do. Therefore both of them seem to be such an expression of intellectual and spiritual things, borrowed from bodily things of this world, as this weakness of our nature is able to bear. And, therefore, seeing God is represented to us throughout the whole Scripture in the majesty of a king sitting upon his throne, as the most glorious thing that all sorts of men (to whom the Scripture is written) can imagine to themselves; it seemeth most reasonable to conceive, that both expressions are borrowed from thence. For the custom of the world knows no more evident mark of preferment, than for a man to see his king, and to be always admitted to his presence; of which admission courts know that there are many degrees. As the seven princes, in Esther i. 14, "which see the king's face;" or "stand before the king's face," as the queen of Sheba expresseth it in Solomon's servants, 1 Kings x. 8. As the souls of the martyrs "are before God's throne, and see Him day and night;" Apoc. vii. 15. And so by consequence those souls, that are admitted into God's presence, have another manner of knowledge and familiarity with God than ever Moses had: because it is one thing to see God and to speak with God mouth to mouth in His tabernacle (where, by a glorious appearance speaking in His person, He testified His presence); another thing, in the third heavens, whereof the most holy place of the tabernacle was but a figure.

§ 13. Here take notice, before we go further, in what fashion the majesty of God appeareth or is described in the Scriptures. "I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left;" saith the prophet, 1 Kings xxii. 19: that is, all the angels attending on both sides of His throne. "God is to be trembled at in the great council of His saints, and terrible above all that are about Him;" saith David, Ps. lxxxix. 8. The majesty of His throne is "terrible" even to the angels that stand beneath and about it. For the saints of heaven, in the Old Testament, are only angels. Thus far none of them sits in God's presence. In that vision of His throne, which appeareth Dan. vii. 9, 10 (with God "sitting" on it like "the ancient of days," with "a thousand thousands and a myriad of myriads" waiting upon Him), it is said indeed,
"thrones were set;" but no mention of any but this one in all that followeth. And though the people of God are called there (vv. 22, 25, 27.)—" the saints of the Highest:" yet the angels are still the saints of heaven; His people the saints on earth, whom God there giveth sentence for against their enemies. But to the prophet Ezekiel, i. 22, 26, 27, He appeareth in the likeness of a man sitting upon a throne, pitched on a floor, which is drawn by four living creatures; signifying those angels, which covered the ark of the covenant in the tabernacle, upon which God is described to sit as upon His throne in so many places of the Old Testament: whereas, in the vision of the prophet Esay, His throne is compassed by six," Essay vi. 1, 2; in that of St. John, Apoc. iv. 2, 3, 5—8, with four.

§ 14. But, in the New Testament, our Lord promises His twelve apostles, that "at the regeneration," that is, the resurrection, "they shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel;" Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30: where by the way we are also to note, that the kingdom of God which our Lord bequeaths to them, to eat and to drink in it and to sit on these thrones, is not till the resurrection; therefore neither those\* joys, which the said eating and drinking signifies. Hereupon it is, that St. Paul saith; "Know you not, that the saints shall judge the world?" 1 Cor. vi. 2. When therefore God appeareth to St. John, as about to take vengeance upon the persecutors of His Church; His throne appeareth environed with twenty-four thrones, for twenty-four elders to sit on, and give sentence with Him (Apoc. iv. 4); the angels attending upon their thrones, as upon His (Apoc. v. 11, vii. 11); and the souls of the martyrs, which (Apoc. vi. 9) appear "δυνατῶ τοῦ θυσιαστήρου"—"beneath the altar" of incense, which stands "before the throne" (Apoc. viii. 3), appear "before the throne" (Apoc. vii. 9). Just as, in the church, the people was wont to stand at the service of God with their faces towards the bishop, sitting on his throne in the midst of the seats on which the presbyters sate on both sides of him, the deacons standing to give them attendance: as I have shewed [at\*] large

\* This does not appear in Issaiah: but merely that each of the seraphim (whose number is not mentioned) had six wings.  
\* Corrected from MS.; "these," in folio edition.  
\* Added from MS.

§ 15. But all this while we must remember, that, though this vision appears to St. John in the heavens (Apoc. iv. 1), yet doth it not appear, that the throne of God, before which the souls of the martyrs stand and round about which the twenty-four elders sit, is seen by them, as it is seen by St. John in the vision here described. For whereas it is plain, that all this is represented, as if there were in heaven such a temple as that at Jerusalem, in the inner court whereof the elders sit, the people stand, praising God (for Apoc. viii. 15, the martyrs “serve God before the throne day and night in the temple”); it is manifest, that the throne of God (which in the temple was the ark of the covenant shadowed with the cherubins) was not seen by those who worshipped without in the court. And Apoc. iv. 5, it is said, that “thunder and lightning came out of the throne;” and that “there were seven lamps burning before the throne, being the seven Spirits of God:” so that, the seven candlesticks being between the holy of holies and the court in which these things appear, we are obliged to understand the throne to be in the holy of holies, as in the temple; and the seven lights in the outward tabernacle, or holy place of the temple. Which is still more plain, when it is said (Apoc. xi. 19); “And the temple of God in heaven was opened, and the ark of His covenant was seen in His temple, and there were lightnings and thunders and flashes and earthquakes and great hail.” For if opened then, then shut afore: neither was the throne seen which the ark of the covenant signifieth. And, Apoc. xiv. 17, 18, one “angel comes out of the temple in heaven with a sharp sickle,” another out of the court, where all this appears hitherto: called there “θυσιαστήριον” or “the sanctuary,” as also Apoc. xi. 1, in opposition to “ναός” —“the temple;” out of which came the seven angels with the seven vials, Apoc. xv. 5 [,6]. So also xvi. 1, 17. And you shall see by all this, what reason we have to think, that those

---

* § 11—15; the paging from the ed. of 1642.
* § 8—6.

---

b c. iv. § 4.
* c. iii. § 9—12: the paging from the ed. of 1649.
who are described before God's throne by this vision, are not admitted to see His face.

§ 16. And therefore, if to "know God as we are known" in St. Paul, to "see Him as He is" in St. John, be our happiness; there is nothing to shew us that it is accomplished before the general judgment. For if St. John, when he sayeth, "We shall know Him as He is," speaks of the resurrection; the same we must needs think is meant by St. Paul, when he says, "We shall see Him face to face" and "know Him as we are known." For St. Paul, not expressing whether he speak of the resurrection, or of the mean time between death and it, must needs be limited by St. John, speaking of the time, when our Lord shall be manifested, or when it shall be manifested what we shall be. And, therefore, though Moses spake with God mouth to mouth, though he see Him "by sight, not in a riddle;" yet is this but the highest degree of prophetical vision: which notwithstanding, "no man shall see God's face and live," and therefore Moses himself sees but His back, Exod. xxxiii. 20—23. And notwithstanding that the martyrs are before God's throne in the third heaven, yet, for all this, they are but in the inward court: and the holy of holies appeared not open to St. John, but upon occasion of judgments; the execution whereof comes from thence, where the sentence must be understood to pass. So that to "know God as He is known," according to St. Paul, and "to see Him as He is," according to St. John, is that which is reserved for them, that shall feast after the resurrection in His presence.

§ 17. For seeing St. John sees the throne of God in vision of prophecy, which the same vision describeth the martyrs' souls in heaven to see; it cannot be concluded, that the martyrs' souls do see God as He is, and know Him as they are known, because they are before God's throne, or because they see Him sitting upon it. For Moses also communed with God mouth to mouth, and that upon His throne in the holy of holies, the ark of the covenant overshadowed by the cherubins; unto whom God said nevertheless, "No man shall see My face and live."

§ 18. The apostle indeed to the Hebrews, xii. 23, when he says—"We are come to the assembly and Church of the
first-born registered in the heavens, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect,"—seems to speak of this mean time. For though some would have those "spirits of just men made perfect" to be the souls of living Christians (as when St. Peter saith, 1 Peter iii. 18, 19, that our Lord Christ, "being put to death in the flesh, was made alive by the Spirit, in which departing He preached to the spirits in prison;" which is necessarily to be understood of the Gentiles, whom the Spirit of God in the apostles won to repentance, though the same Spirit in Noe could not effect it, as it follows); yet it seems more consequent to the rest of the text to understand it here of the souls of Christians made perfect upon their departure hence. But if "just men made perfect" may be understood to signify no more than Christians, because our Lord, distinguishing that righteousness which the Gospel requireth from that which the Law was content with, concludes, "Be ye therefore perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v. 48); certainly the perfection of Christian souls in the mean time between death and the resurrection, cannot be concluded to be such as nothing shall be added to, because it is said, that they are "made perfect." The same we have from the apostle, 1 John iv. 17: "Herein is love perfected in us, that we have confidence in the day of judgment; because, as He is, so are we in this world." For, I beseech you, how can there be any thing added to his confidence at the day of judgment, who hath received his full reward from the day of his death? But St. Paul, 2 Thessalonians i. 6—10: "Seeing it is just with God to render tribulation to them who afflict you, and to you that are afflicted rest with us at the revealing of the Lord Jesus from heaven with His angels, in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them who know not God, who shall endure the punishment of everlasting destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His strength, when He cometh to be glorified among His saints . . . at that day." Where, you see, he referreth, as well the rest of them who are afflicted, as the punishment of everlasting destruction from before the Lord, to the last day of the

general judgment, when He cometh to be admired among His saints: who shall then be as well glorified Christians as the angels; and that in heaven, according to the spiritual sense of the Old Testament; as upon earth, according to the literal sense, the prophet Esay saith, that after the destruction of Sennacherib, “The Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Sion and Jerusalem, and be glorified in the sight of His elders;” Esay xxiv. 23.

§ 19. Here then all those scriptures, which refer the torments provided for the devil and his angels unto the general judgment, come in to bear witness in the same cause. For therefore the words of the sentence bear, “Go ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matt. xxv. 41); to wit, against that time. And St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 3: “Know ye not, that we shall judge the angels?” to wit, the evil angels. And the possessed to our Lord, Matt. viii. 29; “Art Thou come to torment us before the time?” And the apostle, 2 Pet. ii. 4: “For if God spared not the angels having sinned, but delivered them to be kept for judgment in the dungeon with chains of darkness.” And St. Jude, 6; “And the angels, that kept not their original but left their own habitation, He keeps in everlasting chains under darkness to the judgment of the great day.” For though there can be no reason, why the devils, having rebelled against God, should not taste the fruits of their rebellion immediately; as there is a reason to be given, why man is not to be judged till he be tried; especially, the parable of Dives and Lazarus shewing, that wicked souls are in torment before their departure: yet, seeing God hath allowed them to tempt mankind and to dwell in the air about them (Job i. 7, ii. 2; Ephes. ii. 2, vi. 12;— whereupon they desire our Lord not to send them “into the deep,” Luke viii. 31), it seemeth necessary to grant, that He will take account of them for the malice, which at present He suffereth them to exercise, though sentenced to that dungeon and those bonds, which they can no more escape, than be converted to goodness from the beginning.
CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE SOULS OF THE FATHERS WERE NOT IN THE DEVIL'S POWER TILL CHRIST; THOUGH THE OLD TESTAMENT DECLARE, NOT THEIR ESTATE, OF SAMUEL'S SOUL. THE SOUL OF OUR LORD CHRIST, PARTING FROM HIS BODY, WENT WITH THE THIEF TO PARADISE. OF HIS TRIUMPH OVER THE POWERS OF DARKNESS. PRAYER FOR THE DEAD SIGNIFIETH NO DELIVERING OF SOULS OUT OF PURGATORY. THE COVENANT OF GRACE REQUIRES IMPERFECT HAPPINESS BEFORE THE GENERAL JUDGMENT. OF FORGIVENESS IN THE WORLD TO COME; AND PAYING THE UTMOST FARTHING.

It is manifest, then, by these premisses, that there is appearance enough of difference in and between several scriptures, that concern the state of souls departed before the general judgment. Nevertheless in this it cannot be said that there is any difference, but that all is agreed, that the wicked are in pain, and the righteous at rest, upon their departure; as the parable of Dives and Lazarus distinguishes. And this I should here proceed further to limit, but that I hope to do it more clearly and resolutely, premising here the determination of two points incident.

§ 2. For it is manifest, that all parties in difference do allow the hope of salvation to those Christians, that depart imperfectly turned from their evil ways, and amended in their inclinations and actions. Be it but for the example of the thief upon the cross; though we suppose, that as there is but one example written so there are few and very few examples come to pass, yet (seeing that which hath come to pass may come to pass again, and that the case cannot be excepted from the hope of salvation) the question will be, what becomes of those souls that depart hence in the state of God's grace, but burdened with sins which they have not repented of to amendment. And because all that is to be said of happiness after death must come out of the New Testament, according to the premisses; it will be requisite to enquire, in the second place, in what condi-

§ 3. Which draws another question after it, concerning the place where, or the company which Christ's human soul was with, during the time it was departed from the body. For it is manifest, that there is an opinion, which hath very great vogue even among the fathers—\(\text{f}^\) that the soul of Christ was in hell with the souls of the fathers during that time, and brought them along from thence when He rose again, carrying them up into heaven with Him at His ascension; where ever since the souls of the martyrs and other eminent Christians, which now are properly called saints (for in the writings\(^8\) of the apostles Christians are\(^a\) generally called saints, as in the Old Testament Israelites), are received, when they depart hence: those that die not in God's grace, being condemned to hell torments; but those, who have not had care to cleanse themselves of sin by repentance and amendment, remaining in the suburbs of hell (as I may well call that place, which the Church of Rome calls purgatory), till by the prayers of the living, or having paid the debt of temporal pain, remaining due when the guilt of sin is done away with the debt of eternal pain, they are removed to heaven, and to the sight of God\(^1\); which is the same happiness they shall enjoy after the resurrection, only that the body hath no part in it as then it shall have.

\(^{1}\) "That there is Limbus Patrum;" and "that our Saviour also descended into Hell, to deliver the ancient fathers of the Old Testament; because before His passion none ever entered into heaven;" is a part of the thesis of the Jesuit whose challenge Usher answered, Answ. to Jesuit’s Chall., c. viii. Works vol. iii. pp. 278, sq.—Bellarmine’s doctrine is, "quod animae piorum non sustinet in calo ante Christi ascensionem" (De Christi Anima, lib. iv. c. 11. Con- trov., tom. iv. p. 536, A.).—For the fathers who held the opinion in question, see Usher, pp. 293, sq.; and Pearson, On the Creed, art. v. Descended into Hell, note a. vol. ii. p. 324. Oxf. 1833. And that it was the general doctrine of schoolmen, with a difference however of actual or of virtual descent of Christ into hell, see Ussher, ibid. p. 417; and Pearson, ibid. vol. i. pp. 401, sq.

\(^{a}\) Corrected from MS.; "writing," in folio edition.

\(^{8}\) Corrected from MS.; "Christians who are," in folio edition.

\(^{1}\) See Bk. II. of the Cov. of Gr., c. xiii. § 10. note d; and above, c. xi. § 1, 5.
§ 4. That, which the opinion which I have mentioned
saith of the state of righteous souls under the Old Testament,
seemeth to stand upon those descriptions of the dead which
it giveth. The prophet Esay, describing the ruin of the king
of Babylon (Esay xiv. 9): "Hell" (or "the grave") from be-
neath is moved for thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the
311 dead for thee, even all the leaders of the earth." To what
purpose is it here to dispute, whether "hell" or "the
grave;" where it is so evident, that the dead must rise to
meet the king of Babylon? To what purpose to allege
a figure of prosopopæia; unless it could be understood, that
dead corpses could meet him and receive him without their
souls? The "dead" here are in the original "the giants;" of [נֵגְשִׁים]
whom we read, Gen. vi. 4, that for the wickedness of their
times the world was condemned to the flood. For though
Moses call them "Nephilim," and Esay "Rephaim;" yet it [דִּקְרִים]
is manifest, that the same word is attributed to the dead,
because of the violence and wickedness, which the Scripture
sheweth were multiplied upon the earth by the giants before
the flood, and afterwards by the giants that inhabited the land
of promise; whereupon the Scripture, by calling the dead by
the name of giants, signifieth, that the giants were under that
death which God threatened Adam's sin with. And doth not
the Scripture of the Old Testament describe unto us the fathers
of the Old Testament in the same estate? What shall we
say of the soul of Samuel, which the witch of Endor raises
out of the earth, if the Scripture say true, 1 Sam. xxviii.
12, 14; when the woman "saw Samuel," and "Saul perceived
that it was Samuel?" And that no man may say it is a witch,
and that he that went to a witch says it; what shall we say
to the language of Jacob,—"I will go down to my son into
hell mourning?" Gen. xxxvii. 35. For his grief for Joseph
would not have been enough to make him die with sorrow,
had he died with St. Paul's expectation to "be with Christ,"
so soon as he was dismissed. And therefore the language of
David, Ps. xxxix. 4—14, entertaining the thought of death
with such astonishment, seemeth to give credit to that gross

1 Corrected from MS.; misprinted "Israel," in folio edition.
2 "Est προσωπωσία, in qua mortui introductur cum dignitate quam olim
habueure." Grot., Ad Essa. xiv. 9.
III. BOOK opinion, that souls have no sense till the resurrection but
sleep out the time. As also king Ezekiias, weeping at the
news of death, because the dead could not praise God; Esay
xxxviii. 3, 18: as also Psalm vi. 6, and Baruch ii. 17. And
Job, iii. 18, makes his case, had he never been born, the
same with the dead: not because he thought the soul mor-
tal; therefore, because he thought it a light, that death
puts out, and the resurrection kindles it again.

§ 5. But all this is to be imputed to nothing in the world
but that dispensation of the Old Testament, which I have
spoke of so many times, and now shall confirm it by so
visible an instance as this. Death was proposed to Adam
for the mark of God’s wrath and vengeance, which he was
become liable to by sin. The turning of this curse into a
blessing was to be the effect of Christ’s cross, which was not
yet to be revealed. The life of the land of promise was pro-
posed for the reward of keeping God’s law, instead of the life
of paradise. Therefore the cutting off of that life was to be
taken for a mark of that curse, which mankind became sub-
ject to by the first Adam; till it should be declared the way
to a better life by the cross of Christ. Therefore the giants,
that left it with the marks of enmity with God upon them,
are described as within the dominion of hell, but not asleep;
unless we can think it is a mark of misery to go to them that
sleep, when all do sleep: Prov. ii. 18, ix. 18, xxi. 16; Esay
xxvi. 14. For that there should be no praising of God after
death, holds punctually in virtue of the old covenant, which
brought no man to life, and was then on foot; though they,
who writ those things, might and did know, that by the vir-
tue of the new covenant (under which they knew themselves
to be) they should not be deprived of the privilege of praise-
ing God after death and before the resurrection; how sparing

1 “Hos hæreticos... Arabicos pos-
suum nuncupare: qui dixerint ani-
mas cum corporibus mori atque dissolvi,
et in fine saeculi utrumque resurgere.”
viii. p. 24. F: adding however that
by Origen’s means they were con-
verted from their error.—The Saddu-
cees thought, that souls died with the
bodies (Josephus, Antiq. Jud., lib. xviii.
c. 1. § 2. Op. tom. ii. p. 798. ed. Hud-
son).—The notion mentioned in the text
was revived by one William Coward
about 1700 in a tract entitled The Just
Scrutiny or a Serious Enquiry into the
Modern Notions of the Soul, &c.

= Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c.
xiii. § 28. c. xxxi. § 15; &c.: Bk. II.
Of the Cov. of Gr., c. viii., especially
§ 17; c. xxviii. § 4; &c.: and see the
passages quoted in the last reference,
note d.
soever they were to be in imparting this knowledge openly to all the world. For how otherwise should they, whom the apostle (Hebr. xi.) declareth to have sought the kingdom of heaven, have shewed themselves otherwise affected with death, than the martyrs that suffered for Christ were afterwards? How could it be thought the same Spirit, that moved them to such a difference of effects, according to the difference of time?

§ 6. And therefore the same Solomon, that saith there is nothing to be done "in the grave" (Eccles. ix. 10), saith further (Eccles. xii. 7), that, when "the dust returns to the earth, then the soul returns to God That gave it." And when Enoch and Elias were taken away by God in their bodies; neither sleep they, seeing Moses and Elias attend our Lord Christ at His transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 3, 4; Mark ix. 4, 5; Luke ix. 30); nor is it possible for any man, that would have souls to sleep, to give a reason, why, the covenant by which all are ordered being the same, the souls of Christians should sleep, when their souls sleep not. And, therefore, when our Lord proves the resurrection by this, that God is called "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," whereas "God is not the God of the dead but of the living" (Matt. xxii. 32, Mark xii. 26, 27, Luke xx. 37, 38); He not only supposes, that His argument is good, but that His adversaries the Sadducees granted it to be good. And so St. Paul; when he argues, that "if the dead rise not" again, "then ... are we the most miserable of all people," as having no further "hope" than "this life" (1 Cor. xv. [16,] 19). For what needed more to them, that owned the law of Moses and the Gospel of Christ, and yet would deny the world to come, questioning the resurrection that supposes it? For the rest, I will not repeat that, which I produced afore out of the books we call Apocrypha; which he that peruseth, will find a difference between the language of the patriarchs and prophets, speaking of themselves, and the language of those books, speaking of them: but I will insist upon this, that our Lord, when He proposeth the parable of Dives and Lazarus, manifestly accepts of that opinion, which notwithstand-
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ing such difficulties from the Scriptures of the Old Testament had prevailed over the better part of that people by tradition of the fathers and prophets; to wit, that the souls of good and bad are alive in joy and pain, according to the qualities in which they depart hence, and shall resume their bodies to give account in them for their works here. The same doth the appearance of Moses and Elias at His transfiguration, the rendering of His Soul into His Father's hand, the promise of bringing the thief into paradise the same day, signify.

§ 7. Whereby it appeareth, that whatsoever might seem to argue, either that the souls of the fathers were in the devil's hands till the death and resurrection of Christ, or that all souls go out like sparks when men die, and are kindled anew when they rise again, prove nothing, because they prove too much. For if they prove anything, they must prove, that there is no world to come; as the disputes of Ecclesiastes and Job seem to say: because, by the accidents of this world, there is no ground of a man's estate in it. Which, seeing it is so far from leaving any dispute among Christians, that among Jews the Sadducees were reputed sectaries; it is evident, that whatsoever may seem to look that way in the Old Testament, cannot prove, that the souls of the fathers were in the verge of hell, till, Christ rising again, "the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after His resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared to many;" as we read in the Gospel of Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. This indeed were something, if the Scripture had said, that those saints, who arose with their bodies when our Lord Christ was risen again, had ascended into heaven with Him in their bodies: which, because it derogates from the generality of the last resurrection, having no ground in the Scripture, can bear no dispute. Therefore, seeing these saints, as Lazarus afore, and the widow's son of Nain whom our Lord raised, restored their bodies to the grave; there is no presumption from hence, that their souls were brought from hell by our Lord, to be translated into

* See above, § 3. note f.
* See above, § 4. note l.
* See e. g. Josephus, Antiq. Jud.

lib. xviii. c. 1. § 2. Op. tom. ii. p. 793:
and Ussher, Answ. to Jesuit, c. viii.

p. 365.
the full happiness of the world to come, with His own. I do therefore allow that, which is written in the Apocryphal 2 Esdras iv. 41, 42: "In the grave, the chambers of souls are like the womb of a woman; for like as a woman that travaileth maketh haste to escape the pressure of her travail, even so do those places haste to deliver the things that are committed unto them." And vii. 32: "And the earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the dust those that dwell in silence, and the secret places shall deliver those souls that were committed unto them." For in most of those writings which the ancient Church counteth apocryphal, because they are suspected to intend some poisonous doctrine¹, excellent things are contained; which the agreement of them with canonical Scripture, and their consequence and dependance upon the truth which they settle, renders recommendable, even from dangerous authors. And for that which is here said; whether we suppose this book to be written by a Christian or not, before Christ or after*: seeing there is no mention of any saints in those visions of the Old Testament, where God is represented sitting upon His throne, but only the holy angels (though, in the Apocalypse, the martyrs are before the throne, and the elders sit on seats round about the throne⁴); seeing it cannot be said, that they are translated out of the verge of hell into the heavens by the resurrection and ascension of Christ, who were in happiness before by the parable of Dives and Lazarus: I take the "chambers" or the "houses" here mentioned, to be the "bosom of Abraham" in the parable, and "paradise" in our Lord's promise; secret indeed, because the Scripture is sparing in imparting unto us the knowledge of the place, but such as oblige them earnestly to desire and long for the consummation of all things; which not only the comparison of the womb in this apocryphal Scripture, but the cry of the souls in Apoc. vi. 10, xx[ii]. 12, 17, 20, witnesseth.

---

¹ See above, c. xxii. § 31, sq.
² The work is extant in Latin only, and is not reckoned canonical by the council of Trent, although appended (but as apocryphal) to the Vulgate. See Bellarm., De Verbo Dei, lib. i. c. xx.; Controv., tom. i. pp. 80. B—82, C.—Cosin, Schol. Hist. of the Canon &c, num. lxxxii. ; Works, vol. iii. pp. 147, sq.:—Reynolds, Censura Libb. Apocryph., Praelect. xviii. vol. i. p. 149.
³ See above, c. xxvii. § 14.
§ 8. But I must go no further in this point, till I have resolved the difficulty of Samuel's soul: which he that will needs question, whether it were in the devil's hand, for a witch to bring up out of the earth, or in the bosom of Abraham where our Saviour placed Lazarus, may as well question, whether the witch or the Law sent us to the true God*. To a heathen man, that acknowledgeth not the enmity between God and the devil which the Scripture establisheth, necromancy, that bringeth the likeness of the dead out of the earth, need not go for a diabolical art, nor those spirits which minister such apparitions be counted unclean spirits; but the Scripture[s] even of the Old Testament, placing the giants, God's enemies, beneath, oblige us to take it for an unclean spirit, that serves an act forbidden by God's law, by bringing the likeness of God's prophet out of the place where God's enemies go after death. For though God's friends go to the dust as concerning their bodies, and as concerning their souls the Old Testament declares not whither they go; yet hath it no where described them in that company, to which Solomon deputeth his fool. And our Saviour's parable representeth Dives in the flames which burnt Sodom and Gomorrah, no otherwise, than Solomon quartereth his fool with the giants that tyrannized over the old world or the land of promise. Wherefore, though I reject not Ecclesiasticus for commending Samuel, because "he prophesied after his death" (because, at the worst, it is not fit to reject a book of such excellent use for one mistake), yet I had rather say, that Saul, having by his apostasy declined to the worship of the devil by necromancy, did think it more satisfactory to be

* Bellarmine (De Purgatorio, lib. ii. c. 6. Controv. tom. i. pp. 1867, 1868) argues at length that "limbus Patrum sit in inferis sed in partes suprema," from the case of Samuel: answering the argument, that "non est credibile Samuelem subjectumuisse Pythonissae," by alleging that "non venisse iussu Pythonisse sed iussu Dei," and producing against Tertullian and others, who deny that it was Samuel, Josephus, Justin Martyr, S. Ambrose, S. Jerom, S. Augustin (who held both views at different times), and others, who affirm that it was—"Quanquam ubique id quod hic appetur vocatur 'Samuel,' etiam apud Josephum, tum 'Samuelis &c vocatus,' tum 'Samuelis quoque' credibilius tamen est fallacem spiritum sui esse, &c. Groh., Ad I Reg. xx.viii. 11.—Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 20. (omitted in reading the chapter by the Church of England) proves the Jews of that time to have believed in a real appearance of Samuel himself.
answered by Samuel than by any other likeness, and that this is indeed for Samuel's honour: but that otherwise it is no more for Ecclesiasticus to say, that Samuel "prophesied," than for the Scripture, that "Samuel spoke to Saul;" who whether he took it for Samuel or for an unclean spirit, the Scripture would call it no otherwise, than the witch, whom he submitted to, pretended. She, when she saith, "I see gods ascend out of the earth" (though I find it no incongruity, that she should pretend the spirit whom she employed to be of that number, whom the Scripture calleth "gods," or "God's sons"), yet, because it is rather to be thought that she pretended to bring up Samuel indeed, it is more convenient to translate it, "I see a judge come up out of the earth;" understanding, that by the habit of a judge, in which he appeared, she shews him to Saul for Samuel. For the observation of the Jews' doctors is most true, that Elohim signifies the judges of God's people.

§ 9. These things thus cleared, it is manifest, that the Soul of Christ, parted from His Body which lay in the grave, did not go into hell, to free the fathers' souls out of the devil's hands, and to translate them to the full happiness, which wants only the company of the body as an accessory to complete it. But seeing He may be thought to have gone thither to declare the victory of His cross, and to begin that triumph over the devil and his party, which the Gospel shall accomplish at the general judgment by the redemption of the Church; let us see what the Scripture teacheth.

§ 10. St. Peter, Acts ii. 25—35, first affirms, that David [St. Peter, speaking of Christ, when he saith (Psalm xvi. 10, 11), "Thou shalt not leave My Soul in hell, nor suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption; Thou shalt shew Me the path of life, Thou shalt fill Me with the gladness of Thy presence;"

and proves it, because David was "dead and buried, and his sepulchre" was seen "to that day." Just as he proves

* "Vidi Deum, i.e. judicem seu gubernatorem: id quod arguebat ex illius fornis, quam narrat v. 14." Piscator, ap. Poli Syn. ad locum.—"Quidam per Dros huius intelligentis simulatum Samuelum, turmas malorum spirituum comitatum." Poli Syn., ibid.

7 See references in Wolfi Curs Philit. et Critic., tom. ii. ad Joh. x. 34.

* So e.g. Heylin, On the Creed, pp. 261, 282. And see Pearson, On the Creed, vol. i. pp. 412, sq.
afterwards, that, when David said, Psalm cx. 1, "The Lord said unto My Lord, Sit Thou on My right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy foot-stool," he meant it of Christ; because David never "went up into the heavens." And there is no doubt the opinion of the Jews at that day bore him out in that exposition, because, as to this day, so then, they did expound those texts of the Messias*. So he had nothing to do but to shew how true they were of our Lord Jesus. That this no way requireth, that they should not be understood of David in the literal sense; I refer myself to that which hath been said alreadyb. But what signifies it in the literal sense, that God "shews" David "the path of life," and "fills" him "with the gladness of His presence?" Surely, that He preserves him alive in his state and title of king of God's people, to serve God before the ark. So Hezekias, when he was unwilling to die because "the living only praise God," had said, "What is the sign, that I shall go into the temple of the Lord?" Esa. xxxviii. 19, 22. So David; how many times doth he set forth, for the comfort of his life, that he might come and see God in the temple (Ps. xvii. 15, xxiv. 3, 5, xxvi. 6—12, xlii.; and, in a word, everywhere)? If this be the literal sense of the psalm, what shall it signify in the mystical sense; supposing our Lord Jesus the Messias, and supposing Him killed by the Jews? Let St. Peter be judge, when he says, that David, "knowing as a prophet," that the Messias, our Lord Jesus, "Whom ye have slain," "should come out of his loins, . . . foretold of His resurrection, that His Soul was not left in hell, nor did His Flesh see corruption." For is it any way requisite to the validity of this argument, that our Lord's human Soul should triumph over the devil and his party in the entrails of the earth? Therefore, if you accept His Soul to signify His Person*—as David, Psalm xxv. 18, "His soul" (himself) "shall live at ease, and his seed shall inherit the land,"—"Thou shalt not leave My Soul in hell," will be no more than, "Thou shalt not suffer Thine Holy One to see corrup-

---

* See, for Ps. cx., Pearson, On the Creed, art. vi. vol. i. pp. 462, 463, with the notes: and for both that and Ps. xvi., Allix, Judgm. of Jew. Ch. against Unitarians, c. iv. pp. 44, 45.

b See above in c. xxii. § 20, 21; and in the notes there.

* Rivet, Piscator, Gejrus, and Grotius, are cited for this interpretation in Poli Syn. ad Psalm xvi. 10.
tion;"—Thou shalt not suffer Me to be cut off from Thy presence, to which I am to present the sacrifice of My cross.

But if you will needs have the soul to signify that which stands in opposition to the flesh: seeing the souls of the fathers, which by the dispensation of the Law appeared not freed from the devil, were indeed free by the Gospel; under the Law it is no marvel, that our Lord Christ represents His Soul as in the power of those who had the power of death; Who saith, "This is your time, and" the time of "the powers [Luke xii. 53.] of darkness." Doth St. Paul make any more of this text? Hear his words, Acts xiii. 34—37: "That He raised Him from the dead, no more to return to corruption, thus He saith, I will give you the sure mercies of David; wherefore He saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption; for David, having served the counsel of God in his generation, fell asleep and was added to his fathers, and saw corruption, but He Whom God raised saw no corruption." He argues the mystical sense in our Lord Christ, because the literal sense in David was come to nothing by his death; but how the mystical sense in our Lord Christ? by His triumphing in hell, or by rising again?

§ 11. Therefore St. Paul again, Rom. x. 6—9, thus wrest—[St. Paul, of bringing Christ from "the deep."
[Deut. xxx. 13.] the words of Moses out of the Jews' hands to the establishing of the Gospel, upon supposition that the Law is the figure of it:—"Say not in thy heart, Who shall go up into heaven" (as Moses, Deut. xxx. 12, saith, The Law "is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Would to God somebody would bring it us from heaven, that we might hear and do it;" so saith he of the Gospel, Thou needest not say, Would to God somebody would go up into heaven); "to wit, to bring down Christ: or who shall go down into the deep" (as Moses addeth, "The Law is not beyond sea, that thou needest say, Would to God somebody would go beyond sea and bring it us, that we might hear and do it;" so thou needest not say, Would to God somebody would go down into the deep); "to wit, to bring Christ up from the dead: but what saith it" (the Law, correspondent to the Gospel)? "The word is near, in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is,

---

4 See Pearson, On the Creed, art. v. vol. i. pp. 396—401, and notes.
BOOK III.

the word of faith which we preach; that if thou profess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, believing with thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.” Here it is plain “the deep” is not named for the place of the damned; but for that place, or for that state, out of which it was hard to recover Christ, supposing Him dead*: as it was hard to bring the Law from beyond the seas. “The deep,” I deny not, represents to us the place of the damned, Luke viii. 31: as also the parts “that are under the earth,” Phil. ii. 10, Apoc. v. 13, may comprehend also the dead. Therefore “the deep” signifies the place of the damned, not necessarily, as here, but because the speech is of the region of devils and of the sealing up of the devil in the deep. Just as I said of “the grave”—“the pit”—and “the place under the earth:” that, when the Scripture speaks of the giants, of the enemies of God’s people, of David’s enemies in God’s people, it signifies either the place or at least the state of the damned, which the Old Testament must needs acknowledge, acknowledging the happiness of God’s people: Psalm [Ps. ix. 18, Hebr.—17; Eng.Vera.] ix. 18; Proverbs v. 5, vii. 27, ix. 18. And so went Corah and his complices “quick into hell:” Num. xvi. 30, 33. So [Ps. lv. 23, Psalm lv. 24, lxiii. 10. The proper place of the damned Eng.Vera.] spirits seemeth to be properly called by St. Peter, “Tartara,” when he says, that God “delivered them to be kept for judgment—σειραῖς τοῦ ταρταρόωςας”—“in chains of darkness, being cast down into tartara” or “hell:” 2 Peter ii. 4. Now the state of death brings not Christian souls into hell, unless we suppose that the place of good souls under the Law; which supposition I have destroyed. Therefore the bringing of Christ from the deep is done by raising Him again.

§ 12. So, quoting David again, Ephes. iv. 8—10: “Therefore he saith” (Psalm lxviii. 18), “Going up on high He led captivity captive, and gave men gifts; now that He ascended, what is it but that He first descended into the lower parts of

* The passage is employed by Estius (ad loc.), who interprets it much as Thorndike himself, to establish the doctrine of Christ’s descent into hell. Certain expositors, such as Calvin (ad Rom. x. 6), who maintains that our Lord descended into hell in order to suffer, and Heylin (On the Creed, pp. 259, 260), who maintains His descent thither in order to triumph, interpret Ἀβιασ of hell.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

CHAP. XXVIII.

the earth? He that descended is the same that ascended far above all things, to fill" (or “fulfil”) all things.” The psalm speaks of the ark going up into the tabernacle or temple, figuring the going up of our Lord to the right hand of God; as Psalm xxiv. 6—10, xlvi. 5. The going up of the ark was God’s triumph over the idolatrous nations; whom He cast out of the land of promise, giving gifts to His people in it. The going up of our Lord Christ, St. Paul says, implies, “that He had come down before into the lower part of the earth;” either in respect of mount Sinai, upon which the psalm describes God with that attendance, which the ark and the cherubins thereof signify (His host of angels), in the words just afore; or we may well understand “the lower parts of the earth” to signify, by the figure of apposition, the earth that is below; as “flumen Rheni,” and “urbe Patavii,” signify “the river Rhine,” and “the city Padua.” For we have a peremptory instance in Ps. cxxxix. 15: where David saith, that he was “fashioned in the lower parts of the earth;” speaking of his mother’s womb, and therefore meaning the earth below.

§ 13. The ascension therefore of Christ, pretending to “fill” rather than “fulfil” all with His graces (of which he proceeds to speak), requires no descent into hell, which He pretends not to fill with His graces. If the resurrection and ascension of Christ satisfy these texts, so that they require no further descent than into the state of death; supposing what I said before of the souls of the fathers under the Old Testament: I must needs conclude, that, the Body of Christ being buried, His Soul went with the good thief’s soul into [Luke xvi. 22, xxiii. 43.] paradise,” or “the bosom of Abraham,” where the souls of the fathers were refreshed of their travels till the first and then the second coming of our Lord.

§ 14. Paradise, we know, was the place of man’s happiness, wherein he was created, whence having sinned he was shut out. In our Lord’s time, God’s people, it is plain, understood well enough the state of the righteous souls in the other world. You have seen it out of those books which phrase to signify either the Virgin’s womb, or the grave, or hell.

¢ So Bess, Zanchy, Cajetan, Cathe- rinus, and others, quoted in Poli Syn., ad loc.—Other interpretations make the
we call Apocrypha. Supposing the place unknown, as indeed it is, how could it be more properly signified than by the name of paradise: opening unto us the whole allegory, by which the happiness, which we seek to recover by the covenant of grace, was expressed to us by God; first in the land of promise, secondly in the Church, after in the heavens, after the redemption of our bodies. The true land of promise, to which the Gospel and the Church, secretly taught and built under the Law, introduceth us, because the Law cannot; is that paradise, to which Christ restoreth Adam, that was driven out of paradise. If you call the same Jerusalem, it will appear, why the place of the damned is called Gehenna; which was the place without Jerusalem, where those, that were sacrificed to the idols of Canaan, were consumed with horrible tortures of fire. The Scripture of the Old Testament yieldeth not the name, but the true interpretation of it. In the mean time, though our Lord by carrying the thief into paradise shew that it continues not shut, yet continues it no less secret, no better known, than it is known where Adam first dwelt.

§ 15. Is it strange, that “the bosom of Abraham” should signify the same? He is acknowledged “the father of the faithful” by Jews as well as Christians. His hospitality is renowned in the Scripture. The kingdom of God, which His people then expected, is proposed by our Lord in divers passages of the Gospel under the figure of an entertainment, as an expression then familiar to His people. It is no marvel that it should be called “Abraham’s bosom,” from whom the faith that purchaseth it hath so eminent a beginning; though the fathers before Abraham be there.

§ 16. One thing we must note. A vast gap we see between it and the flames where Dives was tormented. But where the partition is fixed, so little is determined by the words of the Scripture; that whether both within the earth, or one within the earth the other in the heavens, or whether both without this visible world (as of the place of the damned authors, that it (Hades) signifies the
is without," in the Gospel), no rule of faith determines. And, therefore, whether the Greek word ἑως,—which the parable useth Luke xvi. 23, when the rich man "lifts up his eyes in hell" and "sees Lazarus in Abraham's bosom,"—whether it comprehend "the bosom of Abraham" as well as the place of torments, no rule of faith determineth. For as it manifestly signifieth the place of the damned in the Scripture (which, it is manifest, God's people must needs distinguish by the Scripture, as the place, where they were sure by the Scripture that God would punish His and their enemies): so, comprehending also the place of righteous souls, not distinguished from the other to God's people by the ancient Scriptures, how should the signification of it be restrained here?

§ 17. For as the heathen, so Josephus also, manifestly [Similar use of the word in Josephus.] ii. 12*) the Sadducees "καθ' ἄδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμᾶς ἀναμφοτερον"—"take away the punishments and rewards of the world to come;" under the one name of ἄδου he comprises both estates, which the rest of God's people attributed then to good and bad. The Pharisees, he says (Antiq. xviii. 2*), "maintain...δικαιώσεις καὶ τιμᾶς"—"punishments and honours under the earth;" and that, as it followeth, "for ever:" which is as much as if he had said, "ἐν ἄδου;" because those things, which were thought to be "ἐν ἄδου," are called "ἡμερών"—"things under the earth." Again, of the Jews†; "Καὶ ταῖς μὲν ἀγαθαίς (ψυχαῖς), ἀμο-

---

* Corrected from MS.; "nor," in folio edition.
* c. i. § 2; ibid., p. 793: adding, that "ταίς μὲν" (scil. the bad souls) "εἰργάνων ἔδειξεν προστίθεναι, ταίς δὲ" (the good) "ρατίφυς τοῦ ἀναμφότερον." (De Bell. Jud., lib. ii. c. viii. § 11; ibid., p. 1064: speaking of the Esseni, not of the Jews in general.

---
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δοξούντες πασίν Ἑλληνοὺς, ἀποφαίνεται τὴν ὑπὲρ ὦκεανοῦ διαταν ἀποκειθαί, καὶ χῶρον οὐδὲ ὄμματος οὐδὲ νυφτοῖς οὐδὲ καύμας βαρυνόμενον, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐξ ὦκεανοῦ πρῶτο ἄει ἐξεφορο ἐπίπτειν ἀναρήξει: ταῖς δὲ φαύλαις ζοφόδης καὶ χειμέριον ἀφορίζουσα μυχῶν, γέμοντα τιμωρίων ἀδιαλείπτων"—“And agreeing with the Greeks they affirm, that good souls are assigned a seat beyond the ocean, in a place not grieved with rain or snow or heat, but always refreshed with a mild west wind blowing from the ocean; but the evil ones they assign a dark and stormy nook full of torments without ceasing.” And yet in another place he saith, they assign them “χῶρον ὄμμανοῦ τὸν ἀγνώτατον”—“the most holy place of the heavens.” So little ground is there for the distinct signification of ἄδης in the sense of those to whom our Lord spoke.

§ 18. It behoveth us, therefore, to acknowledge the victory of our Lord Christ, and His triumph over the devil and all the damned: which St. Paul, as in the text quoted out of the Epistle to the Ephesians he ascribeth to the ascension of our Lord, according to the psalm which he allegeth; so, Col. ii. 15, to the cross, when he saith, “Spoiling principalities and powers, He made open show of them, triumphing over them in it” (“by it,” or “upon it”); to wit, His cross, to which he had said just afore that He “nailed the handwriting which was against us.”

§ 19. This victory and triumph belongs to the rule of faith, and the belief of it to the substance of Christianity; because by virtue of it we have reconciliation with God, and the rest of that which the Gospel promiseth. But that it should be performed by the descent of Christ’s Soul into the place of the damned, being begun upon the cross and finished at the ascension; as the necessity of our redemption requireth not, so no rule of faith will oblige to believe.

§ 20. There is great appearance, that the devil did not understand the effect of it till our Lord rose again; as

"Misprinted in folio edition, "Ἰσο-
φόδης." "Josephus, ibid., lib. iii. c. vii. § 5; ibid., p. 1145.
"For the Vulgate reading, and that of several Latin fathers,—" "in Sema-

ipso,"—and the authorities for preferring ἐν ἀβῳ—i.e. in the cross,—see Pearson, On the Creed, art. v. vol. i. p. 414, and vol. ii. p. 348. notes k, l.
"See above, Bk. 11. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxiv. § 7."
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Ignatius saith, that he understood not the birth of the blessed virgin. Pilate's wife's dream is a sign; that, doubting of the consequence, he would have hindered that, which by Judas he did procure. He thought himself lord of mankind, because for sin they were condemned to death. That by the death of Christ this condemnation was to be voided, possibly he might not understand till Christ rose again. Though the souls of the fathers were delivered out of his power before the death of Christ, yet might he not understand, that by virtue of it. Our Lord saith, John xiv. 30, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me;" because he found nothing of his own, that is, of sin, in Christ. Though he had nothing to do with Christ in justice; seeing indeed he had means to swallow Him, and might not know, that the swallowing of Him would oblige him to render his interest in all that should escape with Him; is it a marvel that he swallowed Him, being "a murderer from the beginning?"

§ 21. Thus far I have owned the reason of our redemption, against Socinus*. Which if it be true, the victory of Christ was declared, that is, the triumph begun, at His rising again. And therefore it is no way prejudicial to the common faith, which I know some have imagined: that our Lord Christ, having been in "paradise" with the good thief, or in "the bosom of Abraham" with Lazarus, till Easter day morning, when He was to rise again, went from thence in His human Soul to the place of the damned, to declare to the devil, that by laying violent hands on Him, Who had not sinned, he had lost, not only the fathers, but all that should believe at the preaching of the Gospel. For herein the triumph of His victory upon the cross consisteth. But, the substance of this ceremony being so fully provided for by the death of His cross and by His rising again in virtue of it, that he, who believeth it not, should be thought to come short of believing all that which it is necessary to salvation to believe, seemeth to me utterly unreasonable. For, the parable representing unto us Dives and Lazarus [Luke xvi. 23—31.]

---

* Quoted ibid., note c. 7 See Bk. II. ibid., c. xxix. § 23. 8 See above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of and notes o—q. Gr., cc. xxvii., xxviii.
conferring together at that distance, what reason can there be, why this victory might not be declared at the same distance; or why the soul of Christ should move to do that, which might be done at that distance: least of all, why it should be necessary to salvation to believe that, which there is no reason why it should be necessary to be done. It is true, our Lord entered into possession of His conquest, when He raised the bodies of those saints, which upon His resurrection appeared in Jerusalem. For that was to say, that their bodies, as well as their souls, were from henceforth free from the dominion which sin gave death over mankind. But seeing their souls, as we have seen, were not to change their abode till the general resurrection; and seeing, therefore, that the Soul of Christ was not to go to take them from the verge of hell for the mark and exercise of His triumph: I do not see, why It should go into the nethermost hell, the place of the damned, to declare His victory and to exercise His triumph, and nothing else.

§ 22. Now, having proved, that the souls of the fathers were not removed from the verge of hell to heaven by the descent of Christ's Soul, at such time as the passage from the Law to the Gospel might seem to make such a change reasonable; I shall be very difficult to be persuaded, that any souls of Christians, who depart in the state of grace, are sent to the verge of hell by the name of purgatory, there to remain, till, having paid the debt of temporal punishment, reserved at the restoring of them to the state of grace, they are by the prayers of their friends here dismissed to heaven and happiness.

§ 23. Every man knows, that this opinion is chiefly built upon the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 12—15:—"If any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall shew it, for it is revealed with fire, and the fire shall try what every man's work is: if any man's
work remain, which he hath built upon” (this “foundation” of Christ), “he shall receive the reward; if a man’s work be burnt up, he shall suffer loss, yet himself shall be saved, but so as through fire.” But who shall consider these words without prejudice, seeing he finds them very difficult, shall find it impossible to build an article of faith upon them; and, finding the issue of them to be at the general day of judgment, shall find that removing of souls out of purgatory (upon which all the consequence thereof depends) utterly inconsistent with the same. For “the day,” whereof St. Paul here speaks, can be no other than the day of judgment; because, had it been any day of inferior note, it must have been described by some further mark, which that day needs not. I know two opinions, that will not have that day to signify the day of judgment. St. Augustin⁵ thinks, that it may signify any day of trial: for “the fire” is the means of that trial; and, tribulation being that trial, “the day” will be the day of tribulation. Grotius⁶ thinks “the day” to be the judgment of the Church here, whereby that which men build upon the “foundation” of Christ shall be tried: whether it be “gold, silver, precious stones,” according to “the foundation;” or “wood, hay, stubble,” no way suitable to it. For that which agrees not with “the foundation,” there is no reason why it may not be lost, and yet he that laid it upon “the foundation” be saved; though not by that “fire,” yet “through” that “fire” that “tries.” What pretence is here left for the purging of souls by that fire, whereby they are “tried?” If the trial be at the general judgment; to bring souls out of purgatory then, what thanks can it deserve? And of the general judgment St. Paul must needs speak, because there is no other trial that is certain. Affliction may try, and the Church may try; but it may also not try. St. Paul speaks of a trial that must be, not


⁶ “Hodie, id est, longum tempus.” Grot., Ad 1 Cor. iii. 18: adding, upon vv. 14, 15, as an explanation of ‘Et nos tu quoque misericordiam omnibus deinceps’ et al., “Si quis doctor præcepta specialia dederit, quæ conveniunt cum generalibus Christi præceptis, in honorem apud Ecclesias omnes consequeatur;” but, in the opposite case, “dejicietur omnium judicio de doctòris munere, aut etiam communi nione privabitur.”
that may be. I confess this is avoided by saying, that St. Paul here prophesies of a judgment of God to come upon those who adulterated the Gospel at Corinth, of whom he speaks; for that judgment, which St. Paul foretelleth, must certainly come to pass. But St. Paul, when he saith "the day shall shew it," speaketh not of a day, which hereby he declareth that it shall come: but of a day, which otherwise they acknowledge was to come; namely, by our common Christianity, whereof the day of judgment is a part. And whatsoever judgment St. Paul foretelleth to come upon them, seeing the judgments of this world do not use to "make every man's work manifest:" neither can it be said, that he whose work remains, shall receive his reward, he whose work is burnt up, though he suffer loss, shall escape as through fire; speaking of such a trial as by the ordinary course of providence manifests not all men's works, but some. Besides, when St. Paul saith the day is revealed, he speaks of a day, which in the mean time is concealed when it shall be, though already revealed that it shall be. And what day is that but the day of judgment? Or what fire did they expect that day to be revealed with, but that fire which our Lord shall come to judgment with? Now the fire of God's vengeance, which the last day shall come with, why should it not try as well as punish? This is indeed, in my understanding, all that possibly can remain questionable in the sense of these words; the rest seems clear beyond dispute. The fire of the last day is a bodily fire, which shall burn up the world, or purify it, to that constitution which shall remain for the future. But what is that to the trying of their works? St. Paul's words require it not. The "day tries," the "fire" consumes the works, and so leaves the men purged by suffering that loss: so, men's works being tried by that great day, if the fire of it cleanse their bodies by sensible torments (for that which we speak of, comes to pass after the restoring of bodies), then it is plain how the man

---

4 So Grotius' interpretation mentioned above, for which see note c. —Calvin (ad 1 Cor. iii. 13) interprets "Dies manifestabit," &c., to mean,— "Ais (apostolus) dicere, Non semper erunt tenebrae, aliquando lux orietur quae omnia manifestabit;" and this, as his interpretation goes on to imply, in the present world, as well as at the last day.

* Corrected from MSS.; "those," in folio edition.


319 escapes “through fire,” whose works are consumed by the fire, which punishes the man by whom they are done. If this fire cannot be properly understood to try what every man’s work is, it will be nothing improper to understand the judgment of God to be the fire which examines men’s works: by which examination they, which have built hay and stubble upon the foundation of Christ, shall lose what they have built; and yet themselves escape through that fire of conflagration, which shall involve those that hold not the foundation, with their works.

§ 24. The other text of St. Paul is more obscure than this; and yet, being brought to prove this purpose, cannot here be balked. 1 Cor. xv. 29: “What shall become of those that are baptized for the dead? . . . why are they then baptized for the dead?”

§ 25. The commentaries upon St. Paul’s Epistles, that go under St. Ambrose’s name, tell us plainly, that there were some then, who, “if a man were prevented of baptism by death, baptized another for him, for fear he should either not rise at all or not well:” and this, he saith, St. Paul hereby alloweth not; only argueth, that this supposeth the resurrection. And truly I shewed you before, that, according to Epiphanius, the Cerinthians did indeed at that time baptize another for any that was dead in that case, having embraced Christianity but dying before he was come to be baptized. Of the Marcionites, St. Chrysostom upon the place, and Tertullian, De Resurrectione Mortuorum xxxviii.

---

1 Quoted and argued upon at length by Bellarum, De Purg., lib. i. c. 4; Contro. tom. i. pp. 1800. C—1804. D.


3 Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xii. § 9.

4 “Sic autem et baptismantur quidam
BOOK III. and Contra Marc. v. 10\textsuperscript{a}, do witness the same. Whereupon it need not be said, that the Marcionites were not in St. Paul’s time\textsuperscript{b}: because they derived their customs from the Gnostics, that were. Nor can I allow St. Chrysostom\textsuperscript{c}, that “βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν” can signify here “ἐπὶ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν”—“upon condition of rising again from the dead;” as being baptized upon condition of that which the Gospel promiseth. I grant, “ὑπὲρ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν” may signify “ἐπὶ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν.” But that “ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν” should signify “ἐπὶ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν,” no example justifieth. Nor does St. Chrysostom cure it by expounding “ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν” to signify “ὑπὲρ τῶν σωμάτων.” For if Christians may be said to be baptized “ὑπὲρ τῶν σωμάτων,” as for the recovering of their bodies from death; they cannot therefore be said to be baptized “ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν,” because their bodies are alive. And divers copies, in the second place, instead of “ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν” read “ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν;” or “ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τῶν νεκρῶν;” as you may see in the readings of the great Bible. And “αὐτῶν” will not serve to signify “ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν;” but requires the sense, which the Syriac renders, Ṣди ḫῆʾ—“instead of the dead.”


* The catechumen, says S. Chrysostom, at baptism is bid to say, among the other articles of the Creed, “καὶ τί πιστεύεις εἰς νεκρῶν ἀναστασιν, καὶ ἐὰν τῇ πιστεῖ τοῦτο τὸν Βαπτιστήμαθα. Ὑπὸ τοῦτον ἀναμμένους ὁ Παῦλος ἔγραψεν, Ἐλ μὴ ἔστω ἀναστασις, τι καὶ Βαπτιστής ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν;” S. Chrys., as quoted above in note k, p. 379. B.

* “Εἰ μὴ ἔστω ἀναστασις, τι καὶ Βαπτιστὴς ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; τοπέλει τῶν σωμάτων καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν τοιοῦτος Βαπτιστής, τοῦ νεκρού σώματος ἀναστάσεως νυσίν, δει σκεπάζει μνήμη νεκρῶν.” Id., ibid., B, C.


them not, that this was not well done. For he writes to
God's people indeed, but upon that which was done by those
who seduced God's people; and, therefore, need not stand
to condemn that from whence he argues, condemning all
along those who pretended to seduce God's people. This is
the supposition upon which I must argue. False Christians
baptized others for those, who, intending to be Christians,
were prevented with death before they could be baptized.
That this [must be*] done in regard to the resurrection, you
need not believe the supposed St. Ambrose; it would not
serve St. Paul to prove the resurrection from that which they
did, otherwise. That the benefit which they might [pretend
to*] find at the resurrection by being baptized must be ex-
pected to come by the prayers of the Church, which always
prayed for Christians, never for those that were not baptized;
is that which is demanded of them, who will never give any
other pertinent reason, why others should be baptized for
those who were dead without baptism.

§ 27. When it was found, that Judas Maccabeus his[Of the sin-
soldiers, that were slain in the battle, had committed sacri-
lege in turning to their own use things consecrated to the
idols: we read, that they "betook themselves to prayer, and
besought" God, "that the sin committed might wholly be
put out of remembrance;" and that Judas "made a gather-
ing throughout the company to the sum of two thousand
drachms of silver, and sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-
offering: doing therein very well and honestly, in that he
was mindful of the resurrection; for if he had not hoped that
they were slain should rise again, it had been superfluous
and vain to pray for the dead; and also, in that he perceived
that there was great favour laid up for those that died godly,
it was a holy and good thought: whereupon he made [a]
reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered
from sin." This we read 2 Maccab. xii. 42—45. The con-
sequence whereof may stand upon two presumptions. He
that taketh it not for historical truth, preferreth his own
empty fancy before all times and persons that have admitted

* Corrected from MS.; "was," in
folio edition.

' Added from MS.
it. He that would have it pass for God's word, must shew the writer to have been inspired by God; of which there remains no tradition in the Church. What should hinder the fact to be true? Doth not the Law, which provideth no sacrifice for sins unreconcilable by the Law, provide sacrifices for sacrilege? Refer but the particular of the case to the determination of God's people, and the elders, which obliged it in every age; what is there in the relation that agrees not with the Law? Did our Lord Christ or His apostles, by word or writing, ever blame any such practice? Thus far there is nothing to render it either suspect for truth; or, if true, contrary to the Law.

§ 28. What have we in the New Testament for it or against it? St. Paul, 2 Tim. i. 16—18: "God grant mercy to the house of Onesiphorus; for he refreshed me many times, and was not ashamed of my chain; but being in Rome, carefully sought and found me: the Lord grant him to find mercy of the Lord in that day: for how many things he furnished me with at Ephesus, thou better knowest." Shall I say, that Onesiphorus was alive at Rome, when St. Paul writ this; and that therefore he prayeth for his household apart, and himself apart? Let impartial reason judge, whether St. Paul would have prayed for him that was with him at Rome alive, as one, who, coming to Rome and not ashamed of his bonds, found him out and refreshed him? Or whether he prays for him being dead, that he may "find mercy in that day;" for his family, only that they may find "mercy." But, fall that how it may, he prays for that, which could not befall him till the day of judgment; and therefore may be prayed for, on behalf of those who are not come to the day of judgment, though dead.

§ 29. And therefore all those scriptures, which make the

---

* Reynolds (Censa. Libb. Apocryph., Prelect. clvii., sq.; tom. ii. pp. 474, sq.) argues at length, that it is "false," to assert, "Judam Macchabæum sacrificasse pro mortuis," or "hoc sacrificium oblatum esse pro peccatis mortuorum, et in eum finem missa Jerusalymen 12000 drachmarum," &c.: maintaining (besides an alleged false reading in the text) that, after all, the whole story is, as we have it, not the act of Judas himself, but the interpretation put upon it by Jason.
* So of course Bellarmine, De Purgatorio, lib. i. c. 3; Controv. tom. i. pp. 1779, sq.
* See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxvii. § 6.
* So Hammond, ad loc.
* So Grotius, ad loc.
reward of the world to come to depend upon the trial of the day of judgment, do prove, that we are to pray for the issue of it in behalf of all, so long as it is coming. Besides Ephes. iv. 30, 1 John iii. 2, Luke xxi. 28, and 2 Thess. i. 6—9; quoted afore. St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 8: "Who shall also confirm you unto the end, that you may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts iii. 19: "Repent ye and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Phil. ii. 16: "That I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain, nor laboured in vain." 1 Thess. ii. 19: "For what is our hope or joy or crown of rejoicing? are not even ye, in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, at His coming?" 1 Pet. i. 5: "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed at the last time." 1 Cor. v. 5: "That the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." 2 Tim. iv. 8: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day." Luke xiv. 14: "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." For all which there were no reason to be given, but the mention of the day of judgment would be everywhere utterly impertinent, if the reward were declared at the hour of death, and that judgment which then passeth. For how can that be expected, which is already enjoyed?

§ 30. You have seen the souls of the martyrs (that appear to St. John before God's throne, where none but martyrs appear, as I have argued) bidden to expect the consummation of their company, before the vengeance of God be exercised upon their persecutors: Apoc. vi. 9—11, vii. 14, &c. After this vengeance is exercised, and they had reigned a thousand years with Christ, and the devil was loosed again and had brought Gog and Magog to fight against God's Church, and they had been destroyed, and the general judgment represented, Apoc. xx. : the Spirit returneth to shew St. John the New Jerusalem, containing those that see God's face and have His Name upon their foreheads, Apoc.

[Even the souls that appear before God's throne, pray for the second coming of Christ.]
BOOK III.

xxi. xxii. 1—5: who "have no need of the sun because God is their light, and shall reign for everlasting." For after all this, again; "The Spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him that thirsteth come, and let who will come, and take of the water of life for nothing: . . . and he that testifieth these things saith, Indeed I come quickly; Amen; even so, come Lord Jesus." What demandeth all this? That which seemeth not to be refused, admitting the consequence of the visions:—that those souls, who appear before God's throne, pray for the second coming of Christ, and the consummation of all things. The renewing of their prayer, Apoc. vi., after the representation of the general judgment, Apoc. xx., enforceth it. The saints therefore in heaven still desiring the second coming of Christ, is it marvel, if there remain something to be prayed for on behalf of inferior ranks; having shewed\textsuperscript{d}, that those who were sealed and saved in Jewry are not described to appear in heaven before God's throne? Whether we admit all that die in the state of grace to "be with Christ," as well as St. Paul, and that in paradise, taken for the third heavens; or reserve, as well we may reserve, so much privilege to an apostle and a martyr (according to that which I have shewed\textsuperscript{e} you out of the Apocalypse), as not to equal with him all that die in the state of grace: certain we are, the estate of those that die in God's grace admits a solicitous expectation of the day of judgment, though assured of the issue of it. That is it, which so many texts of Scripture, alleged afore, signify nothing if they signify it not.

§ 31. What is it then, that reason grounded upon the Scriptures requires? Certainly, did our justification consist in the immediate imputation of Christ's righteousness, revealed by that faith which therefore testifieth, no man could die in the state of grace, but he must be as pure as the blessed virgin\textsuperscript{f}; and he, that can digest such excessive assertions, may think [it] strange, that any difference should be made among them that die in grace. But I must and do suppose that which I have proved\textsuperscript{g};—that the performance of

\textsuperscript{d} Above, c. xxviii. § 7.
\textsuperscript{e} Above, c. xxvii. § 14—17.
\textsuperscript{f} Ibid., cc. xxx. § 6; xxxi. § 2: and other passages there cited.
\textsuperscript{g} See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc.
that common Christianity, the undertaking whereof justify
of several Christians, as must needs be found between the highest
the second death: and therefore infer, that the difference of
their estates between death and the general judgment, must
needs be answerable; though from their death they know
to whether lot they be deputed, as for their particular judg-
ment. And this will necessarily follow, supposing this world
to be the race and the next the goal, according to the tenor
of the covenant of grace, which hath been declared. For
supposing, that he who keepeth account of his steps, and
watcheth over his ways, may be ready for God’s call, and
appear before Him without sin, having washed it away by
the Blood of Christ infused in the tears of final repentance;
must we not of necessity suppose, that they who do not so
(who are evidently the far greater part of Christians), depart-
ing with the guilt and stain of such sin upon them, must
needs appear with it before God, notwithstanding the cove-
nant of grace? Again, the love of this world and of ourselves,
from whence such sin proceedeth, and would have proceeded,
should men proceed to live, suppose it be such as drives not
God’s Spirit away, because incident to that human frailty
which the covenant of grace presupposeth; how shall it be
washed out of that soul after death by virtue of the covenant
of grace, which hath failed of the covenant of grace in not
washing it away being alive? It is therefore necessarily
consequent upon the premisses, that Christian souls, which
escape the second death, because the love of God was alive
in them to strive against sin though not to clear them of it,
continue in that estate wherein they departed till the general
judgment; as for the love of God or of the world, so for the
joy or remorse which they have in themselves for it: that
the purity of this joy, or the mixture of it with remorse, be
not merely the punishment of sin committed, but the effect
and consequence of the estate in which it departeth, though
the sin which it committed in the body be the means to con-
stitute this estate: that the departure thereof bring it that

b Corrected from MS.; "it to that," in folio edition.
anxiety concerning the everlasting judgment, which is proportional to the love of the creature which it departeth with: that, being reposed in an estate and place of refreshment (which those "secret receptacles" and "chambers" of Esdras seem to signify), it remain subject, as well to those clouds of sorrow and remorse, which the sense of sin done, and the love of God which hath not conquered the love of the creature, produceth, as to that light and refreshment, which the Spirit of God may create: that the end of all this may be the trial of the day of judgment, purging away all the dregs and dross of sin and of the love of this world, which may remain in souls that depart or are found then alive in the state of grace, by the fierceness and sharpness of that grief, which the trial of the general judgment shall cause.

§ 32. It may be thought, that "the fire" wherewith "the day" of the Lord "is revealed," seizing their bodies which they shall have resumed, by the pain which it breedeth, purgeth away the love of the creature. And it may be thought, that the examination of the conscience, the conviction of sin, the remorse and shame of so many disloyalties, the fear of the Judge, and in fine the strictness of the judgment, is "the fire," which St. Paul says "shall try every man's work" (as the fire which burns up the world shall their bodies), and sever the dregs and dross of them to the devil and his angels, from whom they came, with the dregs and dross of the world, which divines say shall be conveyed to hell as the sink of it.

§ 33. But hereupon the apostle, when he says, "Ye are come to the spirits of just men made perfect" (Hebrews xii. [22,] 23), may be understood, that they are thus perfected; supposing him to speak of the general judgment to come to pass then straight, as the destruction of Jerusalem did: and that therefore he saith, "Ye are come." But he may be also understood to say, that they are perfected by Christianity, in comparison of Judaism: as our Lord saith, "Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect;" and as He saith, that "the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater

---

1 See above, § 23. 

2 See above, c. xxvii. § 18.
than" John the Baptist. Whereas, if we understand him to say, "Ye are come to the spirits of just men perfected" between the departure and the day of judgment, we make him to say that, which is nowhere else either said or intimated by the Scripture.

§ 34. And that is it, which distinguisheth my opinion from the position of purgatory: or, rather, the doctrine of the Scriptures from the decree of the Councils of Florence and Trent. For will the present Church of Rome be content with such an estate of souls as no man can be helped out of? What were purgatory worth, if men were persuaded, that there is no means to translate their souls out of the flames thereof into heaven before the general judgment? Or what were Christianity the worse, if all were persuaded, that those souls, which we speak of all this while, need their friends' prayers to help them through this middle estate, and especially through the dreadful trial of the day of judgment? Surely thus much the worse; that men must of necessity keep a better account of their steps here, and take a better care to clear themselves of the sins which they commit, that they may pass it with the more joy and cheerfulness. Well may they part with the dross and stubble of the immediate

1 The Definitio Concilii Florentini, A.D. 1438—9, (ap. Lobb, Conc., tom. xiii. p. 515. B—D) lays down, that "Eo de aliquo mortuorum animis viveret, si tenebatur, tunc anima mortuorum aeternitatem in mundum aeternitatis traheret. Assumpsit de eis, et passim hoc quidem appellatum est, in eis etiam quod in animos peccatorum accidat, sicut in innumerabilibus christiani scriptorum et theologorum locis."

imputation of Christ's merits and sufferings (which they have built upon the foundation of the remission of sins and everlasting life in consideration of the same but upon condition of Christianity) upon these terms here, rather than part with it at their charge then, if perhaps they have not failed of the foundation by the means of it.

§ 35. And upon these terms I am not troubled at the words of our Lord, Matt. xii. 32: "Who shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be remitted him; but who shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall never be remitted him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." For, as for mine own part, I find the force of the words well enough satisfied, taking it only for a fashion of speech; signifying only, that that sin could by no means be pardoned, no not in the world to come: not supposing, that the world to come hath means to pardon so great sins, as this world hath no means to do. I confess, according to my opinion, there is in some sort pardon for sins in the other world, though absolutely there is not; because there is none but in virtue of the covenant of grace, the terms whereof only take place in this world though the effect thereof extend to the world to come. For after departure in the state of grace, for a man to know, that there is no more danger of failing of everlasting life, is absolutely that, which the greatest saints of this world could never attain to: though some effects of sin stick to those that are so assured between death and the day of judgment; in respect to which he, who is absolutely said to be pardoned, because in no danger of forfeiting it, may be said so far not to be pardoned, as the continuance of those effects imports. But there is nothing

---

* This is the first text quoted from the New Testament for purgatory by Bellarmine, De Purg., lib. i. c. 4; Con- trov., tom. i. pp. 1785. D. sq.
* Bellarmine on the text (as above quoted, pp. 1785. D, 1786. A) interprets it by saying, that "hinc colligunt sancti Patres quodam peccata remitti in futuro saeculo per orationes et sufragia Ecclesiae."—Grotius (ad loc.), after interpreting as below in note q, adds, that "videtur tamen Christus de industria utrumque seculum nominasse, ut Judæis auferret eam qua sibi blandiebantur adversus gravissima dicta persuasione; existimabantur enim peccata commissa ab his, qui in Judæis professione perseverarent, remitti aut per meram penitentiam, aut in die solenni Reconciliationis, aut per hujus vitæ castigationes, aut saltem post mortem, sive statim sive post temporis alicujus moras;" but that "de Ecclesiæ Christianæ judicio hic agile plane persuadere mihi non possum; ita enim locutum credo Dominum nostrum quomodo loquentem Se scienbat optime a Judæis intelligi."
in my opinion to signify, that there is means of obtaining pardon for those sins in the next world, which there is no means to obtain pardon for in this; which this saying of our Lord at the foot of the letter signifies. And therefore I, for my part, can very well rest satisfied with this sense; taking the enlarging of it by mentioning the world to come, for an elegance, which common speech beareth, and that of our Lord frequenteth. But if any man think I respect not the fathers, that have expounded it to the sense, which I refuse not, the rule of faith being safe; let every man enjoy his opinion in it. Of the figure λατόνης, which Grotius9 observes in the words, “in the world to come;” whereby, “It shall not be forgiven him in the world to come,” signifies, He shall be soundly punished for it in the world to come: let them, who are capable, see him discourse learnedly in his annotations upon this place.

§ 36. As little am I troubled 7 at that other text of the Gospel, Matt. v. 26, Luke xii. 59: “Thou shalt not come forth till thou hast paid the utmost farthing.” For I can easily grant, that the taking away of those effects of sin, which remain in those that die in grace, according to my opinion, may be said to [be meant] by “paying the utmost farthing.” But I need not grant, that he, who says, “Thou shalt not come forth till thou hast paid the utmost farthing,” says, Thou mayest come forth by “paying the utmost farthing.” For the condition of “paying the utmost farthing” will be unpossible, if we understand the prison to be the

---


9 “Simplex est Chrysostomi expositionis καὶ λατόνη (per extenuationem), ‘Punietur graviter et in hoc et in futuro saeculo: cui firmandum facit quod sic loqui solebant Judaei. Nam in Minaoath, &c. Grot., ad loc.: proceeding to cite also to the same purpose, 2 Maccab. vi. 26, and Maimonides “in Regulis Punitentiae, capite vi.” Cited for purgatory by Bellarmine, as above, pp. 1804. D, sq.

lake of the damned; which "the executioner" mentioned afore requires. In St. Luke, for a preface to the parable, "Why do ye not judge what is right from your souls?" saith our Lord; that is, why do ye not judge what is right to do in the matter of My Gospel, by that which you use to do in worldly matters. If you are liable to an action, you find it best to compound it, before the judge give sentence and grant execution upon it: for then you must stand to the extremity of the law. The preaching of the Gospel shews, that the law of God hath an action against you, which you may take up by becoming Christians; and yet you will not do it. In St. Matthew it follows upon the precept of "being reconciled to" a man's "brother," which shews, that God accepts not that sacrifice which is not offered in charity. But it cannot signify less than in St. Luke;—that our Lord upon that occasion puts all in mind to be reconciled to God, because there is no redemption if He grant execution against us. This execution, then, is either upon refusing the terms of reconcilement, or upon failing of that which we undertake by accepting them; that is, not upon those failures which may consist with reconcilement, as those who would have these words to signify purgatory imagine, but which destroy it. And therefore the limitation, "Till thou hast paid the utmost farthing," signifies as Matt. i. 25, "He knew her not, till she had brought forth her first-born Son;" though he never knew her: that is to say, his "utmost farthing" shall never be paid. My opinion would allow me to accept of Tertullian's¹ and St. Cyprian's² sense of this text; who do indeed acknowledge the voiding of those effects of sin, which may remain upon those that depart in the state of grace, between death and the day of judgment, to be the paying of this "utmost farthing." But 324 I have shewed you, why it agrees not with the intent of the


² "Aliud est ad veniam stare, aliud ad gloriari pervenire; aliud misurum in carcerem non exire inde donec solvat novissimum quadratum, aliud statim fidei et virtutis accepere mercedem; aliud pro peccatis longo dolore cruciato emundari, et purgari die igni; aliud peccata omnium passione purgasse; aliud denique pendere in die iudicii ad sententiam Domini, aliud statim a Domino coronari." S. Cyp., Epist. IV., Ad Antonianum; Epist., pp. 109, 110: quoted, except the last clause, by Bellarmine, ibid., B. C.
words. And if it did, it were nothing to purgatory; because Tertullian expresseth it to be paid "mora resurrectionis"—"by the delay of the resurrection," that is, not before the general judgment: whereby purgatory is quite spoiled; for, pretending the expiation of venial sin (which consisteth with reconcilement) together with satisfying the debt of temporal punishment, reserved by God upon that sin which He remitteth, it cannot be intended by him, that gives warning of seeking reconcilement, not of voiding the penalties which may remain when it is obtained. Where you may see by surveying the scriptures which have been debated, that there is not the least pretence in them for paying this debt by enduring the flames of purgatory, for that sin which is forgiven afore; but that all satisfaction endeth in voiding the guilt of sin by appeasing the wrath of God for it before we go hence.

§ 37. There be other texts, both of the Old and New Testament, that are usually alleged in this dispute. But because rather for show than substance; I will rather presume, that all reasonable men may see where the consequence fails, than use so many words as it requires to shew it. "He shall sit as a refiner that purifieth silver, and shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness;" saith the prophet Malachi, iii. 3: but manifestly speaking of the first coming of Christ, and trial which the gospel passes them through, that turn Christians upon mature advice. Whosoever trial the second coming of Christ may bring with it, correspondent to the first: it will be nothing to purgatory, the day of judgment determining it. "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth the prisoners out of the pit wherein was no water:" saith the prophet Zachary, ix. 11; speaking of the return from the captivity of Babylon, and of the prince of Israel that should figure out our Lord Christ, and "rule from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth." Whereby it appeareth, that the spiritual sense of this prophecy, ending in

[Other texts answered.]

* As quoted above in note t.

Bellarmine, De Purg., lib. i. c. 3. Controv. tom. i. p. 1785. B, C., quotes both the texts referred to above in § 37, viz., those from Zechariah and Malachi, as proving purgatory.
the redemption of mankind by the death of Christ, and [the establishment of] His kingdom by the preaching of His gospel, can by no means be extended to any delivering out of purgatory; and if it could, must not be intended to take place before the second coming. Which intent would also appear groundless in this;—because I have shewed, that He did not deliver the souls of the fathers out of the devil’s hands at His first coming; which this text is alleged to prove no less than purgatory. For this will confine it to the delivery of mankind from sin by the death of our Lord Christ and His sufferings.

CHAPTER XXIX.


Let us now consider the tradition of the Church in these particulars. Justin the Martyr, in his dispute with Trypho the Jew, by example of Samuel proveth, that the souls of the fathers and prophets were in the hands of the powers

684 OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

BOOK III.

Ancient opinions in the Church of the place of souls before the day of judgment.

"Et si enim hunc locum (Zach. ix.) adducunt passim pro liberatione Patrum ex limbo, tamen melius convenit libera- tionem animarum ex purgatorio.” Bellarm., ibid.: who had himself quoted the text for the former purpose, De Christi Anima, lib. iv. c. 11. ibid. p. 537. A.

*a* Misprinted XXVIII., in folio edit. b "Ka ή δι’ αντίθεσις αλ ψυχαί, ἀνε- δείχθαι ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ καὶ τῆς Χριστιάνης ψυχῆς κληθήσεται ὡς θ' ἐγκυμοσύνη, ἡς ἰδίως ἐκ Χριστοῦ. Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ δι’ αὐτᾶς αὐτοῦ δικαιῶν καὶ προφητῶν ὡς ἐξουσίας ἔχοντο τῶν τοι-
of darkness; and that by the prayer of our Lord, Psalm xxii. 21, we are taught to pray at our departure, that God would not give us up to them: as He at His death commends His soul into His Father's hands. It is well enough known, that Clemens Alexandrinus believes, that both our Lord and His apostles went into hell to deliver from thence such souls, as should admit that which He came to preach. He followed in it the apocryphal vision of Hermes, then in request; where this is still found libro iii. similitud. iii. And what followers he hath in this opinion, you may see by the late lord priimate his Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, p. 274. St. Augustin, De Haer., cap. lxxix. after Philaetius, De Haer., lxxiv., counts this opinion in the list of heresies: yet doubted not, that He did deliver them

Chap. XXIX.

"Save Me from the lion's mouth: for Thou hast heard Me from the horns of the unicorns;" which the context refers to our Lord.

"If a man have killed a sinless man, let him deliver him to the lion's mouth; for he hath committed a sin similar to that of the men of Nineveh." - S. Clem. Alex., Strom., lib. vi. c. 6; Op. tom. ii. p. 763. "Hæc hodie cum tum tota natione, nam etiam in conspectu Domino, deest et hominum et divinitatis." - Id., ibid., p. 764. "Oh, that he would deliver us from our enemies and from them that persecute us, that he would deliver us from our oppressors, for they persecute us cruelly." - Id., ibid., p. 765.


Scil. of the original edition of 1625: Works, vol. iii. pp. 304, sq. ed. Elrington. The quotations in the previous notes, with a very large portion of those which follow, are taken by Thornike from Ussher.


§ 2. That this opinion had great vogue in the Church and must be counted in the number of ecclesiastical positions, cannot be denied. That it is or ever was held as of the rule of faith, it must [be denied]. Marcion was the first, that placed the fathers' souls in hell, that he might assign heaven for the part of his Christ and his God; as we learn by Tertullian, iv. 34⁴: to wit, to entertain his disciples. For this engageth Tertullian to oppose "the gulf," and the rich man's "lifting up his eyes" in hell, for arguments, that "Abraham's bosom" is no part of it; but higher than hell, though not in heaven, to refresh all believers (Abraham's children) till the resurrection: for he allows paradise only

---


2 "Et Christi quidem animam venisse usque ad ea loca, in quibus pecatores cruciantur, ut eos solveret a tormentis, quos esse solvendos occulta nobis Sua justitia judicabit, non inmerito creditor." Id., De Genae ad litteram, lib. xii. c. 33. § 63; Op. tom. iii. P. l. pp. 320. G, 321. A.-"Nec ipsam tamen rerum partem noster Salvator mortuus pro nobis visitare contemnisset, ut inde solveret quos esse solvendos secundum Divinam secretamque justiam ignorare non potuit." Id., ibid., c. 34. § 66; ibid., p. 322. B.


4 "Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Qui ad fornicem descendit inferni; in quo clausae et pecatorum et justorum animae tenebantur; ut absque exsuntione et noxa Sui, eos qui tenebantur inclusi, mortis vinculis liberaret." Id., In Daniel. lib. i. c. iii.; Op. tom. iii. p. 1086.

5 "Invocavit ergo Redemptor noster nomen Domini ex laeu novissimo, cum in virtute Divinitatis descendit ad inferos, et destructis claustros Tartari, Suos quos ibi reperit eruen, victor ad superos ascendit." Id., In Lament. Jerem., lib. ii. in cap. iii.; ibid., tom. v. p. 829. It is not a work of S. Jerome's according to the Benedictine editors.

6 See proof of this in Usacher's Answer, so often quoted.

7 Added from MS.

8 "Sed Marcion aliorum cogit, scilicet utramque mercedem Creatoris, sive tormenti sive refrigeri apud inferos, determinat eis positam qui Legi et prophetia obedirint; Christi vero et Dei sui coelestem definit sinum et portum." Tertull., Cont. Marcion., lib. iv. c. 34; Op. p. 450. D.

9 "Respondebimus, et habeam scriptura revincente oculos ejus, quae ab inferis discernit Abraham sinum pauperi:
to martyrs, which he maketh also the place "under the altar," where St. John saw only martyrs' souls (though elsewhere, Apolog. cap. xlvii.; and in his poem De Judicio cap. viii.), he assigneth it to entertain the saints' souls, without any difference), alleging a revelation to Perpetua, a Montanist virgin, to that purpose, De Resurr., xliii.; and therefore, De Anima, lv.; makes that, which he made before


* See above, c. xxvii. § 9—17.


۸ Speaking of those who arose from the grave at the resurrection of Christ:——

"Illos non tumulos certum est repetisse silentes,
Amplius aut terrae retineri viscera clausos;
Reliqua sed recusat nunc turba cubilibus imis;
Ille dies donec, completo tempore, magnus
Adveniat."


In another poem against Marcion, the other view is maintained:——

"Federis hinc etiam novi inennarrabilis auctor,
Discipulis Ioannes animas pro nomine passas
Testatur tali sese vidiisse sub arca,
Clamantes Dei vindictam pro cæde potenti;
Istic interdum requies sub corpore terræ
In parte ignota quidam locos extat apertus,
Luce sua fretus; Abraham sinus iste vocatur,
Altior a tenebris, longe sometos ab igne,
Sub terra tamen. . . . . . . . .

. . . . .

Tempore divisa et spatio et ratione ligata
Una domus, quamvis velo partita videtur.
Atque adeo passo Domino velamine rupto,
Celestes patuere plagae, caelataque sancta:
Atque duplex quondam, facta est domus una perennis."
higher than hell but not in heaven, a part of hell, where our
Lord visited the fathers' souls; to wit, the upper part of it,
being all contained within the entrails of the earth. To the
same purpose Irenæus, v. 31, saith, "It is manifest, that the
souls of Christians go into an invisible place" (the English
of ἀδηνάσις) "assigned them by God, to attend the resurrec-
tion in it;" because our Lord, being to undergo the lot of
mortals, stayed till the third day in the lower parts of the
earth, where the souls of the dead were. And though he
allege for this an apocryphal passage, which he takes to be
Esay's, iii. 23, but Jeremy's, iv. 39; yet says it no more
but that "the Lord God of Israel remembered His dead,
asleep in the delve of the earth, and went down to them
to bring them the news of His saving health:" of which
preaching otherwise Irenæus and Tertullian say nothing.

§ 3. Here then, to shew that there is no tradition in the
Church for limbus patrum, you have, in the opinion of
Irenæus and Tertullian, a state of content and joy for all 326
righteous souls till the resurrection, though within the earth
for the place; where our Saviour was with them during His
death.

§ 4. But it is still more particularly described in a frag-
ment of a very ancient Christian, who is called Josephus,
but is thought to be Caius, that writ against the Montanists
in Tertullian's time. The book is mentioned by Photius,

qui satis superbe non putant animas
fideilium inferis dignas; servi super
Dominum, et discipuli super magis-
trum, aspermati forte in Abraham sinu
expectandae resurrectionis solatium ca-
304. A.

2 "Cum enim Dominus 'in medio
umbrae mortis abierit,' ubi animae mor-
tuarum erant, post deinde corporaliter
resurrxit, et post resurrectionem as-
sumptus est; manifestum est quia et
discipulorum Euius, propter quos et hec
operatus est Dominus, animae abunt in
invisibilityem locum, desinuit eis a
Deo, et ibi usque ad resurrectionem
commorabantur, sustinentes resurrection-
em: post recipientes corpora, et
perfecte resurgentes, hoc est, corpora-
liter, quemadmodum et Dominus re-
surrxit, sic venient ad conspectum
c. 31. pp. 451. b, 452. a. Part of the
passage is extant in the Greek, but so
as to omit the word answering to "in-
visiblem."

b "Ἐμφανής δὲ Κόρος ὁ Θεὸς ἀνή
corrigend. ἄγιος) "Ἰσραήλ τῶν ἔθνων
Αὐτοῦ τῶν κοινωμένων εἰς τὴν χάμα-
τος, καὶ καταβας πρὸς αὐτούς ἀγγελ-
λοσαβα Αὐτοῦ τὸ σωτήριον Αὐτοῦ." Cited as from Isaiah by Irenæus (but
extant only in the Latin), as in last
note, lib. iii. c. 23. p. 252. A. The
passage is cited in Greek (as just given)
by Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph., §
c S. Iren., ibid., lib. iv. c. 39; p.
339. a. S. Irenæus cites the same
passage a third time, in lib. v. c. 31, as
above in note a, and here without a
name.

d "Caius, who lived at Rome when
Zephyrinus was bishop there, and is
accounted to be the author of the treatise falsely fastened upon Josephus, upon which the fragment is published by Hæschelius in his annotations thereon: and there is a copy of it in the library at Oxford, a transcript whereof I have to shew by the favour of the late learned Doctor Langbaine. The tenor of it is, that ἃ ἔστιν a place under the earth, where light cometh not, and therefore dark; and assigned for souls to be guarded by angels, that distribute them their lots for a time. One quarter of it is the lake of unquenchable fire, which the
wicked shall be thrown into at the last day, when the righteous shall receive the kingdom; who in the mean time are in the same ἡδης, but quartered apart. For there is one common descent, at the entrance whereof stands the archangel with his host, distributing the souls that are conducted by their angels, the righteous to the right hand, to be lighted and conducted with melody by the good angels to the company of the righteous in a place of light and joy, the wicked as prisoners, with violence and shame, on the left, to hard by the said lake, hearing the boiling of it, and seeing the righteous in joy afar off, and expecting, as the righteous better things, so they worse, at the day of judgment. Set aside the limiting of the place to be under the earth, in what description can the Scriptures better agree than in this?

§ 5. The verses of the Sibyls, libro i.1 conducting the three sons of Noe to Acheron in the house of ἡδης, tell us, that “there they shall be honoured,

. . . . Ἐσσειθ μακάρων γένοις ἡσαν
:"Ολθειν ἄνερες, οἷς Ἰαβάθον νοῦν ἀθλήν Ἰβακρεί
:"Αδρατ καὶ τούτοις διε συμφράσατο βαύλδη’
:"Αλλ’ οὗτοι μάκαρες τέ καὶ εἰν ἄδιδα μιλώντες
:"Εσοντα!” —

“Because they are the offspring of the blessed, happy men themselves, [to] whom the Lord of Hosts gave a good mind, and conferred counsels with them, who shall be happy though they go to ἡδης,” or “hell.” And is not this a clear resolution of St. Augustin’s doubt, whether “Abraham’s bosom” belong to hell or to paradise (Epist. lvii., In Psalm. [1]xxxv. b) : and whether “inferi” or “hell” do ever signify a good place in the Scripture, as “Abraham’s bosom” certainly doth, De Gen. ad lit. xii. 23, 341 which he suppose to be resolved

1 Ap. Grymoni Monum. PP. Orthodox., tom. i. p. 121.


1 “Proinde, ut dixi, nondum inveni, et adhuc quero, nec mihi occurrunt inferos alucibi in bono posuisse Scripturam dumatxat canonicam: non autem in bono accipiendum sinum Abraham, et illam requiem, quo ab angelis pius pauper ablatos est, nescio utram quis-
in the negative, Epist. xcix. m, but finds no absurdity in the affirmative, De Civit. xx. 15°.

§ 6. For, taking ἀνάγψις only for a place invisible, where the [Meaning of the term inferi.]

souls of good as well as bad are disposed of until the day of judgment, in which the Scriptures and the Church both agree; if "inferi" be the Latin of it every where, "inferi" also must signify such a place. But, taking it to signify a place under the earth, as it is true the word "inferi" signifies; who dare undertake, that either the Scriptures have taught or there is any tradition of the Church, that the souls of the righteous till the resurrection are guarded under the earth, though the authors hitherto quoted have believed it? Whose opinion therefore in that point is not part of the tradition of the Church.

§ 7. St. Augustin, for certain, admitteth all but that: re- [St. Au-
solving (Enchirid. ciix.9);—"Tempus [autem], quod inter
hominis mortem et ultimam resurrectionem interpositum est,
animas abdit receptaculis continet; sicut unaqueque digna
est vel requie vel ærumna, pro eo quod sortita est in carne dum
"cum"
vivet?"—"The time, that comes between a man's death and
the last resurrection, guards souls in secret receptacles; as
every one is worthy of rest or sorrow, according to the lot of it whilst [it? lived in the flesh." For what are these

quam possit audire; et ideo, quomodo
cum apud inferos credamus esse, non
video." Id., De Gen. ad lit., lib. xii.
c. 33. § 64; Op. tom. iii. P. i. p. 321.
C. D.—"Qua rational et illud me non-
ungum invente consistor, inferos appella-
tos, ubi iustorum animae requiescunt." 
Id., ibid., § 63; ibid., p. 320. G.—
"Quanto magis ergo post hanc vitam
etiam sinus ille Abraham paradiesus dicit
potest; ubi jam nulla tentatio, ubi tanta
requies post ommes dolores vitae hujus;
Neque enim et lux ibi non est prorsa
quondam et sui generis, et perfecto
magnis; quam dives ille de tormentis
et tenebris inferorum, ubi etique de
longinquo, cum magnum chasma esse
in medio, sic tamen vidit, ut ibi illum
quondam contentum pauperem agno-
sceret." Id., ibid., c. 34. § 65; ibid.,
pp. 321. G. 322. A.

= "Non utique sinus ille Abraham,
id est, secretum cujusdam quietis habi-
tatio, aliqua para inferorum esse cre-
denda est: quanquam in his ipsis
tanti magistri verbis, ubi ait dixisse

Abraham, 'Inter vos et nos chaos mag-
nurn firmatum est,' satis, ut opinor,
appearat non esse quaedam partem et
quasi membrum inferorum tantis illius
felicitatis sinum." Id., Epist. clixiv.
(ciix. edd. bef. Bened.). Ad Euodium,
c. iii. § 7; Op. tom. ii. p. 575. F. G.

a "Si enim non absurde credi videtur,
antiquos etiam sanctos, qui venturi
Christi teneurunt fidem, locis quidem
a tormentis impiorum remotissimis sed
apud inferos fuisset, donec eos inde
Sanguis Christi et ad ea loca descensus
erueret: profecto deinceps boni fideles,
effuso illo pretio jam redempti, prorsus
inferos nesciunt, donec etiam receptis
corporibus bona recipiunt quæ meren-
tur." Id., De Civ. Dei, lib. xx. c. 15;

a c. ciix. (misquoted in the text from
Usheer, p. 284, as c. cixiii.) § 29; Op.
tom. vi. pp. 237. F. 238. A.—So also,
and in the same words, De Octo Dul-
cit. Quest., Qu. ii. § 4; ibid. p. 130.
A.

Added from MS.
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“secret receptacles,” but the invisible place which δός signifies?

§ 8. Pope Pius I. in his letter to Justus Bishop of Vienna (the ancientest that the Latin Church hath, that is unquestionable):—“Presbyteri illi, qui ab apostolis educati usque ad nos pervenerunt, . . . a Domino vocati, in cubilibus eternis clausi tenentur”—“The ancients” (saith he), “who being bred by the apostles were come to our time, . . . being called by the Lord, are kept shut up in eternal bed-chambers;” to wit, until the last judgment.

§ 9. Novatianus, of St. Cyprian’s time, in his book De Trinitate, [cap.] i.:—“Quae infra terram sunt, neque ipsa sunt digestis et ordinationis potestatibus vacua; locus enim est, quod piorum impiorumque animae aucentur, futuri judicii prejudicia sentientes”—“Nor are the parts under the earth void of orderly disposed powers; for there is the place, to which the souls of the godly and the wicked are conducted, feeling the prejudice of the judgment which is to come.”

§ 10. The same saith Origen, all but the place, De Principiis, iv. 21:—“Qui de hoc mundo secundum communem istam mortem recedunt, pro actibus suis et meritis dispensantur, prout digni fuerint judicati; alii quidem in locum qui dicitur infernum, alii in sinum Abraham, et per diversas mansiones”—“Those, that go out of this world by this common death, are disposed of according to their works and deserts; some into the place called hell, others into the bosom of Abraham, according to several lodgings.” So also In Num. [x]xxi. hom. xxvi.


2 Cave however says of this and the other letter of Pius to Justus, that they are “communi fere doctorum consensus tanquam spurius rejector, nec ipse Bellarminus, qui ex iis testimonium citat, veluti indubitatum fidei defendere audef.”


* “Sed et illum figuram esse diximus ex eundis de Εὐπρωτία cum relinquuit anima mundi humi tenebras ac naturam corporum semitatem, et transferetur ad aliud sæculum: quod vel sinus Abraham,
§ 11. St. Hilary saith the same, *In Psalm. ii.* and cxxv. 7
For thus he writeth:—“Exeunt de corpore ad introitum illum regni caelestis, per custodiam Domini fideles omnes reservabuntur; in sinu scilicet Abraham intermissi collocati, quo adire impios interjectum chaos inhibit, quousque introeundi ruinam in regnum caelorum tempus adveniat.”—“All the faithful, going out of the body to the entry of the heavenly kingdom, shall be kept there under the Lord’s guard; as placed for the time in Abraham’s bosom, whither the gulf interposed prohibits the wicked to come, till the time of re-entering the kingdom of heaven come again.” And therefore the same he means, when he says (*In Psalmum cxxviii.*) that “the law of human necessity, which our Lord refused not, is this, that the body being buried the soul go ad inferos.” For *In Psalmum ii.* he exemplifies in Dives and Lazarus.

§ 12. And Lactantius, vii. 21:—“Nec tamen quisquam [Lactantius.] pulset animos post mortem protinus judicari: omnes in una communiquem custodieta detinentur, donec tempus adveniat, quo maximus Judex meritorum faciat examen”—“Yet let no man think, that souls are judged straight after death: they are kept in one common guard, till the time come for the sovereign Judge to examine their deserts.” He denies them to be “judged,” whom Novatianus acknowledgeth to be “pre-judged,” or “forejudged.” He means “one common guard,” but intends not to deny the gulf which it is parted with.

§ 13. St. Ambrose, *De Bono Mortis,* x. xi., saith, that [St. Ambrose.] those “lodgings,” which the apocryphal Esdras speaketh of, [2 Esdr. iv. 41.]


*”Humanus ista lex necessitatia est, ut conseptus corporibus ad inferos animæ descendat. Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem verit hominias non recusavit.”* Id., *In Pa. cxxviii.* § 22; ibid., p. 572. C.

*“Testes nobis evangelicis dives et panper: quorum unum angeli in sedibus beatorum et in Abraham sinit locaverunt, alium statim poenas regio suscepit.”* Id., *in Pa. ii.* § 48; ibid., p. 69. C.


*See above, § 9.*
are the "many lodgings," which our Lord saith are in His Father’s house, John xiv. 2: and, speaking of the Gentiles,
—"Satis fuerat dixisse illis, quod liberate animae a corporibus αἰθροὴν pereunt, id est, locum qui non videtur, quem locum Latinum infernum dieimus."—"It had been enough for them to have said, that souls freed from their bodies go to αἰθροὴν, that is, to a place not seen, which place we call hell in Latin:" signifying, that according to Christianity all souls, going to Esdras his "lodgings," may be said to go to αἰθροὴν, which the Latin makes to be under the earth; but whether Christianity so understand it or no, not expressing. Again:—
"Ergo, dum expectatur plenitudo temporis, expectant animae remunerationem debitam: alias manet pæna, alias gloria; et tamen nec illæ interim sine injuria nec istæ sine fructu sunt"—
"While therefore the fulness of time is expected, souls also expect their own reward: some punishment, some glory attends; yet neither they without hardship, nor these without benefit, in the mean time." Yet, as it follows, neither grieved with cares, neither vexed with the remembrance of that which is past, as the wicked; but, "foreseeing their rest and glory to come, enjoy the quiet of their lodgings under the guard of angels.""

§ 14. If it be excepted, that here is no mention of the fathers’ souls; let it be considered, how many Church writers have made "the bosom of Abraham," in which Lazarus rested before our Lord’s death, a place of rest and refreshment from death till the day of judgment. Their words you may find in the Answer to the Jesuit’s Challenge, named afore, pp. 260—267: where those expositions of the gospel, which go under the name of Theophilus of Antiochia and [Eucherius] of Lyons, write two opinions, the one

---


5 S. Ambrose, De Bonæ Mortis, c. x. § 45; as quoted in last note, p. 408. A.

6 "In habitaculis suis cum magna tranquillitate requiescens sitapesesidiiis angelorum." Id., ibid., c. xi. § 48. p. 409. A.

b Corrected from MS.; "there," in folio edition.


k "In hoc quoque quod apud infernum Abrahamum vidit, hæc subesse quibusdam ratio putatur, quod omnes sancti ante adventum Domini nostri
placing it under the earth, the other above, because the rich man “lifted up his eyes;” from whence the second of those dialogues against the Marcionists, that go under Origen’s name, argueth that it is in heaven. So far is the ancient Church from being agreed, that those “store-houses” (wherein it is agreed that all souls are kept till the general judgment) are beneath the earth.

§ 15. And though he was a Christian that writ the apocryphal book of Esdras ii. from whom St. Ambrose and St. Augustin receive their “store-houses of souls;” yet speaks it in the person of Esdras concerning the fathers of the Old Testament. In the mean time, of the removing of them by the descent of Christ out of the verge of hell into heaven, not one word in all this; which certainly may serve to evidence, that there never was nor is any such tradition in the Church.

§ 16. In fine, the descent of righteous souls into hell, and the deliverance of them from thence by the descent of our Lord Christ, may be understood two several ways; either according to the literal sense of the Old Testament, or according to the mystical sense of the New. For it is manifest, that Adam was condemned to labour the earth first, and then to return to the earth; and this, being expelled out of paradise. The secret of Christianity (consisting in this,—that our Lord Christ should restore the posterity of Adam from those sorrows, which brought him to the earth whence he was taken, to paradise whence he was expelled) was not

---


= See above, a. xxviii. § 7. note a.

= See above, § 18. note d.

= See above, § 7. note a.
to be revealed; though it was to take effect in all, who in effect though not in form embraced and held the covenant of grace during the Old Testament. The land of promise, and the blessings thereof, were then the pledges of this hope. To leave them by death, was, then, to acknowledge themselves liable to the second death, which returning to the earth signified, so long as their return to paradise was not revealed; though to them, which understood what the land of promise signified, it was to return into paradise. The New Testament succeeding to reveal the mystery of the Old, must it not needs seem strange, that the fathers of the Old Testament should behave themselves towards death, as they who had not this hope? Supposing this reason not then to be declared, it need not seem strange; not supposing the same, it seems to call in question something of our common Christianity. The gospel opens the secret, representing Dives in hell torments, Lazarus in “Abraham’s bosom.” But our Lord Christ Himself being brought down to the dust of the earth, to deliver mankind from the second death, signified by the same; did our common redemption require, that He should come any further under death and then who had the power of it, our common faith might seem maimed in not believing it. But, the work of redemption being accomplished upon the cross, the effect of it was to be tried by the disposing of His soul. Which effect, whether those that belonged to the New Testament under the Old understood by the scriptures of the Law, they understood it (as did the devil\(^p\)) by their deliverance out of his hands; for the reason of their deliverance he might not understand, till the rising of Christ again taught it.

\(^p\) See above, c. xxviii. 20; and Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxiv. § 7.
under the Old. Without distinguishing thus, I conceive it will be impossible to reconcile the fathers to themselves and the common faith. For, pressing that which they say on either side, you will not fail to make them cross one another, as well as the Scriptures. But, thus distinguishing, the common faith will remain that, which Macrina in Gregory Nyssen’s dialogue De Anima et Resurrectione answers to the question, where δόξα is: to wit, that the translation of the soul from this visible world to that which is not seen, is all that can be had either from heathen writers or from the Scriptures, there being nothing under the earth but that which answereth this hemisphere above the earth; which clause is added to meet with one opinion of the Gentiles,—that the lower hemisphere is the place of souls, and the torments of hell (which they call Tartara) as much beneath it as heaven is above this.

Only here it must be provided, that the gulf be not forgotten, which our Lord fixeth between Abraham’s bosom and the place of torments. Dionysius, Eccles. Hierarch. cap. ii., seemeth to agree with Gregory Nyssen; and so do others: whom, unless you distinguish thus, you will not find to speak things consequent to themselves.

§ 18. And I am much confirmed in it, first, by the difference of opinion among the fathers concerning Samuel’s

[Difference of opinion among the fathers re-

[Difference of opinion among the fathers re-

[Luke xvi. 26.]
soul: which, as there be enough of them, that cannot en-329
dure to yield it to have been in the devil's power to raise,
so are they by that means obliged to maintain the rest of the
fathers' souls, with Samuel's, to have gone into Abraham's
bosom with Lazarus.

§ 19. Secondly, by their agreement in acknowledging,
that paradise, which was shut upon man for the sin of Adam,
is opened by the death of Christ to receive the righteous. For
to conceive, that they understood this of that paradise
which Adam was expelled, would be to make them too child-
ish. But, understanding it of that estate which that paradise
signified, you have St. Basil assigning paradise to Lazarus,
De Jejunio, hom. i. ; besides another homily entitled to
Zeno Bishop of Verona. Nay, you have expressly in Philo
Carpathius upon Cant. vi. 2: "My love is gone into His
garden," or "His paradise; tunc enim paradisum triumphator
ingressus est, cum ad inferos penetravit"—"then did He
enter paradise in triumph, when He pierced into hell:" mak-
ing "the beds of spices" there to be the souls of the
fathers, to whom our Lord conducted the good chief. And
Olympiodorus upon Cant. iii. saith, that some make paradise
under the earth and that there Dives saw Lazarus, others in
heaven; whereas the letter of the Scripture placeth it upon
the earth: but, howsoever, that the righteous are both in joy
and in peace, and also in paradise: things not to be re-
conciled, not distinguishing as I do.

a See above, § 1: and c. xxviii. § 8.
b See Ussher, Answ. &c., c. viii.
pp. 296, sq.
c See Ussher, ibid., pp. 347, sq.
d So Euthymius Zigabenus, ad Luc.
xxiii. 46; tom. ii. p. 658. Lips. 1792: and see below, § 39. note q.

"Oúx deis tòv Láζarou, tòs de
myneias elègwv eli tòv paradísewv!"
S. Basil. M., Hom. de Jejun. l. § 4;
Op. tom. ii. p. 3. C.

"Utumur ergo et nos hac via, qua
rediri ad paradisum potest. . . . Illic
prececessit Lazarus." Pseudo-Zeno
Veron., De Jejunio; ap. Biblioth. PP.,
tom. iii. p. 127. F.

"Prisci enim illi sanctissimi viri
per phialas aromatum non inepte sig-
nificantur: quales fuere Noe," &c.
"Tunc enim," &c. (as above in the
text). "Adest nobis Ipse Deus hac
in re testis, cum in cruce latroni . . .
clementissime respondit, 'Hodie Me-
cum eris in paradiso.'" Philo Car-
path., In Cantic., c. v.; ap. Biblioth.
PP., tom. iv. p. 551. H.

c "Tum deis deosan eti kal tòv para-
deiou en tò Ûdov twn xwron tòv
phoi, kal ò plousious eti tòv Láζarou.
diav, de ò idia kai ò idia teira, didaskalwv
kal ò idia paradísewv metat. ò idia
thiai grafwv, ò idia kai ò idia tòv
eiswv elègwv eli tòv

etwv, tòv ò idia kai ò idia kai ò idia
calóswv. . . .
Eteleis deis deosan tòv
paradísewv en sunei kai ò de ò idia
ekaleiastiké ek polw phoi eiswv eli
tò twn xwron, tòv ò idia.

Olympod., In Ecclesiast.,
c. iii.; ap. Biblioth. PP. Graeco-Latin.,
tom. ii. § 624. C, D. Paris. 1624—
"Cant." in the text above is a mis-
take.
§ 20. Lastly, the reason of faith setteth me upon this ground. The reason of faith, I say, not the rule of faith. For I do not say, that any part of this dispute belongs to that, which the salvation of all Christians necessarily requireth them to believe. He, who understandeth, that himself is saved by embracing Christianity and living according to it: I do not understand why he should be damned, because he understood not by what means the fathers afore Christ were saved; provided he deny not their salvation, to the disparagement of Christianity, whereof they were forerunners. And this is the case of Hermes, and Justin, and Clemens, and if there were any others; who thought, that the fathers or the philosophers were saved by believing in Christ at His descent into hell: merely because they understood not the ground of that difference between the literal and mystical sense of the Old Testament, which I have said. Indeed, in regard it is by consequence destructive to Christianity, that the fathers should have attained salvation any ways but as Christians; in that regard, I answer, the position is by consequence prejudicial to Christianity. But because by that consequence, which the most censorious of their errors do not own, and not owning necessarily incur some other inconvenience to Christianity: I say not, that they destroy the common faith who hold it, but that they destroy the true reason of it; which subsisteth not, unless we grant, that the fathers obtained salvation by Christ; nor that, unless we grant, that they came not under the devil's power by death, who died qualified for salvation as that time required.

§ 21. There remains no question, what company the Soul of Christ was with for the time It remained parted from the Body, nor how the descent thereof to hell is to be understood; supposing the premisses. The tradition of the descent of Christ's Soul into hell can by no means be parted from the tradition of an intent to visit the souls of the fathers. That supposes, that the souls of the fathers were disposed of under the earth (whether in the entrails of the earth, or in the hemisphere below us, as the heathen did imagine); and

---

4 Corrected from MS.; "the," in folio edition.
5 Corrected from MS.; "the error," in folio edition.
6 See above in § 1. note e.
7 See ibid., note b.
8 See ibid., note d.
9 See Ussher, Answ. &c., c. viii. pp. 373, sq.
infers, that the intent of it was to redeem them out of the
devil’s hands, to go with our Lord Christ into His kingdom.
Could this be maintained to be the tradition of the Church,
I might be straitened by the tradition of the Church. But
as I have shewed it to be by consequence prejudicial to the
faith; so I have shewed, that there is no tradition of
the Church for the disposing of all souls before Christ under
the earth, whether in the devil’s hands or otherwise; nor for
the translating of any soul from under the earth to heaven
with Christ and by Christ: but for the continuance of all in
those unknown lodgings, where they are disposed at their
death, till the day of judgment, whether before or after
Christ; though the Latin hath no name to signify them but
inferi or infernum, necessarily signifying, as to the original
of the word, the parts beneath the earth.

§ 22. There is therefore no question to be made as to the
tradition of the Church, that the Soul of Christ, parting with
the Body, went to the souls of the fathers, which the gos-
pel represents us “in Abraham’s bosom” (whether the death
of Christ, removing the debt of sin, which shut paradise upon
Adam, make that place known to us by the name of “para-
dise,” to which our Lord inducted the good thief; or whether
the Jews had used that name for the place, to which they
believed the souls of the righteous do go). But there is there-
fore no tradition remaining, of the descent of Christ’s Soul
into hell to rescue the souls of the fathers out of the verge of
hell (commonly called limbus patrum) to go with Him into His
kingdom. True it is, which Irenæus’ saith (and the tradition
of the Church will justify it), that our Lord Christ was to
undergo the condition of the dead for the redemption of
mankind. And, therefore, the separation of His human Soul
from the Body was really the condition, in consideration
whereof we are freed from the dominion of death. True it
is, that this dominion of death is signified in the Old Testa-
ment by the returning of Adam to the earth of which he
was made; and that the grave is an earnest of the second
death in all those, that belong[ed] not to the New Testament

k "Et Ipse (Dominus) moriens, uti
exiliat homo exiret de condemnatione
et reverteretur intrepide ad suam haer-
iv. c. 19. p. 305. b.—"Si ergo Dominus
legem mortuorum servavit, ut fieret
primuminitus a mortuis," Sc. Id., Ibid.,
lib. v. c. 31. p. 451. b.—See also Id.,
Ibid., lib. v. c. 9. p. 413. a.
while the Old *was* in force. Therefore, that our Lord Christ
was to undergo the condition common to mankind, to which
the first Adam was accursed, is a part of our common faith;
because the curse *was* to be voided by His undergoing of it.
Accordingly, therefore, you shall find by the Answer to the
Jesuit's Challenge, pp. 308—326, that the spoiling of hell is
attributed by the fathers to the rising of our Lord Christ from
the grave, whereby the law of death was voided. Which if
it be true, what tradition can there remain in the Church,
that our Lord Christ's Soul should harrow hell, and ran-
sack it of the souls of those there detained or in the
verge of it?

§ 23. St. Basil, *De Spir. Sanct.*, cap. 15*um*—"Πῶς όν κα-
τορθούμεν τὴν εἰς ἄδου κάθοδον; μιμησάμενοι τὴν ταφὴν
["μωσειωτός Χριστού δία τοῦ βαπτισμάτος ολοει γὰρ εὐθαύς τοῖς
ὑδατι τῶν βαπτιζομένων τὰ σώματα"]—"How then do
we go down to hell aright? imitating the burial of Christ by
baptism: for the bodies of those who are baptized are as it
were buried in the water."

§ 24. St. Chrysostom, *In 1 ad Cor. hom. xl*:*—Τὸ γὰρ [St. Chry-
βαπτίζομεν καὶ καταδύομεν, εἰσ ἀναψεως, τὴς εἰς ἄδου
καταβάσεως ἐστι σώματος, καὶ τῆς [ἐκείθεν] ἀνόδου"]—"For
to be baptized, and first to sink, then come up again, is an
emblem of going down into hell and coming up again."

§ 25. And, truly, if the force of Christ's death in voiding
the dominion of death stood by the merit of His sufferings;
then was the descent of His flesh into the grave of force to
that effect, without any descent further of His soul into the
lower parts thereof. And if the death of Christ, and His
continuing in death for the time that God had appointed,
was declared by God to be accepted by Him to that effect;
then was His rising from death, His triumph over hell and
death: whereby the title of His rising again being declared,
it must needs appear, that neither death nor hell nor the
devil hath any more interest in Christians.

§ 26. Nor is it so strange, that the descent of Christ into
hell should be mentioned by the Apostles' Creed after His
burial, if it signify not the descent of His soul; as it would
be, that it should be left out of other Creeds, if it did signify,
that it is necessary to the salvation of all so to believe. For neither is it expressed in the Creed of Nicea or Constantinople, nor was it found in that which the Church of Rome, or that which the Churches of the East used, saith Ruffinus upon the Creed; who notwithstanding expoundeth it, because the Church of Aquileia, which he belonged to, used it. Which had the signification of it been a distinct truth, necessary to the salvation of all to be believed; the Churches could by no means have connived at one another in not delivering it.

§ 27. And, truly, seeing the dominion of death (intimating the second death, to which those who belong not to the New Testament are accursed) is signified in the Old Testament by "going under the earth;" the signification of "going down into hell" in the Creed can by no means be thought superfluous, though our Lord neither went thither to rescue the fathers' souls, nor to triumph over the powers of darkness. For as thereby the common curse, from whence we are redeemed, so is also the reason and means of our deliverance from it, intimated. And seeing there is appearance from that which hath been said, that the devil himself did not understand the secret of God's intent to dissolve his interest in mankind by the death of Christ, until it appeared by what right our Lord resumed His Body which He had laid down; this being declared in the other world by His rising again, and in sign thereof the souls of the saints that slept rising again with Him and resuming their bodies: there is no reason, why the mention of His resurrection, following immediately upon the descent into hell in the Creed, should not sufficiently express that triumph, which this declaration importeth. Which triumph being effected by the Godhead, though in His flesh, it will be no marvel to meet with some sayings of the fathers, that ascribe it to His Godhead.


‡ See note p.

§ "Nos tamen illum ordinem sequimus, quem in Aquileiensi Ecclesia per lavacri gratiam suscepit." Ruffin., ibid., p. 129.

* See above, § 16. note p.

§ 28. Now the common doctrine of the School maketh it no matter of faith to believe the descent of Christ's Soul into that hell, where the damned were; but only to the verge of it, where the souls of the fathers were. It is enough with them, that the "effect" of this power reached to the place of the damned. Cardinal Bellarmine, when he published his Controversies, held it "probable, that the Soul of Christ descended to the place of the damned;" but "upon better consideration," in the review of them, "thinks, that the other opinion of Thomas and the rest of the School is to be followed."

And yet it is not possible to distinguish between this verge and the lowest hell by any tradition of the Church. Nay, Durandus goes so far out of their road, as to maintain, that the Soul of Christ went not to hell (that is, to limbus), but only by the effect of it in making the souls of the fathers happy; which is, in my opinion, declaring to them the reason of their happiness. And the opinion of Suarez the


...Cum articulus sit, Christum ad inferos descendisse, et non posse intelligi ratione Divinitatis, secundum quam est ubique; nec ratione Corporis, secundum quod fuit in sepulcro; restat quod intelligitur ratione Anime: quod supposto, videndum est quater Anima Christi descendit ad infernum. ... Potest dixi quod anima separatam potest descendere ad infernum duplriciter. Uno modo secundum deputationem: et sic dicitur descendere ad infernum animae dannatorum simpliciter. Hoc autem modo non dicitur Anima Christi descendisse ad infernum. Alio modo potest dixi anima separatam descendere ad infernum, secundum effectum: et hoc modo potest dici Anima Christi descendisse ad infernum, propter dupllicem effectum quem habuit in illis qui erant in inferno," &c. Durandus, Comm. in Sent., lib. iii. dist. 22. qu. 3; fol. 281. i.—L. Paris. 1508.
BOOK III.

Jesuit is remarkable: that, “taking an article of faith for a truth necessary for the salvation of all Christians to be known, the descent of Christ into hell is no article of faith; for that is not very necessary for single Christians to know: and for that cause perhaps it is not in the Nicene Creed; which whoso believeth, believes enough” to save him: and that “perhaps for this cause some fathers, expounding the Creed to the people, make no mention of” it: In iii. [Part. D. Thomea], Disput. xliii. sect. 2. and 4.b

§ 29. I may add for the advantage of my opinion; that, if it be not necessary for single Christians to believe, much less is it necessary for the Church as a body to believe it. For those things, which the Church believeth as a body, it imposes to be believed upon them who are of the body. But it cannot be reasonable, for the Church as a body to impose upon the members thereof the belief of that, which it is not necessary to their salvation as single Christians to believe. And, therefore, allowing the conscientiousness of St. Augustin, who, having presumed that he who believes not the descent is no Christian, doubts not, that by the descent as many were delivered as God’s secret justice thought fit (Epist. xcix.c); and of St. Jerome (In Eph. ii.d), allowing some work of God to be managed by it, which we understand no more than what good our Lord’s death did the good


c “Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverituisse apud inferos Christum?” S. Aug., Epist. clxiv. (xcix. edd. bef. Benedictine), Ad Euodium, c. ii. § 3; Op. tom. ii. p. 574. C.—He proceeds to answer the question, who were delivered from Hell by Christ’s coming; determining (in the words, and quotations, of Pearson, On the Creed, vol. ii. pp. 337—339), “that how many were delivered out of the torments of Hell was uncertain, and therefore ‘temerarious to define.’” Sed utrum omnes quos in eis inventit an quosdam quos illo beneficio dignos judicavit, adhuc requiro’” (Epist. clxiv. ibid. c. iii. § 3. p. 576. A). And again, “In quibusdam accipi potest, quos Ille dignos ista liberatione judicabat.” Id., ibid. c. ii. § 5. p. 575. B.

angels: I allow also the reservedness of those of the confession of Augsburg, or of Suisse, who, acknowledging the literal sense of this article, find not themselves bound to maintain, for what reason it was; I am not offended with those in the Church of England, that assign the triumph of our Lord for the reason of it; but, believing with St. Gregory Nyssen, In Pascha et Resurrect. Christi, and Epist. ad Eustath., that our Lord "by the descent of His Body into the grave abolished him that had the power of death, by His Soul made way for the thief into paradise," where itself was—count this enough for the salvation of all Christians to be believed; and, therefore, that the Church cannot impose upon them as the necessary means of their salvation to believe any more.

§ 30. I do not intend to say much more than I said be-

The saints' souls in

De Origine et Progressu Formule Concordis, c. xii. fol. 68. a, Tigur. 1607, in reviewing the Formula as quoted in the last note, expressly adopts Luther's doctrine there cited. — "De articulo autem descensus Christi ad inferos, clam me non est quam varia sit eruditorum sententia. Obscurum quidem est, et multis disputatibus obooxius: verum ex eo nemo piorum verbis apostolicis repugnabit, aut sim aliquam inferet: sed luceam hujus rei a Deo posit, et interius simplici fide verbo veritatis adhuc retinet, etiamsi modum adimipcionis illius perspicuus intelligere nequeat." Mussculus, Ad Psalm. xvi. p. 142. B. Basil. 1599: quoted by Bilson, as in last note.


"Ἀλλὰ μετὰ μὲν τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ τῆς ἐπαράδοσει γίνεται ἀδόκιμωσα διὰ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ ἐνδιαφέρου ἐφεδρον διὰ τοῦ Ἀδάμτου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς ἀναμορφώσεως τοῦ τρόπου ἑχοντος τοῦ θανάτου," k. τ. l. Id., Epist. ad Eustathiam, Ambrosiam, et Basili-
fore, to shew you, that the ancient Church from the beginning held the happiness of the saints’ souls to continue imperfect till the resurrection of their bodies.

§ 31. Gennadius, De Dogmat. Eccles., lxxviii. lxxix., will have us to take it for the doctrine of the Church, that the souls of the fathers before Christ were in hell till they were delivered thence by Christ; that since Christ they go straight to Christ, expecting the resurrection of their bodies, that with them they may attain entire happiness. And that this doctrine had for some time great vogue in the Church I deny not; nor intend to deny, that the saints are with Christ, some whereof the Apocalypse represents “before the throne.” But that there is no tradition for the translating of the fathers’ souls, and that the saints are “in Abraham’s bosom” (or “paradise”) with them till the resurrection; I conceive I have shewed, by clearing the sayings of the most ancient Christians from the misprisings which they are entangled with.

§ 32. He, that shall consider the premisses, may find Tertullian, Lactantius, and Victorinus (whom Cardinal Bellarmine acknowledgeth to detain all souls in their storehouses till the resurrection, De Sanct. Beat. i. 5) good company among the rest of the fathers. And therefore I will refer it to the reader to judge between that exposition, De Vita Beatæ, c. 21. pp. 653, 654. ed. Spark: quoted above in § 12; and by Bellarm., ibid., p. 1911. D. f

\[\text{f} \quad \text{“Ante passionem et resurrectionem Domini omnes animæ sanctorum in inferno sub debito praevacationis Adae tenebantur, donec auctoritate Domini per indebitam Ejus mortem a servili conditione liberarentur.” Gennad., De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, c. lxxviii. p. 41. ed. Elmenhorst.—“Post ascensionem Domini ad caelos, omnium sanctorum animas cum Christo sunt: et exstantes de corpore ad Christum vadunt, expectantes resurrectionem corporis sui, ut ad integrum et perpetuam beatitudinem cum Ipso pariter immumentur.” Id., ibid., c. lxxix.; ibid.—In the Append. to S. Augustin, Op., tom. viii. p. 76. B., they are reckoned as cc. xlv., xlvii.}\]

\[\text{g} \quad \text{Cont. Marcion., as quoted above, § 2, note r: cited by Bellarmine, De Sanct. Beatit., lib. i. c. 1; Controv., tom. i. p. 1908. B.}\]

\[\text{h} \quad \text{Lactant., Instit. Divin., lib. vii.}\]
that he fits the passages of the fathers with which he produces, and that, which my opinion requires; especially, having Doctor Stapleton (Defens. Ecclesiast. Authorit. i. 27) to confess, with others of that side, that all the ancients in a manner do hold the contrary of that which is since defined by the Council of Florence.

§ 33. St. Bernard I must not omit; because it is he, who, considering the text of the Apocalypse, which (you may see by the premisses) says more than all the Scripture besides, hath so pertinently observed out of it, that they are but in the court as yet, but at the consummation of their bliss shall enter into God’s house. Therefore he maketh “three states of the soul; the first in tents, the second in the courts, the third in God’s house: into which neither the saints shall enter without the common people of the Church, nor their souls without their bodies”: De Omnibus Sanctis, Serm. iii.

* The fathers whom Bellarmine quotes as in his own favour, he quotes as proving, that “animas sanctorum jam nunc fru Dei visione”; admitting, however, a distinction between the degrees of such “sight of God,” enjoyed immediately after death, and at the final resurrection. Of the other three he says, that “Tertullianus heresiarcha fuit, Lactantius in plurimos errores lapsus est, praesertim circa futurum sæculum,” and to Victorinus, “erudito defuit.”

* Sed et age, ut unum aduc aut alterum exemplum adjiciam, tot illi et tam celebres antiqui patres, Tertullianus, Irenaeus, Origenes, Chrysostomus, Theodoretus, Eusebius, Theophylactus, Ambrosius, Clemens Romanus, D. Bernardus, omnès hereticæ fuerunt, quia huic sententiae (quæ nunc in... concilio Florentino... magis demum conquestione facta... quod justorum animæ ante diem judicii Dei visione frustraret, non sunt assensii, sed sententiam contrarium tradiderunt? Tu fortasse, ut quod temere semel et ignarantier affirmasti, pertinaciter et superhe hereticorum more defenda, hoc totum necessare non vereberis. Sed neminem puto sane mentis esse qui sic teum insinuare volerit.” Stapleton, Authoritatis Ecclesiasticæ circa SS. Scripturae romam approbationem, adeoque in universum, luculentæ et accurata Defensio, contra Disput. de Scriptura Sacra Guili. Whitakeri, lib. i. c. 2. Op. tom. i. p. 868. D.—So Pegna also, as quoted by Uscher, Answ. &c., c. ix. p. 485; and Sixtus Senensis, as in note p. above.—Stapleton is urging the authority of the Church to make new articles of faith, and also to set forth as canonical Scripture, books that had not previously been canonical Scripture.

* See above, c. xxvii. § 34. note 1.—The Greeks in the council of Florence admitted only, that “AI μαυ (ψυχα) οὐκρηνούν μην ἐν βασανιστηρίῳ, καὶ ἕστη πιεύσων, ἑστη ἰδροὺς καὶ τιθήλη, ἑστη τι ἐνακόρον ὁ διαφορομεθα.” (Conc. Flor., Sess. xxv. A.D. 1439; sp. Labb., Conc., tom. xiii. p. 492. A.)

* S. Bernard is quoted by Bellarmine as against himself, De Sanct. Beatis, lib. i. c. 1. Contr. tom. i. p. 1913. A. B; as in his own favour, ibid. c. 5. p. 1937. A—D.

* “Advertisti, nisi fallor, ... tress esse sanctarum status animarum; primum videlicet in corpore corruptibili, secundum sine corpore, tertium in corpore jam glorificato: primum in militia, secundum in requie, tertium in beatiudine consummata: primum de nique in tabernaculis, secundum in atriis, tertium in domo Dei. ... In illam enim beatissimam domum (anima) nec sine nobis intrabunt, nec sine corporibus sua; id est, nec sancti sine pelle nec spiritus sine carne.” S. Bernard., Serm. iii. In Festo Omnium Sanctorum; Op. tom. iii. p. 1039. B—E quoted in part by Bellarm., ibid. c. i. p. 1913. A.
And Serm. iv. 7, the saints, which now see only the Manhood of Christ under the altar, he saith, shall be lifted upon the altar to see the essence of God.

§ 34. The School since his time, upon occasion of the contest with the Greek Church 7 (believing with St. Bernard 1), hath stated the dispute upon this term of "seeing God." And John XXII. Pope is questioned, whether, intending to determine with St. Bernard, he held heresy heretically or not. For his successor Benedict XII. first, and after him the council of Florence 4, hath decreed that for matter of faith,


"Exponens" (as Bellarmine says)

"Illum, 'Vidi sub altare animas intersectorum,' intelligi per altrae Christi Humanitatem," &c.


As in § 31, above.


8 See Benedict XI. 's sentiments at length, in Raynald's Contin. ad Baroniun, ad ann. 1335, numm. viii.—xxvi; and in his Bull beginning "Benedictus Deus," Epist. i. among the Epiat. Benedicti XI. ap. Mansi, Concil. tom. xxv. pp. 985. D, sq.; in which "definit, animas sufficerent purgatas clara Dei visione frui," alleging that his predecessor, John XXII., "morte preventus," could not come to a decision upon the subject.

See above, note a.
which before the decree was not matter of faith; and therefore, if that be true which I said in the first Book, can never become matter of faith.

§ 35. For my part, I see St. Augustin, De Cura pro Mortuis cap. ix., resolve the question, how the dead can know what is done here, three ways: by the report of those who go hence, and by the will of God remember what is done here; by the ministry of angels; and by the revelation of God's Spirit. And if St. John, being in the Spirit, saw by vision of prophecy God sitting upon His throne in heaven, as well as the elders and martyrs' souls did; I can easily grant, that those souls, which should have such revelations of God's Spirit (whether by the ministry of angels or without it), might see God upon His throne: as St. John and the prophets did, and as the elders and martyrs are there described to do. But this would be no more that sight of God, in which St. Paul and St. John seem to place the happiness of God's kingdom; than that sight of God, which Moses had, when he communed face to face with God before the ark, was that sight whereof God said to him, "Thou shalt not see My face, for no man shall see My face and live."

§ 36. This for certain: St. Augustin, deriving that knowledge of our matters which blessed souls may have, from the ministry of angels and revelations of God's Spirit and perhaps from report from hence, was far enough from owning St. Gregory's consequence; — "Quae intus omnipotentis Dei claritatem vident, nullo modo credendum est, quod foris sit aliquid quod ignorant" — "Those who see within the brightness of Almighty God, it is not to be thought, that there is any thing which they are ignorant of without" (Moral. xii. 14). For, supposing the saints see the essence of God, it followeth...
not, that thereby they see what is done here; because it is not the essence of God, but His will, by which it may appear. So far it is from any appearance of truth, that he, who hath recourse to souls that go hence, to the ministry of angels, to revelations of God's Spirit, to inform the saints departed of that which is done here, should believe them to have that sight of God, wherein the happiness of His kingdom consisteth.

§ 37. In fine, by the Archbishop of Spalato, De Rep. Eccles. 333 [lib. v., c.] viii. [§] 110—120\(^k\), you shall find the opinion of Calvin to be the same I here maintain; though his followers, it seems\(^m\), are afraid of the evidence for it, or the consequence of it. Let us see whether justly or not.

§ 38. It hath been a custom so general in the Church to pray for the dead, that no beginning of it can be assigned, no time, no part of the Church, where it was not used\(^n\). And though the rejecting of it makes not Aetius a heretic, as disbelieving any part of the faith\(^o\); yet, had he broke from the Church upon no other cause but that which the whole Church besides him owned, he must as a schismatic have come into Epiphanius his list of heresies\(^p\), intending to comprise all parties severed from the Church.


\(^m\) E. g. "Quamdiu in corpore est (spiritus), virtutes suas exerceat; cum ex illo ergastulo egreditur, ad Deum migrare, Cujus sensus interim frutur dum in spe beatæ resurrectionis requiescit: hanc requiem esse illi paradisum: spiritum vero repribo hominim, dum terrible judicium in se expectat, torqueri illa expectatione." Quoted from Calvin's Psychopannychia ("qua refellitur quorumdam imperitorum error, qui animas post mortem usque ad ultimum judicium dormire putant"—Op. tom. viii. p. 345. A.) by De Dominia, as above, § 112. p. 380. D. E.

\(^n\) See below, § 39. note q.


\(^p\) See the account of this matter in Ussher, Answ. &c., c. vii. pp. 257, sq.

\(^q\) See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xiv. § 2.—Epiphanius, Adv. Hær., lib. iii. tom. i. Hær. 75. (Op. tom. i. pp. 904, sq.), argues at length against Aetius: but, as Ussher says (Answ. &c., c. vii. p. 257), "neither does Epiphanius name this (about prayers for the dead) to be an heresy; neither doth it appear that he (Epiphanius) himself did hold, that prayers and oblations bring such profit to the dead as these men dream they do:" for "he is much deceived, who thinketh everything that Epiphanius fandeth fault withal in be-
§ 39. All that I have known pretended, is that which the learned Blondel, in a French work, of the Sibyl's verses, hath conjectured; that it had the beginning from that book. Which book, as divers before him* have shewed reason, why it should be thought the work of a Christian, intending to advance Christianity by such means; so I confess I cannot see whence it should come more probably than from Montanus or some of his fellow prophets, as he conjectureth*. For though he hath failed of his usual diligence in clearing the difficulties, which the account of time raiseth,—how Justin Martyr's Apology* and Hermes his Pastor* should borrow from Montanus;—yet do I not see, why Montanus might not begin to declare himself by it before the date of them. But neither doth my business require nor my model allow me to declare it. For supposing Justin Martyr*, or Clemens*, or Tertullian*, or Lactantius*, or many more particular writers, retics, to be an heresy, seeing heresy cannot be but in matters of faith; and the course which Epiphanius taketh in that work, is not only to declare in what special points of faith heretics did dissent from the Catholic doctrine, but in what particular observations also they refused to follow the received customs and ordinances of the Church," &c.

* Des Sibylles Célébres tant par l'Antiquité Pagene que par les Saints Peres, Discours traitant des noms et du nombre des Sibylles, de leurs conditions, de la forme et matière de leurs vers, des livres qui portent jusqu'aujourd'hui leurs noms, et de la conséquence des suppositions que ces livres contiennent, principalement touchant l'estat des hommes bons et mauvais après la mort: par David Blondel, âgé de Charenton 1649. It was translated into English by J. Davies, fol. Lond. 1661.—Liv. ii. cc. ix.—xii., pp. 165—187, sq., is occupied in proving four "dogmes capitales de l'esprit dit Sibyllin;" of which the first is, "La pretendue descente et detention de toutes les ames en enfer jusques au jour de la resurrection de leurs corps;" the second, "l'embarasme du monde au dernier jour qu'il pretend devoir servir de Purgatoire aux ames et corps des Saints," the third, "la conservation du Paradis terrestre qu'il feint devoir estre la retraite des quelques uns des Saints apres leur resurrection;" the fourth, the millenary dogma: and from hence Blondel goes on, in c. xiii. pp. 195, sq., to speak of the "inductions a prier pour les morts resultantes necessairement des hypotheses proposées en l'escrit dit Sibyllin."

* See Beveridge, Cod. Canon. Eccl. Prim., lib. i. c. 14; and Cave, art. Sibylla Oracula.—Thornide probably refers to Casaubon, Exercit. i. in Ann. Baronii (num. xviii. pp. 52, sq. Francof. 1615); or to Hoornbeck or Mareis, whose Cave quotes as assigning the authorship of the Sibylline verses to Pappas and to Montanus respectively. Bishop Montague, Isaac Voss, and others, date them before the Christian era.

* Blondel, Des Sibylles, liv. ii. c. vii. p. 163: but adding "mais je ne determine rien."

* Blondel, ibid. pp. 161, 162, and c. vi. p. 160, refers both to Hermes, as quoting the Sibylline verses A.D. 148 or 149, and to S. Justin Martyr, who also quotes them, and who was martyred A.D. 165; but does not appear to have noticed the anachronism resulting, of the conjecture just mentioned, with which he closes the chapter.


* Cohort. ad Graccos, § 37, 38; Op., pp. 38, D, sq.: Apol. i. p. 20; ibid., p. 56. D.—Blondel quotes and argues about the fathers cited above in the text.

* S. Clem. Alex. frequently refers to the Sibylline verses: e.g. Stroumb. lib. i.; Op. tom. i. p. 384, &c.

* De Fallio, c. ii.; Op. p. 113. B.

* Divin. Instit., lib. vii. De Vita Beata;
were induced to allege it, as for the advantage of the common Christianity; he, that sees not, how much more it were to induce particular Churches and by consent of them the whole, seems to me to renounce the advice of common reason for love of his own voluntary prejudice. Can it be imagined, that the Sibyl's verses, coming from an author of doubtful credit, could persuade the whole Church to take up a custom of praying for the dead, because they have persuaded divers writers to allege them in favour of Christianity? Why could not then Montanus persuade it to embrace the pretence of his prophecies? Why, but because it was more to give law to such a body than to surprise a few scholars.

§ 40. And yet, could all this be overseen, would not that serve the turn. The opinion of Justin, that our Lord by His prayers (Psalm xxii. 21), and by commending His Soul to God on the cross, teacheth us to pray, that our souls may not fall into the hands of those spirits which had the fathers' souls in their power,—is the mould in which some prayers in the Church of Rome for the dead are framed. Suppose this, not granting it: this is not the doctrine of the Sibyl's verses. For they place the sons of Noe in bliss, not in the devil's hands, though under the earth; as I shewed you. Neither could the reign of Christ upon earth for a thousand years come from the Sibyl's verses; how many soever were transported with the concet of it. For though Montanus be found as ancient as Justin, he will never be found so ancient as Papias, who preached it. As for the quartering of righteous souls under the earth and in paradise; I have shewed you, how both are true according to the dispensation of the Old and of the New Testament. If the simplicity of the
primitive Christians speak sometimes according to the one, sometimes according to the other, as following the language and style of the Scriptures; it is not because they followed any Montanist, as a disciple of Montanus, whom the Church disowned. It must be, because they knew him not to be Montanus or any disciple of Montanus; and they knew him not by these particulars, because others before and after him had committed the same mistakes (for, supposing they understood not the secret which I spoke of in the Scriptures, they were indeed mistakes), and were not by the Church disowned for it.

§ 41. But what is it that I appeal to in the prayers of the Church for the dead? That they are made for the patriarchs and prophets, for the apostles and martyrs, even for the blessed Virgin, as well as for all the departed in the communion of the Church. The words of the ancient Liturgies, I remit you to the Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge quoted afore, to see, p. 185. Be this in regard to the resurrection and the day of judgment, so it be in regard to their resurrection and judgment, so that the benefit which they receive by it, not which their bodies receive by it (which were not prayed for), be acknowledged. If that be acknowledged considerable for the whole Church to pray for in behalf of those; how much more in behalf of all others, that were admitted to communion with the Church?

§ 42. I acknowledge a scruple made in St. Augustin's time to the assumption which I suppose; De Verbis Apostoli, Hom. xvii. "Ideoque habet ecclesiastica disciplina quod fideles noverunt, cum martyres eo loco recitantur ad altare Dei, ubi non pro ipsis oretur, pro caeteris autem commemoratis defunctis oratur; injuria est enim pro martyre orare, cujus nos debemus orationibus commendari"—"And therefore the Church hath that discipline which the faithful know; when the martyrs

---

1 See quotations in Ussher, Answ. &c., pp. 201—203, 210—216.
3 Added from MS.
4 Scil. of the ed. of 1625: the passages quoted in notes i, k, above.
are reckoned at God's altar in that place, as not to pray for them, but for others departed, who are reckoned; for it is an injury to pray for a martyr, by whose prayers we are to be commended." Thus St. Augustin: whereas St. Cyprian, in his time, made no question of offering for martyrs, Epistle xxxiv. "The same St. Augustin, Enchir. cap. cx. p.:—"Cum sacrificia sive altaris sive quaramcunque eleemosynarum pro baptizatis defunctis omnibus offeruntur; pro valde bona gratiarum actiones sunt, pro non valde malis propitiationes sunt, pro valde malis eti nulla sunt adjuncta mortuorum quae cunque vivorum consolationes sunt"—"When sacrifices either of the altar or of whatsoever alms are offered for all the dead after baptism; for the very good they are thanksgivings, for the not very bad propitations, for the very bad, though no helps to the dead, yet some kind of consolations to the living." Thus St. Augustin avoideth an objection; how the same prayer should be a petition for some, for others a thanksgiving. For, the custom being that the saints departed were rehearsed in one place of the service, others in another place, he takes it to be the intent of the Church to give thanks for saints and martyrs, to pray for others. The form then used in Africk we have not; neither can say, why this construction may not stand with it.

§ 43. For the very Latin mass at this day is capable of it: where you have first; "Memento Domine famulorum famularumque Tuarum N. et N. et omnium circumstantium, . . . pro quibus Tobi offerimus (vel qui Tibi offerunt) hoc sacrificium laudis, . . . communicantes et memoriam venerantes inprimis gloriosae semper-Virginis Maria"—"Remember Lord Thy servants, such and such, and all here present, for whom we offer unto Thee (or who offer Thee) this sacrifice of praise, communicating in and reverencing first the memory of the glorious ever-Virgin Mary:'—so proceeding to the rest. Where by the way it is manifest, he, that made this, read in St. Paul,

---


† c. cx. § 25; Op. tom. vi. p. 238. C.

‡ See Serv. of God at Rel. Ass. c. x. § 62.

† Missal. Rom., p. 224. V.
Rom. xii. 13, "ταῖς μυελαῖς τῶν ὁμών κοινωνοῦντες"—"communicating in the memories of the saints;" as St. Ambrose and other fathers did: not as now we read, "ταῖς χρείαις"—"the necessities." But after the consecration:—Memento Domine famulorum famularumque Tuarum, [N.et N.,] qui nos procresserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis; ipsis Domine et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus locum refri- gerii, lucis, et pacis, ut indulgeas, deprecamur"—"Remember Lord Thy servants such and such, that are gone before with the badge of faith and sleep in the rest of peace; we pray Thee, Lord, grant them, and all that rest in Christ, a place of refreshment, rest, and peace." This then shews, that there was some ground in the manner and form of praying for the dead in the African Church for St. Augustin’s construction, that the intent of the Church was not to pray for saints and martyrs at all.

§ 44. Which notwithstanding, it is evident by the forms which I alleged afore, that the intent of the Church was to pray for them. What account Gennadius his position would give for this difference and for the prayers then used for the dead, I understand not: supposing it to extend the name of saint to all that die in the state of grace, and to intend, that all such since Christ go to Christ and are with Christ; afore Christ, under the earth. But according to St. Augustin, and those that dispose of them till the day of judgment in secret store-houses, signified by the name of ἁδῆς or the invisible place of the dead (against which opinion I maintain there is no tradition in the Church), the reason is plain; from the difference of those lodgings according to the difference of the

---

* "Memoriis sanctorum communicantes" is the reading commented on by the Pseudo-Ambrose, Comment. in Epist. ad Rom., ad loc.; ad fin. Op. S. Ambros. tom. ii. p. 96. E.

And so also many other fathers, for whom see Mill ad loc.
* Griesbach prefers the textus receptus, viz. χρείαις.—Mill rather inclines to prefer χρείαις, considering χρείαις probably a gloss that has crept into the text.
* "The forms extant are not reconcileable to St. Augustin's opinion, though grounded upon some appearance in the use of the Church." Added in margin in MS.
* Above, § 41.
* Quoted above, § 31. note 1.
qualities in which men depart, though all in the state of grace. Take but the court of the temple in heaven, which St. John saw in the vision of prophecy, for one of those secret store-houses, in which the saints’ souls are bestowed till the day of judgment; and the Scripture remains reconciled to itself, and to the primitive and general practice of the Church. Tertullian mistook a little, when he affirmed, that only martyrs’ souls appear there. For the twenty-four elders sit as judges with God; according as our Lord promises, that His disciples shall do, when He comes to judgment. But if they and St. John saw both the same throne: St. Paul may “be with Christ” as one of them; and St. John may say, that “when Christ appears” (or “when it appears what we shall be”), we shall see God as He is;” that is, not afore. And so the reason is plain, why the Church prayed for all, because it hath something to pray for on the behalf of all: to wit, that which the martyrs in the Revelation pray for; the vengeance of God upon the enemies of the Church, and the second coming of Christ, upon which their own consummation depends.

§ 45. What account Innocent III. Pope gives for the change of a prayer that had been used for the soul of Pope Leo, and how the divines of the Church of Rome are entangled about it, you may see in the place alleged, p. 1974. But neither had the change nor the account for it needed, had it been considered and admitted, that the resurrection shall be a benefit even to the souls of saints and martyrs, supposing that in that estate there remains nothing else to desire for them.

§ 46. And this Epiphanius also alleges against Aerius;
that, to make a difference between Christ and His saints, we
pray for them. Not that Christians need to be taught a
difference between Christ and His saints: but because the
difference between the state of our Lord Christ having re-
sumed His body [and 1] carried it into heaven in perfect hap-
piness, and the saints departed, whose happiness is not com-
plete till they resume their bodies, is the whole ground of
those prayers in reference to saints and martyrs. And the
same is signified by Epiphanius, when he saith we pray for
the dead " ώς ἐν ἀποθημεία δυτῶν"—" as yet in travel;" and
perhaps also, when he saith, " ἵνα τὸ εἰνελεύστερον σημανθῇ"
—"to signify that which is more complete."

§ 47. But shall there be therefore no difference between
the store-houses in which the apostles and martyrs, and those
in which all that depart in the state of grace, are lodged? Is
their entertainment the same, because there all rest till
the day of judgment? The martyrs’ souls in the Apoca-
lypse, praying for God’s vengeance upon the persecutors of
His Church, thereby pray for their own accomplishment.
And therefore "the Spirit and the bride saith, Come;" even
the spouse of the Lamb, the new Jerusalem, which St. John
saw "come down from heaven dressed like a bride for her
husband" (Apoc. xxi. 2); to wit, "with fine linen that
shineth, which is the righteous deeds of the saints" (Apoc.
xix. 8). This bride still prayeth for the coming of her
spouse. But I have shewed you 2 the Lamb upon mount
Sion with the hundred [and] forty four thousand that had
the Father’s Name marked upon their foreheads, which sing
not the song of triumph which the martyrs sing to their
harps, but understand it, and they only (Apoc. xiv. 1—3).
And therefore I have shewed you 3 another store-house for
souls of a lower rank, yet with the Lamb. And St. Augus-

---

1 Added from MS.
2 As above in note e.
3 Above, c. xxvii. § 9.
4 Above, c. xxvii. § 10.
BOOK III.

[Difference in the prayers made for them respectively.]

§ 48. And, therefore, if there be written copies of the Latin mass, in which the prayer for "refreshment, rest, and peace, to them that are fallen asleep in Christ," appears not; as it is alleged in that Answer, p. 196: it appears sufficiently otherwise, that the Church did pray to that effect for those that were not taken for saints and martyrs. Epiphanius® allegeth against Aeriuss, that, "because we sin all with our will or against our will," therefore the Church prayeth for remission of their sins. And perhaps, when he said, "ίνα τὸ ἐντελέστερον σημανθῇ"—"to signify that which is more complete;" he meant to distinguish the prayers which were made for saints, from those which were made for others. So the forms which you have in the Apostles' Constitutions, viii. 4[1]; and other liturgies®. So St. Cyril, Catech. v. Mystag.®, saith, that, though the Church "knit no crowns" for sinners, yet it "offereth for them Christ slain for our sins to render God propitious." And the supposed Dionysius (though he mention no prayer for saints whose names are then rehearsed before the consecration, Eccles. Hierarch., cap. iii., yet), speaking of burying the dead, cap. vii.®, he mentioneth prayer for the remission of their sins.

---

1 See above, § 42. note n.
3 As above, in § 46. note e.
4 Constit. Apost., lib. viii. c. 41 (ap. Coteler, PP. Apost., tom. i. pp. 423, 424), contains a form of prayer "pro mortuis," praying "ὅπως ἀδελφῶν, . . . διὸς ὁ Θεός . . . παρεῖδροι αὐτῶν τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἔκοσιοι καὶ ἁκοθίων, καὶ Λεως καὶ εὐμενῆς γενόμενος, κατανεῖδα ἐν ἔχον εὐσεβῶν, ἀνεμέλους ἐν λύπῃς Ἀρβαδια καὶ Ἰσαια καὶ Λα-καβί, " k. t. a.—Ibid., c. 42. (p. 424.) next forth, "τῶν δει καὶ ποιεῖ γίνεσθαι τὰ τῶν κομμηθέντων πιστῶν μισέας καὶ διὸ εἰ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς δι' εἰς παρέγγειλα κέρασις."—And lastly, ibid., c. 43 (p. 424), it is declared, that "πραγματέα περὶ Εὐσεβῶν λέγομεν τίραν τῆς ἀδελφίας, τὰ τῶν κομμήσεων δὲ πένθως, ὀδηγὴν ὑγιῆς αὐτῶν."—
7 There is no mention of prayer for saints in the account of the "Μυστή- ριον συνάξεως εἰςων κοιναίας," De Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii. (Op. Pseudo-Dionys. Areop., pp. 88. A, 89. C.), which is a summary of the service at the Eucharist; but merely, that "ἐμεταχει τῶν ἱερῶν τυχόν ἀδέσποτας ἐξελείται," immediately after the kiss of peace, and before the Euchai- ristic prayer of consecration.
8 "Ειτε προσελθὼν δ θέος λειράχθη, εὐθύς ἱεράν ἐπὶ τῷ κεκοιμημένῳ πατε- ταί καί μετὰ τὴν εὐχήν, αὐτόν τε το θεοράχθη σαφῶς, καὶ ἕξεις οἱ παροικοί ἐπάνως. Ἡ μὲν ὡς εὐχή τῆς θεοραχής ἄκοπτετο δεῖ τῶν μὲν ἀφειναι τὰ δὲ ἀναρείναι ἀνεσθείας ἡ- μαρτημένα τῷ κεκοιμημένῳ κατα τίμα
§ 49. For supposing no punishment inflicted upon any, that departeth in the state of grace; notwithstanding it is reason to suppose, that the soul remaineth affected with comfort for the present, and a cheerful expectation of her future account, or the contrary, according to the love of goodness which she contracted here. Wherefore, if the saints of God are visited either by the immediate operation of His Spirit or the ministry of angels, whereby St. Augustine conceiveth they may learn what passeth here; is it strange, that ordinary Christians, departed in the state of grace but imperfectly turned from less sins, should need the influence of God's Spirit or the visitation of the angels, to hold them up in the desire of their accomplishment and in the expectation of their trial to come? Is there any thing prejudicial to the faith in that of 2 Esd. iv. 35: "Did not the souls of the righteous ask questions of these things in their chambers, saying, How long shall I hope on this fashion? When cometh the fruit of the floor of our reward?" Is it not agreeable to reason and to faith, that they should be dissatisfied of their present comfort, and of the terrible trial to come, after the rate of that affection they had for the world, when they parted with it; and yet at rest from the temptations of it, and secure of being defeated of ending in God's grace; and yet not under any punishment inflicted by God, but only under the consequence of that disposition which they leave the world with.

§ 50. I do allege here, as for the interest of this mine [Examples of St. Ambrose and others.]

 malaysia 2x1 to 392x617
perors Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, and for his brother Satyrus; as likewise Gregory Nazianzen\(^2\) for his brother Cæsarius: whom nevertheless they suppose to be in happiness. Their words you may see there, p. 1887. To which he, that will take the pains, may add all that Blondel hath collected in his second Book of the Sibyls, cap. xli.\(^3\); of epitaphs, which pray for them whom they describe in happiness. For, in short, where there is hope that the deceased is among God’s saints, there is there doubt on the other side, that he may have need of “light and peace and refreshment.” And therefore the supposed Dionysius, Eccl. Hierarch., cap. vii.\(^4\), where he relateth the custom of praying for the remission of sins in behalf of the dead, relateth the singing of psalms of thanksgiving at funerals. And St. Augustin\(^5\) telleth, how Euodius begun the ci. psalm, when his mother was dead; yet, in consideration of the danger which every soul that dies is subject to, prayeth for her, as she had commanded: Confess. ix. 12\(^6\). In fine, though custom made not the difference every where visible between prayers for saints and prayers for ordinary Christians, yet was the common faith of the Church a sufficient ground for Holy Scripture, then “σιλάντον αетесь ἐξορίσατε, ἐξαὶ τὰν ἱερὰν καρποφόριν” S. Greg. Naz., In fun. Cæsarii, Orat. vii. § 15; Op. tom. i. p. 206. D.—“Nunc mihi Χριστος Καισάρ,” k. c. Id., ibid. § 24; p. 216. A.—See Ussher, ibid., p. 205.


\(^3\) “Ego autem jam sanato corde ab ilio vulnere in quo poterat redargui carnalis affectus, fundo Tibi, Deus noster, pro illa famula Tua: longe aliud lacrymarum genus, quod maneat de concusso spiritu consideratione periculorum omnium animarum, quæ in Adem mortit. Quamquam illa in Christo vivificata, etiam nondum a carne resoluta sin vixerit, ut laudetur nomen Tuum in siste moribusque ejus, non tamen audet dicere, ex quo eam per baptismum regenerasti, nullum verbum exisse ab ore ejus contra praecipuum Tuum,” &c. Id., ibid. c. 13. § 34. p. 169. D. E.
both; whatsoever descent private construction might make upon the plainsong of it.

§ 51. Tertullian, expecting the reign of Christians upon earth for a thousand years, and thinking those that should rise first most advantaged, took the "delay of rising again" for "paying the utmost farthing;" and to have part with them that rise first, fit to be prayed for for our friends that are dead: De Anima, cap. Ixviii.⁴; De Monog., cap. xi.⁵ But this the Church is not chargeable with.

§ 52. That there was a conceit among some licentious Christians, that the pains of the damned might either cease or be abated by the prayers of the living; you shall find by the Answer so often quoted, pp. 226—232⁴; and that All-Souls day had the beginning from such a conceit. But though men openly wicked may die in communion with the Church, yet the Church supposeth no man damned that dies in communion with the Church; and, therefore, the Church is not chargeable with prayers for the damned. It 237 is a known rule of the Church, that the offerings of those that died not in communion with the Church should not be received; that the offerings of those that die in communion with the Church could not be refused.⁶ That this rule is more ancient than the heresy of Marcion, and before Marcion, that baptized others for those that were dead, as you have seen (that is, as ancient as the apostles), appears; because the reason why they baptized others in their stead must be, because all those that were baptized were prayed for at the eucharist, and only those as you see by St. Augustin,⁷ and the canon of the mass, quoted just afore. If, then, men openly wicked died in

---

⁴ "In summa, quam carcerem illum, quem Evangelium demonstrat, inferos intelligamus; et novissimum quadratum, mediocrum quodque delictum mora resurrectione illic liendum interpretemur; nemo dubitabit animam aliquam pessare penes inferos, salva resurrectionis plenitudine, per carmem quoque." Tertull., De Anima, c. lviii. et ult.; Op. p. 307. B.—And see a similar passage, ibid. c. xxxv.; quoted above, a. xxviii. § 36. note t.

⁵ "Enim vero et pro "anima ejus" (conjugia defuncti) "orat, et refrigatorum interim adpostulat eis, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offerit annuis diebus dormitionis ejus: nam hic nisi fecerit, vere repudiavit quantum in ipso est." Id., De Monogam., c. x.; Op. p. 531. A.


⁷ Ussher, ibid., pp. 254, 255.

⁸ See Bingham, XV. ii. 2.

⁹ Above, c. xxviii. § 25.

¹ Quoted above, § 42. note o.

¹¹ Quoted above, § 43.
BOOK III.

Communion with the Church, it was because the laws of the Church were not executed; which had they been executed, they should not have died in communion with the Church. And because this inexecution may be for the common good of the Church; it was not offensive, that such were prayed for among other members of the Church. For there is possibility for the salvation of those, for whose salvation there is no presumption that is reasonable. And there had been just offence for the kindred and friends of such dead, had they been refused the common right of all members of the Church. Therefore St. Augustin says, though they that die in this case receive no help, yet they that remain alive receive some comfort and satisfaction, in the memory of their relations, being owned by the prayers of the Church for Christians.

§ 53. I will not here allege, that the Church of England teacheth to pray for the dead: where the Litany prays for deliverance "in the hour of death and in the day of judgment;" or when we pray after the communion, that "by the merits and death of Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all the whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion." But it is manifest, that in the service appointed in the time of Edward the Sixth prayer is made for the dead, both before the Communion, and at the Burial, to the same purpose as I maintain. It is manifest also, that it was changed in Queen

*See above, § 42, note p.*

The prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church in the 1st Book of Edw. VI., after giving God praise and thanks for all His saints from the beginning of the world, and chiefly for the Virgin, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, proceeds thus—"We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants which are departed from us with the sign of faith, and now rest in the sleep of peace; grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection we, and all they which be of the mystical Body of Thy Son, may all together be set on His right hand." &c.—In the Funeral Service in the same Book, instead of—"We give Thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our brother," &c.—there was a prayer running thus—"Grant unto this Thy servant, that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness; and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous," &c. Before this also were the versicles, "From the gates of hell, Deliver their souls, O Lord:" and similar prayers were inserted in one or two other places in the service.—See L'Estrange, Alliances of Divine Offices, cc. vi., x.; pp. 235, 276, 432, 456. Oxon. 1846: and the references below in note o.
Elizabeth's time, to content the Puritans; who now it appears could not be content with less than breaking of the Church in pieces.

§ 54. And, therefore, since unity hath not been obtained by parting with the law of the Catholic Church (in mine opinion) for the love of it, I continue the resolution to bound reformation by the rule of the Catholic Church: allowing, that it may be matter of reformation to restore the prayers which are made for the dead to the original sense of the whole Church; but maintaining, that to take away all prayer for the dead is not paring off abuses but cutting to the quick.

§ 55. For I must now add, that all this shews the prayers of the Church of Rome for the delivering of souls out of purgatory-pains, to have no ground in the tradition of the Church: there being no such place as purgatory among those store-houses, which are designed for those that depart in the state of grace till the day of judgment; no pain appointed to make satisfaction for the debt of temporal punishment, remaining when the sin is remitted; no translating of souls so purged from purgatory to heaven and the happiness of it. The "delay of the resurrection" may be a penalty, if you take it into the consideration of that estate in which the soul may be detained; being such, as that affection to the dross of the world, which it departeth with, enforceth. But what use is there of torment, when the race is done? When neither amendment of the party on whom it is inflicted, nor of others that see the example, can be expected; to make God torment them, whom He is reconciled to, for the satisfaction of His vindicative justice, is to make His vindicative justice delight in the evil of His creature, when no reformation is to be expected by it: which in the government of the world is cruelty, not justice. If the Law allow "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," it could never stand with Christianity under the Law to take it, where

* The alterations of the passages quoted in note n were made in the Second Book of King Edward, A.D. 1552. Queen Elizabeth merely retained them as altered. Calvin and Bucer were the persons to whose influence the change is due. See L'Estrange, Wheatly, Cardwell's Two Books of King Edward VI. &c., Keeling's Liturgie Britannice; and Bucer's own Censure &c., in his Scripta Anglicans, pp. 467, 468.
it repairs not a man’s loss; though the magistrate was to give it, being required. Civil law may allow revenge, to satisfy passion; but the magistrate grants reparation, to satisfy commutative justice, which the party may demand for mere revenge.

§ 56. That there is no ground for such punishment in the tradition of the Church, I refer you to the title of Purgatory in the Answer to the Jesuit’s Challenge for evidence. And it is indeed a thing, which the disputing of our controversies hath made to appear: that there was from the beginning no question of any punishment for them, that die in God’s grace; that St. Augustin began to make some question of it upon some disputes which he met with; that St. Gregory first professed an opinion of it, grounded upon no scripture, no nor tradition of faith, but upon apparitions and revelations; that there is great appearance, that Venerable Bede, having received it from St. Gregory’s scholars, who planted Christianity here, added much to it by his credulity in such matters; and yet that they had yet assigned no quarter in the verge of hell for this purpose, but only believed it of certain souls in some places of this earth; until the School...
hammered out a debt of punishment, to which souls, acquitted both of the guilt and stain of sin, may remain liable.

§ 57. The extending of indulgence to the voiding of this (how properly soever it may be counted purging of souls) made the position a matter of great jealousy for the interest of profit, which our common Christianity abhorreth. And indulgence indeed of canonical penance, I have shewed, hath the first ground in St. Paul's example, and necessary [2 Cor. xii. 10.] use in the Church. But when redeeming of penance was come into practice in the Church, it was granted upon considerations, [which Christianity and the safety of poor souls allowed not; of paying a rate, of taking the cross against infidels, of modern jubilees.] But that there should be a stock of merit in the Church upon account of works of supererogation done by the saints, which their own reward answered not; and that the Church, in granting indulgence of penance, may allow it to his account that receives indulgence: is a conceit, as injurious to the merits of Christ (the consideration of all pardon) and to the covenant of grace (the condition whereof it abateth), so, that hath no evidence from any rule or practice of the ancient Church. But that they should be thought to be of force to redeem souls out of purgatory; and that, taxing the time which they grant; and the like; for which neither there is nor can

* See above, c. xi. § 1.
* Above, c. x. § 18.
* Corrected from MS.: "with" in folio edition.
* "See above, c. xi. § 8, 9.
* ""Asserimus igitur non paucos sanctos homines multo plura propter Deum et justitiem esse perpessos, quam exigeret reatus poenae temporalis cui fuerunt obnoxii propter culpas ab ipsis commissis. Nam culpam ipsem et reatum poenae sempiterne non ipsorum satisfactionibus sed Christi sanguine exptari Ecclesie Catholica docet." Bellarwine, De Indulgentiis, lib. i. c. 2; Op. tom. iii. p. 1498. C. edit. Ingolst. 1601. He lays down in the chapter, that "exeat in Ecclesie thesaurus satisfactionum ex Christi passionibus infinitus, qui nunquam exsauriri poterit:" and that "ad hunc thesaurum supereffluentium satisfactionum pertinent etiam passiones B. Maris Virginis, et omnium aliorum sanctorum, qui plus passi sunt quam eorum peccata requirent:" and in c. 3, that "esse in Ecclesia potestatem applicandi thesaurum satisfactionum ac per hoc indulgentias concedendi:" An indulgence is defined by Bellarwine (ibid. c. 8. p. 1527. B) to be ""absolutio judicialis a reatu poenae Deo debite in foro pœnitentiari extra sacramentum data per applicationem satisfactionum quae thesaurum Ecclesie continentur." See also Bk. II. of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxii. § 40. note g.
* See last note.
† Bellarwine (as in note d, c. 9. pp. 1528. D, sq.) discusses the question, whether a certain duration of penance in the present life is equivalent to the same duration of purgatory pains, or to what longer, or shorter time; and decides for the last of the three proportions: starting with the assumption, that "omnes convenient, cum per indulgentias condonantur pœnitentiam ali-
be any ground: the best that is said, or can be said, in defence of them who publish them to poor people, by whom they are frequented, is, that they get themselves money, the account whereof being alms they charge themselves with; and that people are by this means employed in the works of devotion, which, if not available to the effect which they imagine, are howsoever good for their souls' health.

§ 58. As for the translating of souls to heaven before the day of judgment, it is so diametrically contrary to all antiquity, that the very naming of it takes away all pretence for tradition on behalf of purgatory.

§ 59. It is acknowledged indeed, that a number of the ancient fathers during the flourishing times of the Church do believe, that the fire which the world is to be burnt up with, as it shall involve the wicked and carry them to be everlastingly tormented in the sink of the world, so it shall touch and scorch even the saints themselves, to try if their works be such as God's vengeance can take hold of, and to purge away that dross which the love of the world they died with importeth. This is by divers called Origen's purgatory; because they conceive his credit might move St. Hilary, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, Gregory Nyssen and Nazianzen;
St. Jerome⁵, St. Augustin⁶, and St. Chrysostom⁷, with divers others⁸, to follow it. But Blondel⁹, having observed that it is found in the Sibyl’s verses, will needs have them all to have taken it up from thence. Which as I have no reason to yield to, having shewed already¹⁰, that the credit of that


Ussher, Answ. &c. c. vii. pp. 246—249, quotes several passages of S. Chrysostom, to shew him to have held “a private concept, intertayed by diversity (as well of the elder as of middle times) in their devotions for the dead;” viz. “that an augmentation of glory might thereby be procured for the saints, and either a total deliverance, or a diminution of torment at least wise, obtained for the wicked.” But neither does Blondel cite him, nor the other authors referred to above in note g, as symbolizing with Origen’s doctrine; nor does Bellarmine quote one single passage from him containing an allusion to a “purifying fire.”—See also Sextus Senensis, Biblioth. Sanct. lib. vi. Annot. 264. pp. 528, 529.

Irenæus, Lactantius, and some others, are cited by Blondel, Des Sibylles, liv. ii. c. 10. pp. 174—179; and by Ussher as above in note g; besides the fathers quoted in the preceding notes.

Blondel, Des Sibylles, liv. ii. c. 23. pp. 228, sq.

Above, §§ 39, 40.
book was not the foundation of other particular opinions which had vogue in the Church; so do I not find those famous doctors so affected to Origen (whose writings concerning the exposition of the Scriptures they were necessarily obliged to frequent), as to admit an opinion so near concerning the faith upon his recommendation, on whom they declare so much jealousy in matter of faith. For my part, as I find it very agreeable to the words of St. Paul, when he saith, that they, whose “works are burnt” up, “shall escape themselves, but as through fire;” so, how men’s works should be “tried” or “burnt” up by that fire, I find it not easy to be understood. And therefore (without taking upon me to censure so great persons for innovating in the Church, or to maintain that, in which there is no concurrence of any Scripture with any consent of the whole Church) I leave the truth of this to judgment, as secure that it will not concern the common faith.

§ 60. But this I say peremptorily, that, admitting it, there remains no pretence for purgatory in the tradition of the Church; unless it be by equivocation of words. For this, coming to pass at the day of judgment, admitth no release before; and without release before, purgatory-fire goes quite out: no indulgences, no jubilees, no stock of merit to be dispensed by the Church, no such works of devotion as it limiteth, can be of any request, if they take not effect afore the day of judgment.

§ 61. Take away the opinion of translating souls from the verge of hell, which [is?] purgatory, to the sight of God; and the clergy of the Church of Rome shall no more “eat the sins of the people,” as the prophet complains of the priests under the Law. For while the people are persuaded, that their sins are cured by the sentence of absolution once pronounced, penance serving only to extinguish the debt of temporal punishment remaining, and that to be ransomed by the services which they pay for in the name of their friends which are dead; the clergy live by those sins, of which the people die, because they are not duly cured. For, the lusts for which men sin not being cured by that hardship of penance,
which the case requireth, to change attrition into contrition, the guilt of sin remains upon the head of him in whose heart the love of sin remains alive; notwithstanding the keys of the Church, mistaking in that case.

§ 62. Besides, take away the opinion of translating souls from hell to heaven since the coming of Christ, and there will remain no ground for the translating of the fathers' souls from the verge of hell (which is limbus patrum) to the sight of God by the descent of our Lord into hell and His rising from the dead again; there will be no cause, why that reason, which I tender for that variety of imaginations (rather than opinions or belief) in the fathers, which that which all agree in is entangled with, should not be admitted. For, the translating of Christian souls from purgatory to heaven not being believed, why should the translating [of a] the fathers' souls remain? why should not the simple faith, in which all Christians agree, revive, and take the place of tradition in the Church, which indeed it hath—that between death and the day of judgment the good are in joy, the bad in pain, both incomplete; till both be fulfilled, after both shall have received their final doom.

CHAPTER XXX. b


Now to come to the reason, for which ceremonies are to be used in the public service of God: I must here rest in that, which I have rendered in my book of the Service of God at the Assemblies of the Church; being satisfied, that it pointeth at the very ground for the use of them from the beginning among God's people. Man is compounded of soul and body: and the worship of God, and prayer to God, is an act of the soul; which the body by the senses thereof

---

* See above, c. xi. § 4.  
* Added from MS.  
* Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. ix. And see also Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 30, sq.  

---
may divert the mind from, but cannot help it forwards, till by the motion and gesture of the body the soul be engaged to attend on that which the mind proposeth.

§ 2. Therefore the people of God in the Scripture pray always either standing or kneeling, unless some special cause move them to prostrate themselves. That their ordinary posture was standing, appears by Matt. vi. 5, Mark xi. 25, Luke xviii. 11; Neh. ix. 5, Jerem. xv. 1, xviii. 20; Job xxx. 20. And they have reason, who derive the “stations” of the primitive Christians, and the use of not kneeling on Lord’s days and between Easter and Whitsuntide, from their custom. But therefore they kneeled in Lent, and Daniel kneeled when he fasted, ix. 20; and Moses fell prostrate before God, Deut. ix. 18, 25: but Esdras upon his knees, Esd. ix. 5, x. 1: as Daniel also, [vi. 10*]. To what purpose, but to cast down the mind by the posture of the body, that, being sensible of his wants, a man may attend upon God with deeper devotion and reverence? The publican “durst not lift up his eyes to heaven;” Luke xviii. 13: which shews, that otherwise they did “lift up their eyes, and spread their hands to heaven;” as Lam. iii. 41, 1 Kings vii. 54, 1 Tim. ii. 8. But the publican “smote upon his breast,” because he exacted pittance of himself. He was a fool for his pains, if that be reformation which is pretended: to claim familiarity with Almighty God by talking with Him negligently, to

---

4 “Stantes orabant Judaei, nisi lucet semper judicis. Vide Danielem ix. 20. Imitati hoc Christiani: nam in Quadragesima... orabant in genibus; diebus Dominicis et in Pentecoste, id est, totis quinuaginta diebus post Pascha, non nisi stantes, ut docet Tertullianus de Cor. Mil.” &c. “Statis igitur... receptissimum orandi modum significat... Atque ita vocem stationis usu quam tum Christiani veteres,” &c. Grot., ad Matth. vi. 5.—L’Estrange, Alliance, &c., c. iv. Annot. F. pp. 158, sq., answers him.—Whether the stations were so called from the posture of standing, or from their being fixed and standing days, or from the analogy of military stations; see Pamel. ad Tertull. De Orat. c. xiv., et ad S. Cyprian. Epist. xii. num. 10; Albaspineus, Observ. De Vet. Eccl. Ritibus, lib. i. Observ. 16. pp. 108, sq.; Petavius, Animad. ad S. Epiph. Expos. Fidei, in fin. Op. S. Epiph. and Du Fresne, and Hoffmann, and Spelman, Gloss. Arch. ed. in voce. The word was applied in two opposite senses, to the Wednesday and Friday fasting, and to the assembling for worship upon Sundays at particular churches. Thormeke refers to the latter use of it, as (probably) in S. Cyprian, Epist. xiv. (xii. ed. Pamel.) Ad Cornelium; Epist. p. 85: and Tertull., Ad Uxor., lib. ii. c. 4; Op. p. 168. D.

* See Grotius, as in last note.

† This reference, which is borrowed from Grotius, is corrected in MS. into Dan. vi. 10, which speaks of Daniel's kneeling when he prayed: ix. 20, speaks of his fasting, but does not mention his posture in prayer.

‡ The reference in the folio edition is to vii. 11: which is an evident mistake, apparently for the passage substituted above.

§ Corrected from MS. “deep” in folio edition.
signify that we are sure of Him, having faith that we are predestinate to life, as of the number of those for whom Christ died exclusively to the rest of mankind; or if it be reformation to sit and censure, with how fit and pertinent conceptions, in how proper and choice terms, a man expresses his necessities and the necessities of his people to God. But praying to God is something else than all this; and not only the ancient people of God, but those who have no sense of religion but that which nature forceth them to, shew us by their practice, that lowliness of the body stirreth as well as testifieth reverence in the mind to God in His service. All this holdeth, taking a man by himself as a single Christian. But supposing the society of a Church, and an assembly of God’s people for His service, there is more to be said.

§ 3. The people of God spoke much by visible signs, not all by words. Jeremy might have said to them of Jerusalem, Take example by the Rechabites, who drink no wine upon the order of their patriarch: but that was not enough; he must bring them to the temple, and set wine before them, that, having formally refused it, he might thereupon protest to his people. The same Jeremy might have told the Jews, as St. Paul doth the Romans, that men are as clay in the potter’s hands, without going down to the potter’s and seeing him spoil a vessel that he was making, that he might thereupon take his rise and say, that God was framing evil against them whom He had made (Jer. xviii. 1—5); without buying an earthen vessel and breaking it before the ancients of the people and of the priests, to tell them that God would break them likewise (Jer. xix. 1, 11, 12). When he makes all that business on purpose, he shews, what force visible signs have to make impression upon the mind of that, which words signify nevertheless. The Law would never have appointed to sit still on the sabbath in remembrance of the creation of the world, or the deliverance from Egypt; to carry a bundle of branches in the hand, and to dwell in booths, in remembrance of the voyage through the wilderness otherwise. And is not this reason fit to be applied to the assemblies of Christians? Witness the prophet Joel. Why must they “weep” and “mourn” with their “fasting?” why must “the children and sucklings” assemble? why
must the joy of the bride-chamber be superseded? but to make impression of sorrow upon particulars, from that which the public expresseth: Joel ii. 12—16. The people of Nineveh and the king thereof put on sackcloth and sat in ashes, nor man nor beast must taste food or drink water, at the preaching of Jonas; iii. 5—7. On the contrary, at the bringing of the ark into the city of David (1 Chron. xiii. 8, xv. 28): “They have seen thy goings, O God, even the goings of my God, my King, into the sanctuary; the singers went before, those that played on instruments followed, amongst them were the damsels playing on timbrels.” And the solemnity, which the wall of Jerusalem was dedicated with, you may read in Nehem. xii. 27—43.

§ 4. The festival of our Lord’s resurrection presupposeth the fast of the passion, and makes all the Lord’s days of the year festival by renewing weekly that joy which it solemnizeth. The fast, which goeth before it by the institution of the apostles (agreeing in it, because not agreeing when it should end), in Tertullian’s time was enlarged to those days, on which “the Bridegroom was missing,” but by just use of the Church’s power is enlarged to forty days. Shall it be superstitious for the Church to profess solemn penance and mourning for that time, which gained the Ninevites that grace, which the gospel tendereth the Gentiles that repeat according to their example? If it be reformation to abolish all ceremonies, let it be reformation for God’s people to understand no difference between a humiliation and a thanksgiving.

§ 5. St. Paul disputeth hard, that the women of Corinth ought to be veiled, the men unveiled: not for any consideration of reverence to God, which the uncovering of the head did not signify in those times, but to signify the humility and modesty of the sex; which, had he spoken of serving God in private, he need not have stood upon, and, therefore, in regard to the Church. Which if it be true, if consideration ought to be had of the Church in celebrating the service of God at the assemblies thereof; then it is

---

1 See above, c. xxi. § 32—36.
2 See ibid., § 32, note x.
3 See ibid., § 32, 33, 36.
4 "Ob pudorem sexus," &c. "Nihil hoc pertinet mos Septentrionis in reverentiam signum capita nudandi, qui quanquam per Germanicas nationes late manavit, et Judaeis tamen et Graecis et veteri Italiæ fuit incognitus." Grot., ad 1 Cor. xi. 2.—See also Estius ad 1 Cor. xi. 4.
requisite, that, when the world is come into the Church and all assemble, those ceremonies should be used, which were not requisite when the numbers were small and the assemblies thereof thin.

§ 6. That the ministers of the Church should perform the service thereof in their ordinary apparel, when they minis-
tered it in grots and caves to a few, I marvel not, but count it reasonable. That when all assemble, wheat and chaff, good fish and bad, all should be summoned to that apprehension of the work in hand, which our common Christianity enforceth, by the habit in which it is ministered; it seemeth to me very unreasonable, that any man should marvel.

§ 7. Imposition of hands is necessarily an act of authority. Boaz may say to the reapers, “The Lord be with you,” and they answer him, “The Lord bless thee” (Ruth ii. 4); they may bless him, as well as he them: and as the priest saith to the people, “The Lord be with you,” so may they to him, “And with thy spirit;” where there is nothing but matter of common charity in hand. But if Abraham pay Melchisedec tithes, acknowledging his superiority; and Melchisedec thereupon bless Abraham: then the saying of the apostle, Hebr. vii. 7,—“Without question the less is blessed by the greater;”—takes place. Of this kind is Jacob’s blessing his nephews by laying his hands on their heads, Moses his blessing of Joshua, the priests’ blessing of the people. The Israelites’ laying hands on the Levites, Numb. viii. 10, seems rather to signify the charging of the sins of the congregation upon them, that by them they might be expiated, according to the Law. But our Lord lays hands on the little children whom He blesses; and His apostles lay hands on them whom they cure, Mark xvi. 18: as Naaman [2 Kings v. 11.] thought, that Elizeus would have laid hands on him, praying for him. So our Lord “lifts up His hands” over His discip-
ceplies to bless them, because He could not lay hands on them all. The apostles’ laying hands on the seven, Acts vi. 6, and the imposing of the hands of the presbytery, 1 Tim. iv. 14, signifieth the authority that enchargeth them with their office. And it is strange, that any man

* See Bingham, XIII. viii. 1, 2.
pretending learning can attribute the ordinations made by Paul and Barnabas (Acts xiv. 23) to the votes of the people, signified by holding up their hands: the act of constituting them being expressly ascribed to Paul and Barnabas; and, therefore, by imposition of their hands, not by holding up the people’s hands. Imposition of hands therefore, as it is used by the Church, succeeding the apostles in that use, signifieth that authority, [with a] which the Church blesseth, or prayeth for blessing, in behalf of those whom she presumeth to be qualified for the blessings, which by so blessing she prays for at God’s hands.

§ 8. I am not to forget the sign of the cross: though a ceremony, which I cannot say the Church hath either precept or precedent for in the Scripture; having prescribed, that there is no presumption that it cometh not from the apostles, because no mention of it in Scripture. Justin the Martyr mentioning the use of it, Tertullian and St. Basil testifying that it was common to all Christians, all times, all parts of the Church whereof there is remembrance, using it: choose, whether you will have St. Paul (when he saith, “In Whom we were sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise,” Eph. i. 13; and again, “By Whom ye are sealed to the day of redemption,” Eph. iv. 30) to intimate, that the Holy Ghost was given by baptism, which was solemnized by signing with the sign of the cross; or that the Church took occasion upon those words to appoint that ceremony to be used in baptizing: it will nevertheless remain grounded, that the use of it on all occasions, in all times, over all parts of the Church, is to be ascribed to the apostles. And, certainly,
there are many occasions for a Christian to have recourse to God for His grace upon protestation of his Christianity (which is the condition upon which all grace of God becomes due), when there is neither time nor opportunity to recollect his mind unto a formal address by praying to God; all which this ceremony fitly signifieth. What then if it be used by those, who bethink not themselves at all of that Christianity, by which alone we may expect any benefit of Christ's cross? who may seem to hold their Christianity needless, promising themselves the benefit of it by the opus operatum of making a sign of the cross? Does this hinder any man to use it as it ought to be used? Does it prejudice him that so uses it? I will not say, that there cannot nor did not consist any reformation in laying this ceremony aside. But I will say, as of prayers for the dead; we know well enough, whom there was a desire to content, when this ceremony in the eucharist was laid aside under Queen Elizabeth, having been prescribed under Edward VI.: which seeing it hath not served the turn, but that the unity of the Church is dissolved, and so much more demanded of them that would be thought reformed (if yet any man can say what is demanded); I think myself obliged to maintain in this point as in all the rest, that the reformation of the Church consists not in abolishing but in renewing and restoring the orders of the Catholic Church and the right intent of the same. He, that will take the pains to add hereto that which I have said in the place quoted afore, shall comprehend the reasons, upon which I remain satisfied in this whole point; seeing there is no cause, why I should either recede from any part of it or repeat it here again.

§ 9. That which remaineth for this place, is the consideration of the nature and number of the sacraments: which being essentially ceremonies of God's service, the right resolution of the controversy concerning it must needs consist in distinguishing the grounds, upon which, and the intents, to which they are instituted; the difference whereof must make [That which remaineth, is of the nature and number of the sacraments.]

* "Protestation of Christianity, recourse to God, want of opportunity to pray." Added in margin in MS.
* Above, c. xxix. § 53, 54.
* The omission was made in the second Book of Edw. VI.: see Card-well's Two Books of Kg. Edw., and Keeling's Liturgiae Britannicae. And through Bucer's influence: Censura, &c., in Bucer's Scripta Anglicana, p. 472.
* See above, § 1. note c.
Of the laws of the Church.

III.

Of the equivocation of the word sacrament in the fathers.

§ 10. And, truly, of all the controversies which the Reformation hath occasioned, I see not less reason for either side to stand upon their terms, than in this; which stands upon the term of a sacrament, being not found in the Scriptures; attributed either to seven or to two. For being taken up by the Church, that is to say, by those writers whom the Church alloweth and honoureth; what reason can deny the Church liberty to attribute it to any thing, which the power given the Church enableth it to appoint and to use for the obtaining of God's blessing upon Christians? Why should not any action, appointed by the Church to obtain God's sanctifying grace by virtue of any promise which the gospel containeth, be counted a sacrament? At least, supposing it to consist in a ceremony fit to signify the blessing which it pretendeth to procure.

§ 11. For it is manifest, that baptism also and the eucharist are ceremonies, signifying visibly that invisible grace, wherewith God sanctifieth Christians. But there will be therefore no consequence, that baptism and the eucharist should be counted sacraments for the same reason and in the same nature and kind, for which any thing else is or can be counted a sacrament; no, not though they may all in their proper sense be truly called sacraments of the Church, because the dispensing of them all is trusted with the Church. For baptism, by the premisses, enters a man into the covenant of grace, as the visible solemnity whereby it is contracted with the Church in behalf of God; which, unless in case of peremptory necessity, cannot be invisibly contracted. So it entitleth to all the promises, which the gospel pretendeth. And so also doth the eucharist, being the visible ceremony which God hath appointed for the

---

4 "Apud Catholicos, qui fatentur matrimonium esse sacramentum proprium dictum, probamus nomen sacramenti esse in Scripturis, non solum in genere, sed etiam in specie, id est, ut significat res illas septem quas propriae sacramenta vocamus. Ali autem apostolus ad Ephes. v. &c. "Apud haeresicos autem . . . possumus ex Scripturis ostendere nomen sacramenti, ut est nomen genericum, et commune ad nostrae septem sacramenta et alias res quasdam; nimium ut significat signum rei sacrae vel arcane." Bellarm., De Sacram. in Genere, lib. i. c. 7; Controv. tom. ii. pp. 19. C, 20. A: speaking of course of the word "μυστήριον," assumed to be equivalent to "sacramentum." —See also Du Fresne, sub voc. Sacramentum: and Peter Lombard, Sent., P. iv. dist. i. B.
newing of it and of our profession to stand in it, and to ex-
pect the promises which the gospel pretendeth, upon suppo-
sition of the condition which it requireth, not otherwise.
And, truly, the Flesh and Blood of Christ, mystically re-
ceived by our bodies, necessarily importeth His Spirit re-
ceived by our souls, supposing them qualified as the gospel
requireth; and in and by the Spirit, whatsoever is requisite
to enable a Christian to perform his race here or to assure
him of his reward in the world to come. And yet the ne-
cessity thereof not so undispensable, but that, supposing a
man cannot obtain the communion thereof from the Church
but by violating that Christianity which it sealeth, neither
can a man obtain it by the sacrament, nor without the sacra-
ment need he fail of it; that is, standing to his Christianity
as well in all other things, as in not transgressing his Chris-
tianity for communion in the eucharist with the Church.
And this is the case of those, which are unjustly excommu-
nicate: seeing, in matters indifferent, he that yields not to
the Church, that is, to them who have the just power to con-
clude the Church (when they judge it for the common good
for him to do that, which otherwise he is not obliged to do),
must needs seem justly excommunicable. So these two
sacraments have the promise of grace absolutely so called,
that is, of all the grace which the gospel promiseth: which
it is to be acknowledged and maintained, that no other of
those actions, that are or may be called sacraments of the
Church, doth or can do upon the like terms as they do.

§ 12. For of a truth it is granted, that both these sacra-
ments are actions, and consist in the action, whereby they
are either prepared or used; though with so much difference
between the two. For baptism is, of necessity, an action
that passes with the doing of it: whereas, in the eucharist,
there is one thing done in the preparing, another in the
using of it; insomuch that the effect of consecrating it
(which I suppose here to be signified in the Scriptures, as
well as the most ancient of the fathers, by the name of
eucharistia or thanksgiving *) remains upon the thing con-
sacrared, so that the bread and the wine over which God was
praised and thanked are metonymically called the eucharist;

* See above, c. iv. § 7, sq.; and c. xxiii. § 1.
and yet, in regard the consecration in reason tends to the use of receiving it, and that the Church is not trusted or enabled to do it with effect but to that intent, the total of both is necessarily understood by the name of that sacrament. For supposing the ancient Church might have cause to allow the use of receiving this sacrament to them, who were not present in body though in spirit at the celebrating of it (which I for my part in point of charity find myself bound to suppose, even when I am not able to allege any reason why myself would have done the same in the same case); so long as, by reasonable construction, which the practice of the Church alloweth or groundeth, the consecration tendeth to the use of receiving, it is reasonably called the sacrament or the eucharist in order to that use. If it be consecrated to any other intent, either expressed or enforced by construction of reason upon the practice of the Church; such practice bordering upon sacrilege in the abuse of the sacrament, the Church hath nothing to do to answer for it. Nor is it my meaning, that the sacrament of baptism or the eucharist doth or can consist in the outward action of washing of the body, or of praying over the elements and reciting the institution of our Lord. It is true, the very bodily action were able in a great part to interpret the intent of doing it to those, who are already Christians and know what Christianity requireth. But seeing that can never be enough, much less always; it is necessary, that the intent be declared by certain words signifying it. But those words, with the bodily action which they interpret, will by this discourse concur to make but one part of the sacrament; which, containing the solemnizing of the covenant of grace, will necessarily contain that which all this signifieth, of invisible and spiritual grace, conveyed to those, who are qualified for it, by that which is said and done, in virtue of God's promise. He, that will speak properly of these two sacraments, must make the matter of them to consist in one of these two parts: the form of them being (not the signification, which is the same in all ceremonies, but) the promise, which tieth to them the whole effect of the covenant of grace; to which purpose

* See above, c. xxiv. § 21. notes n.  
* Corrected from MS.: “these” in t. s.
it were well if the world would understand them to be seals of it.

§ 13. This createth a vast difference between these two, and any of the rest, which are called sacraments: which whether the council of Trent sufficiently express, by providing an anathema for those, "who shall say, that the seven sacraments are so equal one to the other that none is more worthy than another" (Sess. vii. can. iii.), or not; let them look to it, I dispute not. Thus much we see; a difference is hereby acknowledged. But the difference is vast in this regard, that, whereas both these sacraments take effect in consideration of every particular man's Christianity and the promises annexed to that end, the rest, all of them, take effect in consideration of the communion of the Church, and that which it is able to contribute towards the effect of grace; which necessarily consists in that, which the Church is able to contribute towards the effecting of that disposition, which qualifieth for it. So, whereas these two immediately bring forth God's grace, as instruments of His promise, by His appointment; the rest must obtain it by the means of God's Church, and the blessing annexed to communion with it. He, that believeth not God's Church, in the nature of a society grounded upon profession of the true faith and consisting in that communion which separateth it not from the whole, may promise himself the benefit of his baptism and of the eucharist (whomsoever he communicateth with), professing himself a Christian. He, who believeth every Church to be a part of the whole Church, as he must acknowledge it requisite to the effect of baptism and the eucharist, that they be ministered neither by heretics nor schismatics, so must he attribute the effect of the rest to the foundation of

Bellarmine (De Sacram. in Gen., lib. i. c. 18. Controv. tom. ii. pp. 67. D, 68. B) distinguishes the various opinions of the School, and in his own communion, thus—"Prima est quorundam recentiorum, qui volunt propriis in sacramentis materiam et formam non esse res et verba, sed rem sensibilem esse materiam, sive sit sive verbum sive utrumque, significationem autem esse formam. Quod vero communiter dicitur, rem in sacramento esse materiam, verbum esse formam, volunt explicandum esse de sacramento materialiter. Ista docet Dominicus a Soto."


the Church; the prayers whereof God by founding it hath promised to hear, being made according to that Christianity which the foundation thereof supposeth.

§ 14. Let us consider, whether extreme unction may be or must be counted a sacrament upon these terms, or not; for if that, what question will remain of the rest? I conceive I have observed that, which is very pertinent to the consideration of all the rest, in shewing that they are the solemnities, wherewith some acts of that public authority is exercised, which the Church hath in respect of the members of it. Only, in the unction of the sick I have not found any act of authority, distinct from that power of the keys, whereby in extremity all are admitted to the communion of the eucharist in hope of God's mercy; acknowledging the debt of that penance remaining, if they survive, which must qualify them for it in the judgment of the Church. And the promise of forgiveness of sins annexed to it, I have found to suppose that contrition, which undertaketh the same in case a man survive. Which notwithstanding, whosoever acknowledges the Church, cannot think the prayers of the Church needless in such an exigent.

§ 15. But as for the ceremony of anointing with oil, I have found it in the premisses to concern the recovery of bodily health, by the practice of all ages that are found to have used it; though not pretending miraculous graces of curing diseases, extant in the primitive times, but only that confidence which God's general promise to the Church grounded, of hearing the prayers thereof even for temporal blessings, so far as the exception to it which Christianity maketh shall allow.

§ 16. It was thought fit to lay aside this ceremony at the Reformation, lest the Church should seem to pretend a pro-

---

² See above, cc. i. § 1, ix. § 1, xiii. § 1; and references below in § 18. note a.

¹ See above, c. ix. § 21, 32: and c. xii. § 4.

≈ See above, c. ix. § 17, 28.

≈ See above, c. xii. § 11—24.

≈ "If we anoint not with the oil, it is because we doubt, whether it be lawful to continue that extraordinary and miraculous custom, that was well used in St. James's time." Additional notes by Bp. Cosin &c., at the end of Nicholls on the Common Prayer Book, p. 62. a.—In the Order for the Visitation of the Sick in the first book of Edw. VI. were a rubric and prayer to the following effect—"If the sick person desire to be anointed, then shall the priest anoint him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross, and saying, As with this visible oil
mise, the effect whereof being temporal and visible could not
be made to appear; which might seem a disparagement to
our common Christianity. But there have not wanted doc-
tors of the Reformation, Bucer\(^\text{9}\) by name, that have acknow-
ledged,—nor will any man of a peaceable judgment make
question,—that the ceremony might have been retained at
the visitation of the sick; which he that would have the
Church lay aside, because the Church of Rome useth this
ceremony at it, he would have the Church be no Church,
because the Church of Rome is one. For as the office of
the Church can never be more necessary, than in that extremity,
to procure that disposition qualifying for pardon, which then
it is not too late to procure; so can no ceremony be fitter
than anointing with oil, to signify that health of body, which
the Church cheerfully prayeth for on behalf of them whom
she promiseth remission of sin, [and] that health of mind,
which the present agony so peremptorily requireth. Sup-
posing then the constitution of the Church such, that the
ministry thereof must needs be thought sufficient means to

thy body outwardly is anointed, so
our heavenly Father, Almighty God,
grant of His infinite goodness that thy
soul inwardly may be anointed with
the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of
all comfort, and gladness: and vouchsafe for His great
mercy (if it be His blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health
and strength to serve Him,” &c.—
These were omitted in the 2nd Book
of Edw. VI.; and on the suggestion of
Bucer. See next note; and L'Estrange,
Alliance of Div. Off., c. x. pp. 422,
449.

\(^9\) “Hæc autem in unionem istam
quæ vulgo fit fiducia venialilia peccata
tollendi ex opere operato, ut loquuntur,
et quoslibet similis ritus, ita dicta voce,
ut tam eminim dammem, siquæ ut
veteres sancti patres aliquid hujusmodi
ceremoniarum ex vera thy bodily health
ad commonefaciendum tantum gratie
Christi usurpant; ut siquæ salutem
ægrotantis a Domino orantes, uugerent
eos, ad commonefaciendum illos, Do-
minum, si Ei credant, eos uenguento
Spiritus Sui sic uncturum, ut aut morbo
leventur, aut certam ex ipso etiam
morbo salutem percepturi sint. Ita si
inusgatur qui hoc munere fungit de-
bet, quo magis de uctione Spiritus
Sancti sollicitus sit, eamque fortius spe-
ret, si vocacioni suæ bona fide inser-
vit; nihil ineit huic ceremonie quod
impietatis damnes.” Bucer, Enarr. in
Matth. ad c. x. v. 7; p. 97. b, fol.
Paris. 1553.—But in his Censura super
Libro Sacrorum, &c. in Regno Angliae
(Scripta Anglicana, p.489), Bucer urges
the discontinuance of the rite of extreme
unction:—“ Consat enim ritum hunc
 nec vetustum nec ullo Dei praefecto
vel laudato sanctorurn exemplo com-
 mendatum; sed præpostera inventum
apostolici facti imitatione: cujas imi-
tationis ministri vulgo non habent nec
mandatum nec facultatem: apostoli
ægrotos uctione ex oleo sanabunt; .
aeque de hujusmodi uctione symbolo
sationis, quæ Divina vi administratu-
batur ab apostolis,” &c., “loqui Jacob-
bum in sua Epistola, ex ipsiusmet
verbis abunde constat:” for all which
reasons “optarem hunc ritum aboleri.”
And accordingly in the Latin form of
Liturgy prefixed to the Censura (ibid.
p. 446, sq.), no uction occurs in the
form for Visitation of the Sick. So
also (ibid., p. 478) of the chизм of
baptism: which, with the white dress,
he would prefer, “sublatis quam re-
tenta; si autem retineri omnino con-
tingat, opto ut salutaris eorum usus
quam diligetissime doceat et ur-
geatur.”

3 c 2
procure salvation for the members of it; and, then, supposing
the Church so constituted enjoin prayer to be made for the
sick, to whose reconciliation the keys thereof are applied,
anointing them with oil to signify that health of body and
mind which is prayed for: so far am I from dividing the
Church in that regard, that I acknowledge it may be very
well counted one of the sacraments of the Church in that
case; to wit, as a ceremony appointed by the Church, signi-
ifying that health, which the Church, rightly using the power
which it is trusted with, appointeth to be prayed for in that
case.

§ 17. To prove marriage to be a sacrament, it is well known
how the text of St. Paul is alleged, Ephes. v. 32, "Sacra-
mentum hoc magnum est"—"This is a great mystery, but I
mean concerning Christ and the Church." But St. Paul
saith not, that the marriage of Christians is a sacrament, but
that the marriage of Adam and Eve was a great mystery: as
indeed it was, if the apostle say true, that it figured the mar-
rriage of our Lord Christ with, His Church; and that there-
fore the woman was taken out of the man, as Christians are
the limbs of Christ; and therefore wives are to be subject to
their husbands, as the Church to Christ. True it is, that—see-
ing marriage in paradise was made an inseparable conjunction
of one with one, with an intent, that it should figure the in-
separable conjunction between our Lord Christ and the con-
gregation of them, whom He foreseth that they shall perse-
vere,—in that regard the marriage of Christians also, being by
our Lord reformed to the first institution of paradise, cannot
choose but signify the same, though now in being; whereas
the marriage of Adam was a mystery foresignifying the same
to be. But supposing all this, and not supposing an order in
the Church for the blessing of marriage, as a solemnity pre-
scribed by the Church; I know not, whether there could
be cause to reckon marriage among the sacraments of the
Church, all the rest which pretend to that quality, being

a E. g. "Quod igitur ad secundum
attinet, matrimoniwm signum esse rei
sacrae et proinde non civilem contrac-
tum solum sed etiam mysterium quod-
dam et sacramentum, probamus ex c. v.
Epiat. ad Ephesios; 'Sacramentum
hoc magnum est; ego autem dico in
Christo et in Ecclesia.'" Bellarm.,
De Matrim. Sacram., lib. i. c. 2; Con-
trov. tom. ii. p. 1544. B.—And see
Sanchez, De Matrimonio, lib. ii. Disp.
4. tom. i. p. 139; and Romanist con-
troversialists generally. But see on the
other side, Erasmus ad Ephes. v. 32.
* Corrected from MS.: "for signi-
offices of the Church to be performed with some solemnity. 

Whereas, supposing something peculiar to the marriage of Christians, in regard whereof it is to be celebrated with the solemn blessing of the Church, there is no cause, why under the equivocation premised it may not be counted among the sacraments of the Church.

§ 18. For is there any question to be made, that Christians—submitting themselves to marry according to the law of Christ, with an intent not only to keep faith to one another, according to that which is between Christ and His Church, but to breed children for the Church, and so submitting unto the Church, and those limits wherewith the Church boundeth the exercise of God’s law for maintaining of unity in the Church,—may promise themselves the effect of that blessing which the Church joins them with? Supposing them qualified for the common blessings of Christians, and the Church formed by God with a promise of His blessings; what doubt can be made, that the blessing shall have effect, which the Church joins them with? But what assurance can be had of the effect of that blessing without it, supposing the Church, and supposing the blessing of marriage appointed by the Church? I have shewed the ground, whereupon the allowance of marriage among Christians is necessarily part of the interest of the Church. I have shewed, that in ordination, in confirmation, in penance (as well as in baptism and in the eucharist), the Church exerciseth some power and authority, which she is trusted with by God. The blessing of marriage, what is it, but the mark of that authority in allowing the marriages of Christians, which the Church thereby exerciseth?

§ 19. If Ignatius and Tertullian require the consent of the Church to the marriages of Christians, it must needs be
inferred from thence, that this consent was declared by the blessing of the Church: as the power of ordaining and the power of absolving is exercised with blessing, that is, praying for those that are ordained or absolved. Tertullian saith further, that marriage was confirmed by an eucharist, and sealed [with*] blessing. And Clemens Alexandrinus, Pedag. iii. 1, complaining of her that wore not her own hair, that the priest laying hands on her blessed not her but somebody’s hair besides; what blessing should he speak of but the blessing of marriage? The epistle of Syricius to Himerius bishop of Tarraconae mentions it; and so doth the fourth synod of Carthage, can. xiii. 4; likewise Innocent I. Pope, Epist. [ix.], Ad [Probum] 6; and St. Basil, In Hexaem. hom. vii. 7. Nor can any exception be made to the generality of it.

§ 20. But if there could, there would nevertheless lie no manner of exception against the power of the Church in appointing of it, or the reason why the Church should appoint it; supposing the premisses. And the experience of so much abuse as hath been committed of late years (the same man or woman marrying two brothers or sisters successively, the one party marrying the other being alive, men marrying other men’s wives, through the neglect of lawful impediments for example)—the experience, I say, of abuses, that have succeeded by leaving people free to marry without the blessing of the Church, is enough to demonstrate the necessity

---

* "Unde sufficiamus ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod conciliat Ecclesia, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignat benedictio; angeli renuntiant, Pater rate habet!" Tertull., Ad Uxor., lib. ii. c. 8; Op. pp. 171. C. 172. A.
  Misprinted “which” in folio edition.

b "Τίνι γάρ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐπιτίθησι χείρα; τίνα δὲ ἐυλογηθείς; οὐ τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν κοιτασμένην, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀλτοτριάς τρίχας, καὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἄλλην κεφαλήν." S. Clem. Alex., Pedag., lib. iii. c. 11; Op. tom. i. p. 291.

e "Illa benedictio, quam nuptiam sacerdos imponit, apud fideles cujusdam sacrilegiis instar est, si ella transgressione violetur." Siricius Papa, Epist. i. Ad Himerium Tarraconenses, § 4 (A.D. 385); ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 1019. A.


See Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. viii. § 12. note r; and Gauden’s Pristine Sanctity and Solem-
thereof, as supposing the allowance of the marriage. And, therefore, the solemnity of blessing marriage,—intimating a supposition, that it is intended for an inseparable conjunction of one with one (as is that of our Lord Christ with His Church), and that with due submission to the rules of the Church, from the prayers whereof the blessing is expected,—may well be called the sacrament of marriage: as containing a ceremony, signifying that spiritual grace of living like Christians in the state of wedlock, for which it signifieth the parties to be qualified; and tending to obtain the same by virtue of that promise, which the foundation of the Church warranteth the effect of her prayers with.

§ 21. Consider now, that the sacrament of baptism, though it qualifieth for the promises of the gospel, yet supposing the unity of the Church, out of which the Spirit of God breatheth not: that every Church is the congregation of Christians, that is contained in that place which is the chief seat of that Church, and the territory of it, subject to the bishop and clergy of the same: that whosoever is necessarily to minister baptism, is not always able to make him whom he baptizeth a member of the Church; as in case of heresy and schism, the baptism whereof the Church alloweth to stand good, but without effect of Christ's promise. For he that considers these things will find reason to grant, that, the consent of the bishop being requisite to make any man a member of his Church according to such terms as the rules of the whole Church shall limit, the allowance of every man's baptism to that effect should be solemnized by his blessing, so as the effect thereof to become void in case of the utter neglect of it.

§ 22. This is the reason, that St. Jerome (Advers. Luciferi- anos) renders for the solemnity of confirmations; from the unity of the Church and the person of the bishop, in which and by which every Christian is a member of the whole Church, because a member of his Church, whom the whole

---


a Corrected from M.S.; "territories" in folio edition.


---
Church acknowledgeth pastor of the same. And this [is] the reason, why it was never counted peremptorily necessary for all (as St. Hierome\(^1\) acknowledges, that in villages, where the bishop’s occasions called him not to come, Christians lived and died without it); because the testimony of all those, who seek the bishop’s blessing in acknowledgement of their Christianity (the profession whereof they declare themselves to stand to by seeking the same, and he by giving it to allow) and of their communion with the Church (which by the same means they claim and he owneth), is a presumption on behalf of the rest, who have not the like opportunity to seek it, that neither they pretend towards the Church, nor he on behalf of the Church intends towards them, otherwise. The ground of this construction is manifest by the practice of the Church in reconciling those heretics and schismatics, whose baptism the Church allowed to stand good, to the Church, by confirmation with imposition of hands\(^m\). For this supposeth that baptism, which the Church did not repeat as allowing it ministered in due form, to have been without effect so long as they continued without the Church; and to revive and take effect again by removing that bar of separation from the Church, which their reconciliation voideth\(^n\).

§ 23. If the Church of some times and some places have added to imposition of hands a further ceremony of chrism\(^o\) (consisting of oil and balsam, to signify by the anointing thereof that sweet smell, which the Spirit of the Messias in Essay representeth\(^p\)); why should it be thought, that this addition in the solemnity must needs take away from the efficacy of it? Is it not enough, that it may take away from it in them, who being zealous for the ceremony are careless of the substance? [and] that this is acknowledged by returning to the apostolical simplicity of imposition of hands?

---

\(^1\) "Non quidem abnuo hanc esse ecclesiarum consuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbisibus per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati sunt, episcopus ad invocationem Sancti Spiritus manum impositurus excurrat... In lectulis, aut in castellis, aut in remotoribus locis, per presbyteros aut diaconos baptizati ante dormientum quam ab episcopis inveniretur." S. Hieron., ibid. c. ix.; ibid.

\(^m\) See above, c. x. § 31, 32.

\(^o\) Chrism is first mentioned by Tertullian, according to Bingham, XII. iii. 2.—See also Cave, Prim. Christ., c. x. pp. 159, 160.—That it now constitutes the “materia” of the sacrament of confirmation in the Church of Rome, see Bellarm., De Sacram. Confirm., lib. ii. c. 8; Controv. tom. ii. pp. 421. B, sq.

\(^p\) Corrected from MS. “resenteth” in folio edition.
§ 24. Seeing, then, that the grace of standing to the common Christianity is to be expected from the blessing of the Church upon them, who have recourse to this solemnity with a disposition qualifying for the promises of the gospel in the unity of the Church: it will be no disparagement to the sacrament of baptism, that confirmation should be reckoned among the sacraments of the Church; being a ceremony no way empty of that promise of sanctifying grace, which by the foundation of the Church belongs to the prayers thereof; and yet the said promise no way subsisting, but upon supposition of that covenant of grace which the sacrament of baptism enacteth.

§ 25. As for the matter of ordination, the words of St. Paul stick close, 1 Tim. iv. 14;—"Neglect not the grace that is in thee, being given thee through prophecy by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery;"—at least taking in St. Paul again, 1 Cor. iv. 7;—"For who distinguisheth thee? or what hast thou that thou receive[st] not? but if thou hast received, why dost thou boast as not having received?" Which I have shewed, being spoken of the grace of an apostle, is drawn into consequence on all hands concerning the grace of a Christian. And therefore it will not serve the turn to say, that St. Paul speaketh of some of those graces that are called gratia datae; that serve for the use of the Church, not for the salvation of him that hath them. For St. Paul, when he calleth those graces "the manifestation of the Spirit," signifieth, that they were given by God to manifest His presence in the Church by the visible operations of them. And, therefore, ordinarily they presupposed in him, that had them, the presence of the Holy Ghost to the effect of saving grace.

§ 26. The cases of Balaam, and Caiaphas, or Saul, or those that prophesied in Christ's name, I have shewed already, how far they contain an exception to this.

§ 27. In the case of Timothy, ordained to that work, which St. Paul by his Epistles instructeth him how to discharge; what shall we conceive to be the effect of imposition?
of the hands of the presbytery, supposing him thereupon endowd with a grace of doing miracles, or speaking strange languages, but without any gift of saving grace, to direct the use of the same to the salvation of his people? What else, but that which a sword is in a madman's hand, or knowledge, eloquence, or understanding, in him that should set himself to raise himself a sect of followers into heresy or schism. Which should God allow Timothy, upon imposition of the hands of presbytery, allowing it, that Christian people might have confidence in so great a pastor, in whom they saw such "manifestation of God's Spirit;" might He not reasonably be said to allow him means to seduce Christian people? I will not therefore contend, but the grace, that was given Timothy by prophecy, signifieth some visible manifestation of God's Spirit in him, concerning whom there had "prophecies gone afore" in the Church, of how great eminence he should be in it; but so as to suppose that saving grace, wherein it manifested God to be in Timothy: which saving grace, though not wanting in him when he came to receive imposition of hands (because he who receives it, being no true Christian, shall never receive that effect by it), yet might the effect thereof be extended, applied, or determined to the right use of whatsoever miraculous grace he might thereby receive, in the service of God's Church. For to him, that hath by nature or by God's blessing upon his honest endeavours an ability to preach, to dispute, to resolve [difficulties]\(^\text{a}\) in Christianity, and hath not by God's saving grace the intent to use it well; what doth such a gift bring, but ability to do mischief? Therefore the gift given Timothy by imposition of hands, being that which was prayed for in behalf of him by those who laid hands on him, is the grace to behave himself well in the function which thereby he receiveth. Which being obtained by the prayers of the Church, what reason leaveth it, why the prayers of the Church should not still obtain the like, setting aside the difference between them that pray, or him for whom they pray? And certainly the effect of all prayers depends upon the same conditions,

\(^{1}\) "Puto agi de dono linguarum," &c.; "Quod donum præsignificatum est tibi datum iri per aliorum prophætiam." Grot., ad 1 Tim. iv. 14.

\(^{a}\) Corrected from M.S.; "might by the," in folio edition.

\(^{\text{a}}\) Added from MS.
be it never so much the ordinance of God which they desire Him to bless.

§ 28. Here is then, I mean in ordination, an ordinance of God, solemnized with the visible ceremony of imposition of hands, signifying the overshadowing of God’s protection or of His Spirit, which it pretendeth to procure upon the promise of God’s presence with His Church, when it prays to Him. Which if it be therefore reckoned among the sacraments of the Church, as the property of the term will certainly bear it, so can it be no disparagement to the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, as if it came in rank with them. For the grace which it procureth, as it is limited to a particular effect, of ministering to the Church the ordinances of God, according to that trust which He reposeth in the office; so is the grace which God appointeth to be conveyed to His people by the ministry of every office, no less to be obtained by that outward profession, under which the order of the Church obliges them to minister the same (whosoever a man’s inward intention, that is not visible, may be), than if he really did intend to do his best for the service of God and the salvation of His people.

§ 29. I speak now, so far as the order of the Church goes. For otherwise it cannot be doubted, that a man’s personal abilities may give a great deal of life to the public order of the Church, and add much in prosecution of the true intent and in order to the due effect of it. All which the grace to endeavour the faithful discharge of each office, and the blessing of God upon such endeavours, which the blessing of the Church with imposition of hands prays for, containeth and effecteth.

§ 30. But of all powers of the Church, and the offices which they produce, there is none that cometh so nigh the promises of the gospel, as that which consists in binding the sins of those, that visibly transgress their Christianity, upon them, and in loosing them upon visible penance. For this restores to a capacity for the gifts of the Holy Ghost, for-

---

7 See Thorndike’s Just Weights and Measures, cc. xviii., xxii.—“Though the ordering of ministers hath His visible sign and promise; yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin; as all other sacraments besides the two above named do: therefore neither it nor any sacrament else,” &c. Hom. of Common Prayer and Sacraments, Homilies, Bk. 2nd, Hom. ix. p. 356. ed. Corrie.
feitied by transgressing the covenant of our baptism, and by
admitting to communion in the eucharist immediately re-
neweth the same. And, truly, the whole work of it is nothing
else but the satisfying of the Church, that the man hath
appeared the wrath and regained the favour of God; that is,
satisfied God, in the language of the ancient Church, in con-
sideration of the satisfaction of our Lord Christ, accepting
his penance for satisfaction, which of itself it is not*. And
in regard of this great virtue and effect of penance, I marvel
not, that in the Reformation Melanchthon* is found to have
reckoned it a third sacrament after baptism and the eucharist.
For the name of sacrament seemeth most duly to belong to
the acts of those offices, which conduce most to the attaining
or to the maintaining of the state of God's grace.

§ 31. And truly it cannot be denied, that the solemnity
of penance in the ancient Church* was such, as might well
serve to signify the recovering of that grace; the ground
which Christians have for the help whereof, it so effectually
intimateth. So, though a man's own repentance in private
hath the same promise of grace, yet the solemnity of per-
forming penance in the Church seemeth requisite to the
nature and quality of the sacrament, in whatsoever sense it
shall be attributed to it. And this solemnity, all reason will
allow, must needs have been of great effect to procure
and settle in the penitent that disposition for pardon, which
it seemeth to profess. This solemnity being so much abated
in private penance, that nothing of it remains, saving the

* See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr.,
c. xxxiii. § 1—11.
* "Quot sunt (sacramenta)? Tria
recte numerantur, Baptismus, Absolu-
tio, Cena Domini," Melanchth., Catech.,
Witeb. 1562. And so also in his Loc.
Theol., § de numero Sacram.; ibid. fol.
233. b.
** See Morinus, De Administr. Sacr.
Penitentiam, lib. vi. c. 1, sq.; and for
δέκτωσεν, c. 6. p. 369; and Bingham,
XVIII. i—iv.
* i.e. the kneeling in order to re-
ceive imposition of hands. See Serv.
of God at Rel. Asa., c. x. § 24, note b,
and ibid. § 86.
governed as if they were obliged to believe, that attrition is changed into contrition by virtue of the keys of the Church passing upon it⁴; that is, that he, who is not qualified for pardon, when he confesses, is by receiving the sentence of absolution qualified for pardon, so that neither stain nor guilt of sin remains, but the debt of temporal punishment (whereas the time of canonical penance grounded a presumption that the change was wrought): then may there seem to be cause of questioning, whether penance be a sacrament, that is, a holy office of the Church, in which it is ministered under such an unhallowed opinion as that.

§ 33. In the mean time, neither is the promise of grace annexed to the solemnity thereof (in which there hath succeeded so vast a change as I have signified) by God's choice of any visible creature, in which it is exercised, as in baptism and the eucharist; but by that common reason, for which it is a solemnity fit for the Church to execute it with: nor is the promise of grace annexed to the office of the Church any otherwise, than as it becomes the means to retrieve the condition of baptism, qualifying for the promise by the covenant of grace.

§ 34. In fine, the name and notion of a sacrament, as it hath been duly used by the Church and writers allowed by the Church, extendeth to all holy actions, done by virtue of the office which God hath trusted His Church with, in hope of obtaining the grace which He promiseth. Baptism and the eucharist are actions appointed by God in certain creatures: utterly impertinent to the effect of grace, setting aside His appointment; but apt to signify all the grace which the gospel promiseth, by virtue of that correspondence which holds between things visible and sensible, and things intelligible and invisible: both antecedent, for their institution, to the foundation of the Church; the society whereof subsisteth upon condition of the first, and for communion in the second. The rest are actions appointed to be solemnized in the Church by the apostles; not always and everywhere precisely with the same ceremonies, but such as always may reasonably serve to signify the graces, which it prays for on

⁴ See above, c. xi. § 4: and Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxiii. § 9.
the behalf of them who receive them: the hope of that grace being grounded upon God's general promise of hearing the prayers of His Church, which the constitution thereof involveth.

§ 35. Nor am I solicitous to make that construction, which may satisfy the decrees of the councils of Florence* and Trent†; who have first taken upon them to decree under anathema the conceit of the School* in reducing them to the number of seven. But seeing the particulars so qualified by ancient writers in the Church‡, and the number agreed upon by the Greek Church§ as well as the Latins; I have acknowledged that sense of their sayings, which the primitive order of the Catholic Church enforceth. For though I count it a great abuse to maintain simple Christians in an opinion, that the outward work† of them (not supposing the ground upon which, the intent to which, the disposition with which, they are done) secures the salvation of them to whom they are ministered;—which opinion the formal ministering of them seemeth to maintain;—yet is it a far greater abuse, to place the reformation of the Church in abolishing the solemnities, rather than in reducing the right understanding of the ground and intent of those offices which they serve to solemnize.

† * Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fasisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet, baptismum, confirmationem, eucharistiam, penitentiam, extremum unctionem, ordinem, et matrimonium, aut etiam aliquid horum septem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum, anathema sit." Conc. Trid., Sesa. vii. (A.D. 1547), can. de Sacramentis, can. i.; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 776. D.
§ That Confirmation, Penance, Holy Orders, Matrimony, are severally called Sacraments by the Fathers in some sense or other, seems to be generally admitted: see, on the one side, Bellarm., De Sacr. in Gen., lib. ii. c. 24. Controv. tom. ii. pp. 234. D.—239. B.; and, on the other, Forbes, Instruct. Historico-Theol., lib. ix. cc. 5, sq.—But they gave the same name also to many other things (Jewel, Defence of Apol., P. ii. c. xi. Divis. 2, Works vol. v. pp. 26, 27, reckons seventeen altogether); as a. g. to the cross, the washing of feet, the salt given to catechumens (for which "sacrament," see Bingham, X. ii. 16), martyrdom, virginity, &c.—See also Palmer, On the Church, Pt. vi. c. viii. vol. ii. pp. 442, 443.—For extreme unction Bellarminian produces only Pope Innocent I. calling it "genus sacramenti," and S. Bernard: for whom see above c. xii. § 1. note p.; § 16. note g., § 23. note u.
CHAPTER XXXI.

TO WORSHIP CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST, THOUGH BELIEVING TRANSUBSTANTIATION, IS NO IDOLATRY. GROUND FOR THE HONOUR OF SAINTS AND MARTYRS. THE SAINTS AND THE ANGELS PRAY FOR US. THREE SORTS OF PRAYERS TO SAINTS: THE FIRST AGREEABLE WITH CHRISTIANITY; THE LAST MAY BE IDOLATRY; THE SECOND A STEP TO IT. OF THE RELICS OF THE SAINTS’ BODIES. WHAT THE SECOND COMMANDMENT PROHIBITETH OR ALLOWETH. THE SECOND COUNCIL OF NICAEA DOETH NOT DECREE IDOLATRY; AND YET THERE IS NO DECREE IN THE CHURCH FOR THE WORSHIPPING OF IMAGES.

AND NOW I come to that resolution, which I have made way for by premising these conclusions for assumptions to infer it; only, by the way, I have resolved against those prayers, which the Church of Rome prescribeth, to deliver the souls of the dead from purgatory-pains. I say, then, first, that the adoration of the eucharist, which the Church of Rome prescribeth, is not necessarily idolatry. I say not what it may be accidentally; by that intention, which some men may conceal, and may make it idolatry as to God: I speak upon supposition of that intention, which the profession of the Church formeth, and which alone is to my present purpose. I suppose them to believe, that those creatures of God, which are the elements of that sacrament, are no more there after the consecration; having ceased to be, that there might be room for the Body and Blood of our Lord to come into their stead. I suppose, that the Body and Blood of Christ may be adored, wheresoever they are; and must be adored by a good Christian, where the custom of the Church, which a Christian is obliged to communicate with, requires it. For that which we see is enough for to certify us, that peremptorily to refuse any custom of the Church is a step to division and the dissolution of it; which is the greatest evil that can befall Christianity, next to the peremptory profession of something contrary to that truth, wherein Christianity consists, and which the being of the Church presupposeth.

---

b Misprinted XXX. in folio edition. = cc. xxviii., xxix.

1 See above, c. xxvi. § 1, 2.
§ 2. But I suppose further, that the Body and Blood of Christ is not adored nor to be adored by Christians, neither for Itself, nor for any endowment residing in It, which It may have received by being personally united with the Godhead of Christ; but only in consideration of the said Godhead, to which It remains inseparably united, wheresoever It becomes. For by that means, whosoever proposeth not to himself the consideration of the Body and Blood of Christ, as It is of Itself and in Itself a mere creature (which he, that doth not on purpose, cannot do), cannot but consider It, as he believes It to be, being a Christian; and, considering It as It is, honour It as It is inseparably united to the Godhead, in which and by which It subsisteth, in which therefore that honour resteth, and to which it tendeth. So the Godhead of Christ is the thing that is honoured, and the reason why it is honoured, both: the Body and Blood of Christ, though It be necessarily honoured, because necessarily united to that which is honoured; yet is It only the thing that is honoured, and not the reason why it is honoured, speaking of the honour proper to God alone.

§ 3. I suppose further, that it is the duty of every Christian to honour our Lord Christ, as God subsisting in human flesh: whether by professing Him such, or by praying to Him as such, or by using any bodily gesture, which by the custom of them that frequent it may serve to signify that indeed he takes Him for such; which gesture is outwardly that worship of the heart which inwardly commands it. This honour then being the duty of an affirmative precept, which according to the received rule* ties always, though it cannot tie a man to do the duty always, because then he should do nothing else: what remains but a just occasion, to make it requisite, and presently to take hold and oblige?

§ 4. And is not the presence thereof in the sacrament of the eucharist a just occasion, presently to express by the bodily act of adoration that inward honour, which we always carry towards our Lord Christ as God? Grant that there may be question, whether it be a just occasion or not; certainly, supposing it come to a custom in the Church presently

* Affirmativa præcepta obligant semper, sed non ad semper.
to do that which is always due to be done, you suppose the question determined. This is that which I stand upon: the matter being such as it is, supposing the custom of the Church to have determined it, it shall be so far from an act of idolatry, that it shall be the duty of a good Christian. Therefore, not supposing the Church to have determined it, though for some occasions (whereof more are possible than it is possible for me to imagine) it may become offensive and not presently due, yet can it never become an act of idolatry; so long as Christianity is that which it is, and he that does it professes himself a Christian.

§ 5. Here then you see I am utterly disoblige[d] to dispute, whether or no in the ancient Church Christians were exhorted and encouraged to, and really did, worship our Lord Christ in the sacrament of the eucharist. For having concluded my intent, that it had not been idolatry had it been done, I might leave the consequence of it to debate. But not to balk the freedom which hath carried me to publish all this, I do believe, that it was so practised and done in the ancient Church; which I maintain from the beginning to have been the true Church of Christ, obliging all to conform to it in all things within the power of it. I know the consequence to be this, that there is no just cause why it should not be done at present, but that cause, which justifies the reforming of some part of the Church without the whole; which if it were taken away, that it might be done again, and ought not to be of itself alone any cause of distance. For I do acknowledge the testimonies, that are produced out of St. Ambrose, De Spiritu Sancto, iii. 129; St. Augustin, In Psalm. xcviii. 1, and Epist. cxx. cap. xxvii. 8; St. Chrysostom, Homil. xxiv. in

* See however Bingham, XV. v. 4, 5, for the difference between this and the adoration of the Host, and for the late date of the latter.


‡ “Itaque per scabellum terrae intelligitur, per terram autem Caro Christi; Quam hodieque in mysteriis adoramus, et Quam apostoli in Domino Jesu, ut supra diximus, adorarunt.” S. Ambros., De Spir. Sancto, lib. iii. c. 11. § 79; Op. tom. ii. p. 681. A.

† † “Nemo autem illam Carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraveritis.” S. Aug., In Ps. xcviii. § 8; Op. tom. iv. p. 1065. C.

1 ad Corinth.; Theodorot, Dial. i.ii.; St. Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. in S. Gorgoniama; St. Jerom, Epist. ad Theophilum Episc. Alexandriam; Origen, In diversa loca Evang. Hom. v.; where he teacheth to say at the receiving the sacrament, "Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldest come under my roof," which to say, is to do that which I conclude. Nor do I need more to conclude it.

§ 6. And what reason can I have not to conclude it? Have I supposed the elements, which are God's creatures in which the sacrament is celebrated, to be abolished; or any thing else concerning the Flesh and Blood of Christ or the presence thereof in the eucharist, in giving a reason why the Church may do it, which the Church did not believe? If I have, I disclaim it as soon as it may appear to me for such. Nay, I do expressly war all opinions, that they imagine not to themselves the eucharist so mere and simple a sign of the thing signified, that the celebration thereof should not be a competent occasion for the executing of that worship, which is always due to our Lord Christ incarnate.

§ 7. I confess it is not necessarily the same thing to wor-ship Christ in the sacrament of the eucharist, as to worship the sacrament of the eucharist; yet in that sense, which reason of itself justifieth, it is. For the sacrament of the eucharist, by reason of the nature thereof, is neither the

---

1 There is nothing in S. Chrysostom's Hom. xxiv. in 1 ad. Cor., more to the purpose of the text, than such expressions as, "Εήθηδ αὐτοὶ (ποτηριον εὐλογησε μετεχεσε χοιρετες αιτων δυναμοιωσες, διαμαραθες, εκεπλητομενοι της δεατου δωρεας, ενυλογοςες δια και αυτο τωτο εξεχεες, ηα μη µεινωσεν εν τη πλατε" (§ 1; Op. S. Chrys., tom. x. p. 213. A); and again, "ΕΙ γαρ βασιλεα της ουκ εν άπαξ λεχοντα τη λεγα βασιλεια; ίππον μεν οιν βασιλειου ουκ εν την άπαξ διαθεμεν ακαθοδοντος" (ibid., § 4. p. 216. D); and, "Το γαρ παθων έκει" (in heaven) "τιµιατερων, τοιατο σαλ ει της γης δεινα κελιον," κ.τ.λ. (ibid., § 5. p. 218. E). The last is the passage quoted by Bellarmine, De Sacr. Euch., lib. ii. c. 22: Controv. tom. ii. p. 622. B, C.

2 "Μενει" (so the symbols after consecration) "γαρ ετι της προτερας ωδοις και τω σχηματω και τω ειδως, και δραται δει και θηλη, ολη και προτερων ην; νοειται δια απερ εγενετο, και πιστευται, και προσκυνεται, διεκαναι δει περει πιστευται." Theodorot., Erastistes, Dial. ii. Inconfusus; Op. tom. iv. p. 85. C.


4 Quoted above, c. iv. § 31. note f. —It is not Origen's.
visible kind, nor the invisible grace, of Christ's Body and Blood, but the union of both, by virtue of the premises; in regard whereof, the one going along with the other, whatsoever be the distance of their nature, both concur to that, which we call the sacrament of the eucharist, by the work of God, to which He is morally engaged by the promise which the institution thereof containeth. If this be rightly understood, to worship the sacrament of the eucharist is to worship Christ in the sacrament of the eucharist.

§ 8. But I will not therefore warrant, that they, who maintain the worshipping of the sacrament of the eucharist, do not understand the visible kind, or (as themselves think) the visible properties, thereof by that name*. Which if they shall declare themselves to understand, then is the question far otherwise; and to be resolved upon the same terms, as the question concerning the worshipping of images shall by and by be resolved:—that, though the sacrament of the eucharist may be the occasion to determine the circumstance of the worshipping of Christ, yet is [it] itself no way capable of any worship that may be counted religious, because religion enjoineth it. Cardinal Bellarmine, De Euch. iv. 29c, would have it said, that the sign is worshipped materially, but the Body and Blood of Christ formally, in the eucharist; which are terms that signify nothing. For it is impossible to distinguish in God the thing that is worshipped from the reason for which it is worshipped; so that the thing may be understood, without understanding it to be the reason why it is worshipped. Therefore the sign in the eucharist seems only to determine, why that worship which is always everywhere due, is here now tendered.

* Bellarmine himself, as quoted in note c below (p. 929. A.), affirms, that Christ is to be adored in the sacrament "cultu laetris," and, "Eum adorationem ad symbola etiam panis et vini pertinent, quatenus apprehenduntur ut quid unum cum Ipso Christo Quem continet." But that some in his communion held other and less extreme sentiments, may be seen in Bp. Forbes, Consid. Mod. et Facil., De Sacr. Euchar., lib. ii. c. ii. § 10—15. pp. 440—443.

B. Below, § 36, sq.

C "Qui enim sentiunt sacramen-
tum eucharistiae formaliter esse Corpus Christi, ut est sub illis speciebus, concedunt etiam formaliter sacramentum dici adorandum: qui autem docent sacramentum eucharistiae formaliter esse species panis et vini, ut Christum continent, illi docent consequenter sacramentum eucharistiae materialiter adorandum. Sed quidquid sit de modo loquendi, status questionis non est niasi an Christus in eucharistia sit adorandus cultu laetris." Bellarm., De Sacram. Euchar., lib. iv. c. 29; Controv., tom. ii. p. 929. B.
§ 9. Indeed, when the council of Trent\textsuperscript{4} pronounceth him anathema, that believes not the elements to be abolished and cease to be in it being consecrated; I cannot deny, that their obilging all to believe that, which no man can have that cause to believe for which he believes the Christian faith, hath been a very valuable reason, though not the only reason, to move the Church of England to supersede that ceremony (hardly, in the minds of Christians so bred to it, to be parted from it): contenting itself to enjoin the receiving of it kneeling\textsuperscript{6}; which he that refuseth to do, seems not to acknowledge the being of a sacrament, requiring the tender of the thing signified by it and with it. And I conceive further, that the carrying of the sacrament in procession, and upon such occasions as signify\textsuperscript{7} no order towards the receiving of it, nor any such intent upon supposition whereof the sacrament is a sacrament\textsuperscript{8}, hath added much weight to that reason. For if the use of the sacrament were the reason to make the occasion fit, the abuse thereof must needs render it unfit.

§ 10. But for that which remains; whether those who think the Body and Blood of Christ present instead of the elements, which are there no more, be idolaters for worshipping the elements, which remain present where they think they are not, is a question no way to be resolved, till it be granted, that, supposing them present, it is no idolatry. For if the false opinion of their absence make men idolaters, then are they not idolaters which have it not. Consider then, that,

\textsuperscript{4} "Si quis dixerit, in sacrosancto eucharistiam sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini una cum Corporae et Sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularum conversionem totius substantiae panis in Corpus, et totius substantiae vini in Sanguinem, manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis et vini, quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissime transsubstantiationem appellat, anathema sit." Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii. can. 2; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 808. C. D.

\textsuperscript{6} Canons of 1603, can. xxiii., and xxvii.: and rubric in Commination Service.

\textsuperscript{7} Corrected from MS.: "significat" in folio edition.

were the Body and Blood of Christ so present as to be instead of the substance of bread and wine, the consideration in which any Christian (holding what the Church of Rome teaches) should worship It, would be no other than that, for which It should be worshipped by him who believes It not so present; as, in my opinion, the ancient Church did believe. Both must worship the Body and Blood of Christ because incarnate; and, therefore, as the Body and Blood of Christ is inseparable from the consideration of His Godhead, which every Christian intends to worship. And how can then a man’s mistake in thinking the elements to be away, which indeed are there, make him guilty of honouring those creatures as God; which we know, if he thought that they were there, he must needs take for creatures, and therefore could not honour for God? I do believe it hath been said by great doctors of the Church of Rome, that they must needs think themselves flat idolaters; if they could think that the elements are not abolished. That shews what confidence they would have the world apprehend that they hold their opinion with, but not that the consequence is true; unless that which I have said be reprovable. For what reason can be given, that why bodily gesture, which professedly signifieth the honour of God tendered to Christ spiritually present in the eucharist, should be idolatry, because the bread and wine are believed to remain there; which according to their opinion, supposing them to be abolished, their accidents only remaining, is no idolatry, but the worship of our Lord Christ for God?

§ 11. In the next place, as concerning prayer to saints: I [The terms prayer, invocation, and others like them, necessarily equivocal.

a E.g. “Contendit Claudioius” (Sainctes), “ex unitate adorationis absentiam substantiam panis colligere. Etenim si duplex maneret substantia in sacramento, una panis, altera Christi, non posset citra idolatriam unica adoratio in utramque referri, eo quod esset duplex etiam existentia, quorum unaquaeque suam venerationem postularet .... Affert deinde testimonia Patrum, in quibus ex unica adoratione absentia panis et transcendentia collii videtur.” Suarez, In IIII Part. D. Thom., Disp. cviii. numm. 111, 112; tom. i. 1052.—“Idolatria non committitur sine expressa intentione adorandi pro Deo id quod revera non est. Ac proinde qui adoraret hostiam non consecrata, apprehendens cogitatione sua ibi Christum, idolatriam non committeret.” Id., ibid. Disp. ceix. num. 41; tom. iii. p. 414.—“Hic error” (viz. “Adorationem hujus sacramento idoliatriam esse,”) “ex alio priori videtur sequi: nam si ibi non est Corpus Christi aut Sanguis, ut ipsi (sacramentarii) sunt, fit ut adoratio ipsa in panem et vinum terminetur, quod est idolatria.” Id., ibid., Disp. cviii. num. 108; tom. i. p. 1051.
despite of our hearts equivocal; that is, we may be constrained, unless we use that diligence which common discretion counts superfluous, to use the same words in signifying requests made to God and to man. Which are not equivocal according to that equivocation, which comes by mere chance; but by that, for which there is a reasonable ground in that eminence, which our conceptions (and therefore our words, which signify them) express unto us. For all the apprehensions, that we have of God and all things intelligible, coming from things sensible, we can have no proper conceit of God’s excellence, and the eminence thereof above His creatures; which necessarily appears to us under attributes common to His creatures, removing that imperfection which in them they are joined with. This is the reason, why all signs of honour in word or deed may be equivocal, when they need not be counted so; being joined with signs either of other words or deeds, which may serve to determine the capacity of them. Adoration, worship, respect, reverence, or howsoever you translate the Latin cultus, are of this kind; as I said afore. “Ingressus scenam populum saltator adorat” — “Coming upon the stage to dance, he adores” (or worships) “the people;” or, as another says, “Jactat basia” — “He throws them kisses;” he does reverence to the spectators by kissing his hand, and saluting them with it. So prayer, invocation, calling upon God, is not so proper to God, but that (whether you will or not) every petition to a prince or a court of justice is necessarily a “prayer,” and he that makes it “invocates” or “calls upon” that prince or that court for favour or for justice.

§ 12. Now the militant Church necessarily hath communion with the triumphant: believing, that all those who are
cere oscula,” &c., Tacit., Hist., i. 36.
And Apuleius, Metamorph., uses the word “adorat” several times as = affia-
tur.—See Facciolati sub voc.—Suarez, In III. Part. D. Thom., Disput. xxiii.
tom. i. pp. 921 sq., has a long discussion upon the nature and meaning of
adoration.

1 See above, c. xxvi. § 3—6.
2 Ibid.
Genev. 1619. For the equivocation of
the word “adoro,” see Andrewes, Resp.
ad Bellarm., pp. 65, 275 sq., 400. Oxf.
1851: and Trench’s Star of the Wise
Men, pp. 60—63. Lond. 1850.—“Otho
protendens manus, adorare vulgum, ja-

“Tibicen: gratulari fautores putat.”
Phaedrus, Fab., lib. v. fab. 7. vv. 28, 29.
“Blandaque devexa jactaret basia thedam.”
Juvenal, iv. 118.
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departed in God’s grace are at rest, and secure of being parted from Him for the future; though those, who have neglected the content of this world the most for His service, and are in the best of those “mansions” which are provided for them till the day of judgment (whom here we call properly saints), enjoy the nearest access to His presence. To dispute whether we are bound to honour them or not, were to dispute whether we are to be Christians, and to believe this, or not. Whether this honour be religious or civil, nothing but equivocation of words makes disputable; and the cause of that equivocation, the want of words: vulgar use not having provided words, properly to signify conceptions, which came not from common sense. If we call it [religion], it is manifest, that all religion is that reverence which the conscience of our obligation to God rendereth. If civil, the inconvenience is more gross, though less dangerous. For how can we owe civil respect, where there is no relation of members of the same city or commonwealth? Plainly, their excellence, and the relation we have to them, being intelligible only by Christianity, must borrow a name from that which vulgar language attributes to God, or to men our superiors.

§ 13. I need say nothing in particular of angels; whom if we believe to be God’s ministers employed in serving His children upon earth, we must needs own their honour, though 14.

the intercourse between us be invisible.

§ 14. It were easy to pick up sayings of the fathers, by which religious honour is proper to Christ; and others, in which that honour, that reverence, which religion enjoins,

= See above, c. xxix. § 30—50.
= “Tertia est excellens quaedam media inter Divinam et humanam, qualis est gratia et gloria sanctorum: et huic excellentiam respondet tertia species cultus, quam theologi vocant duliaim... hanc tertiam speciem... dividunt in duliam proprie dictam et hyperduliam, tribuientes illam sanctis ceteris, istam soli Humanitati Christi, et matri Ejus.” Bellarm., De Sanct. Beati., lib. i. c. 12, Controv. tom. i. p. 1951. A—C.
= Misprinted “religion” in folio edition.
= Corrected also in MS.,—from a misprint (in the folio edition), viz., “instructing,” into “in conducting.”
= As is done e. g. in Ussher, Ans. &c., c. ix. pp. 422—430, 466, sq.; and Bingham, XIII. iii. 1, from Daille.
= As is done e. g. in Bellarm., De Sanct. Beati., lib. i. c. 13. Controv. tom. i. pp. 1954. C—1959. D.
is tendered saints and angels. And all to be imputed to nothing but want of proper terms for that honour, which religion enjoineth in respect of God, and that relation, which God hath settled between the Church militant and triumphant; being reasonably called religious, provided that the distance be not confounded between the religious honour of God, and that honour of the creature, which the religious honour of God enjoins, being neither civil nor human, but such as a creature is capable of, for religion's sake and that relation which it settleth.

§ 15. I must come to particulars, that I may be understood. He that could wish, that the memories of the martyrs, and other saints who lived so as to assure the Church they would have been martyrs had they been called to it, had not been honoured, as it is plain they were honoured by Christians, must find in his heart by consequence to wish, that Christianity had not prevailed. For this honour depending on nothing but the assurance of their happiness in them that remained alive, was that, which moved unbelievers to bethink themselves of the reason they had to be Christians. What were then those honours? Reverence in preserving the remains of their bodies, and burying them; celebrating the remembrance of their agonies every year; assembling themselves at their monuments; making the days of their death festivals, the places of their burial churches; building and consecrating churches to the service of God in remembrance of them: I will add further (for the custom seemeth to come from undefiled Christianity), burying the remains of their bodies under the stones upon which the eucharist was celebrated. What was there in all this but Christianity? That the circumstances of God's service, which no law of God had limited, the time, the place, the occasion of assembling for the service of God (always acceptable to God), should be determined by such glorious accidents for Christianity, as the departure of those who had thus concluded their race. What can be so properly counted the reign of the saints and martyrs with Christ, which St. John foretelleth, Apoc. xx, as this honour, when it came to trample paganism

under feet after the conversion of Constantine"? Certainly nothing can be named so correspondent to that honour, which is prophesied for them that suffered for God's law under Antiochus Epiphanes*; Dan. xii. Is not all this honour properly derivative from the honour of God and our Lord Christ, and relative to His service? For that is the work, for which Christians assemble; and for those assemblies the Church stands, as I have often said: the honour of the saints, but the occasion, circumstance, or furniture for it.

§ 16. Neither is it to be doubted, that the saints in happiness pray for the Church militant, and that they have knowledge thereof; if they go not out like sparkles, and are kindled again when they resume their bodies, which I have shewed our common Christianity allows not*. For is it possible to imagine, that, knowing any thing (that is, knowing God and themselves), they should not know, that God hath a Church in the world, upon the consummation whereof their consumption dependeth? Or is it possible, that, knowing this, and being disposed towards this Church as they ought to be disposed towards it in respect to God, they should not intercede with God for the consummation of it and the means thereof? Which is all we can desire. I will not use the text of Jeremy xv. 1, and Ezek. xiv. 18—20*;

---

* "Regnaverunt cum Christo mille annis—Sicut Christus ex caelo in terras regnat, sic et martyres sub Christo, nempe per bona sanationum quae conspicebantur quod ipsorum memorias et per honorem quem ipsam Ecclesiam habuerunt. Ante tempora Constantini neque tutum erat ad monumenta martyrum venire, et vigente paganismo metui poterat ne honor martyrum a paganis in superstitionis sua defensionem rapere. Quod autem additur χλαυς ηγη, eo pertinet ut sciamus post mille illos annos a multis imminui omnis conspice honorem martyrum," &c.: "quas ad res non levus occasio data est ab ilia qui falsa miracula comminiscebantur, quique in martyrum honore non servabant cum modum quem vetus Ecclesia servaverat." Grot, ad Apoc. xx. 4.

* "Non male haec Porphyrius reutulit ad ea tempora cum Lyssias Antiochi personaam gerens omnia crudelissima in Judaeos exercit; sed addenda simul et tempora priora." Grot, ad Daniel. xii. 1.—"Redendum est Porphyrio quod ei debetur testimonium: est enim hunc locum optime interpres tatus de iiis, qui ob Legis cultum diu extorres ad sua redire: sic tamen ut voces mira arte haud temperate, at resurrectionis mysterium, quod aperte ante Evangelium revelari non debuit, innuant magis quam explicent." Id., Ad Dan. xii. 2.

* See above, c. xxviii. § 4. note 1. Calvin's Psychopannychia is especially directed against this heresy. Pagitt in his Heresiography (pp. 143, 144. ed. 1648) alleges its existence in the time of the Rebellion in England. And art. xl. of the 42 Articles of Edw. VI. (A.D. 1562) is also specially directed against it.—That "the saints in happiness" may be believed to "pray for the Church militant," see Pearson, On the Creed, art. ix. vol. i. pp. 600—602: Andrewes, Responsa, ad Bellarm., pp. 45, sq.: Bp. Bull, Corruptions of the Ch. of Rome, sect. iii.; Works, vol. ii. p. 286.

* Cornelius a Lapide (in loc.) prefers to translate in Jer. xv. 1, "Si sit ea—
because it is manifest, that Moses and Samuel, that Noe, Daniel, and Job, are named in them but to put the case—
that, if those men were alive and made intercession for their
people, they should not prevail:—which is not to say (that,
which I have shewed* that the Old Testament speaks not
out plain), that, being alive, they do intercede. Therefore
they make no consequence. I will not use the text of the
Gospel, Luke xvi. 9 b;—‘‘Make ye friends of the unrighteous
Mammon, that when ye fail they may receive you into ever-
lasting tabernacles:’’—though St. Augustin, De Civit. [Dei, lib.
xx]i. [cap.] 27 c, makes a doubt, whether it be by the interce-
sion of his friends that such a man is received; because he
makes no doubt, that it is in consideration of the charity by
which he made them his friends, that he is received; and
therefore in that consideration it must be, that they are said
to receive him, not in consideration of their prayers; of which
therefore this text saith nothing. But I must needs use the 355
text of the Apocalypse, v. 8. viii. 34; whereby it appeareth as
much, that the Church triumphant prayeth for the Church
militant, as that the saints of the Church triumphant are
alive. And I will use those* texts of the Old Testament, where
Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and David are in considera-
tion, and alleged to God in behalf of His people: Gen. xxvi.
5, 24; Ex. xxxii. 13; Deut. ix. 27; 1 Kings xi. 12, 32, 33, 34,
xxv. 4; 2 Kings viii. 19, xix. 34, xx. 6; Es. xxxvii. 35; 1 Kings
xviii. 36; 1 Chron. xxix. 18. For as our Saviour argueth

rint,” for “ai starent;” and infers,
that “Ergo sancti orant pro nobis post
temortem etiam in limbo, multo magis
in caelo.”—On Ezech. xiv. 14, he
says (after arguing that Daniel being
alive at the time is thereby “canon-
ized”)—“Imperite ergo herretici hoc
lacu abutatur, ut ex eo probent sanctos
in caelis non esse invocandos;” for
(among other reasons) the exceptions
prove the rule; “Potius ergo hinc con-
tramirum inferendum esset, solum
invocandos esse sanctos.”—See also Bp.
Bull, Vind. of Ch. of Engl., § 6;
Works vol. ii. p. 156.

a Above, c. xxvii. § 1—3; and c.
xxviii. § 4—6.
b “Duo ex hoc loco, et merita nostra,
et sanctorum pro nobis suffragia, ad-
versus novos hereticos aperte colligun-
tar.”—Maldonat., in Luc. xvi. 9.
c “Est itaque quidam vitae modus,
neque tam male, ut his qui eam vivunt,
nihil prosit ad capessendum regnum
celorum largitas eleemosynarum, qui-
bus etiam justorum sustentatur ino-
pia, et sint amici qui in tabernaculis
eterna suscipiant; nec tam bone, ut
ad tantam beatitudinem adipsiscendum
eis ipsa sufficiat, nisi eorum meritis
quos amicos fecerint, misericordiam
conservat.”—S. Aug., De Civ. Dei,
lib. xxi. c. 27. § 5; Op. tom. vii. p. 653.
B. C: speaking however afterwards (§
6. p. 654. B) of this liberation being ac-
complished “intercedentibus sanctis:”
which hardly bears out the whole of
Thornhike’s statement in the text.

4 Hammond however (ad loc.) re-
stricts the former passage, and Beza
(ad loc.) the second, to the prayers of
the saints on earth.

* Corrected from MS.: “these” in
folio edition.
well, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are alive and shall rise again, because "God is not the God of the dead;" so is the consequence as good, that what God doth for their sakes, He doth it for their mediation or intercession; unless He mean to set that on their score, which they desire not at His hands.

§ 17. The angels of little children "always see the Father's face in heaven;" Matth. xviii. 10. And "there is joy in the presence of God's angels over one sinner that repenteth;" Luke xv. 10. And David saith, that "the angel of the Lord [Ps. xxxiv. 8. Hebr. — 7. Eng. Vers.] pitcheth his tent round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them;" Ps. xxxiv. 8. And, "They are all ministering spirits, sent forth to attend upon them that shall be heirs of salvation;" Hebr. i. 14. And have they not that affection for those, whom God so affecteth as to provide them such attendance, [as?] to mediate with their desires to God the effect of that goodness, which He is so affectionate to bestow upon us? An imagination so barbarous cannot possess any man, till he think himself beloved of God for hating those that honour saints and angels above measure. Let them look to the measure, and let them look how they hate them that observe it not. Let them not ground their measure upon a supposition of as little affection in the saints and angels for us, as in themselves for the saints and angels; unless it be, because such a supposition may deserve to deprive them of the benefit of such relations.

§ 18. For as for the Church; St. Cyprian doubts not, [Sayings of the fathers.] when he desires, that those who shall happen to depart first be mindful of them that remain in their prayers to God: Epist. l[vii]. 8 And the saints in heaven, that are secure of their own salvation, he saith, are solicitous for us: in his book De Mortalitate. St. Jerome saith the same of Heliodorus, Epist. i. 9: nor is any thing to be faulted of that which


7 Veniet, veniet postea dies, quo victor revertaris in patriam, quo feroxolyman coelestem vir fortis coronatus incedas. Tunc municipatum cum Paulo capias. Tunc et parentibus tuis ejusdem civitatis jus petas. Tunc et
he writes against Vigilantius to that purpose. St. Augustin supposeth, that Nebridius prayed for him being dead (Confess. ix. 3\textsuperscript{m}); and expects benefit from St. Cyprian's prayers (De Bapt. v. 17, vii. 1\textsuperscript{a}). He said afore, that we are to be commended by the prayers of the martyrs; and (De Sanctis Serm. xlvi.\textsuperscript{r}), "Debent (martyres) aliquid in nobis recognoscere de suis virtutibus, ut pro nobis dignetur Domino supplicare"— "The martyrs must take notice of something of their own virtues in us, that they may vouchsafe to become petitioners to God for us." And again (Contra Faustum xx. 21\textsuperscript{a}), the reason why they celebrated the memories of the saints, he assigns, that they "might be partners in their merits and be helped by their prayers." Both which Leo, In S. Lawr., considers, "as well the help as the example" of the saints. And St. Gregory, Epist. vii. 57. Indict. ii.\textsuperscript{a}: "Rogo omnipotentem Deum ut Sua te gratia proteget, et beati Petri apostolorum principis intercessione a malis omnibus ille sexum servet"— "I beseech Almighty God to protect thee with His grace, and through the intercession of St. Peter chief of the apostles keep thee unharmed by any evil." It were to no purpose


1 E.g. "Dicis" (ac. Vigilantius) "in libello tuo, quod dum vivimus, mutuo pro nobis orare possuimus; postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio; præsertim cum martyres utionem sui angulled obsecrantes, impetrare non quiverint. Si apostoli et martyres adhuc in corpore constituti possunt orare pro cæteris, quando pro se adhuc debent esse solliciti; quanto magis post coronas, victorias, et triumphos?" &c. Id., Adv. Vigilant.; ibid. p. 283.

= "Nunc ille (Nebridius) vivit in sinu Abraham,... jam non ponit autem ad os meum, sed spiritale os ad fontem Tuum, et bitit quantum potest sapientiam pro aviditate sua sine fine felix. Nec sic eum arbitror inebriari ex ea, ut obliviscatur mei, cum Tu Domine, Quem potas ille, nostri sis memor." S. Aug., Confess., lib. ix. c. 3, § 6; Op. tom. i. p. 188. B. C.


\textsuperscript{a} See above in c. xxix. § 42.


\textsuperscript{r} "Qui (Dominus) est mirabilis in sanctis Suis, in quibus nobis et praesidium constituit et exemplum. . . . Cujus (Laurentii) oratione et patrocinio advauiri nos sine cessatione confidimus." S. Leo M., Serm. lxxxv. in Natali S. Laurentii Martyris, c. iv.; Op. tom. i. p. 339. ed. Ballerin. FFL.

to shew what I allow by bringing more: for this cannot be disallowed, allowing the premisses.

§ 19. But, this being supposed, whatsoever may be disputed, whether saints or angels in this regard may be counted mediators, intercessors, or advocates between God and us, will be mere contentions about words; holding to the terms hitherto supposed. For, the intercession of our Lord Christ being grounded upon the work of redemption, the effects of it must be according: to make all mankind acceptable to God under the condition which the gospel declareth; to obtain for every man those helps of grace, by which he may or by which he is effectually resolved to undergo the condition requisite. He that knows the Godhead of Christ to be the ground, in consideration whereof the obedience of Christ is acceptable by God to this effect; and yet will needs say, that saints or angels are our mediators, intercessors, or advocates to the same effect: there is no cause, why he should be excused of idolatry for his pains. But withal he cannot be excused of contradicting himself; as grossly as he, that maintains those saints or angels to be that one true God, whom he acknowledges not to be that God but His creatures. If there be reason to presume, that they, who acknowledge saints or angels their mediators, intercessors, or advocates to God, intend to commit idolatry by contradicting themselves thus grossly; there may be reason to think, that they count them their mediators, intercessors, or advocates to God, to that effect, to which Christ alone is our mediator, intercessor, or advocate. But if whosoever is accepted to pray for another, is necessarily by so doing his mediator, intercessor, or advocate, to him with whom he is admitted to deal on his behalf by his prayers; then will it be necessary to limit the work of mediation to that effect, which may be allowed to the intercession of the saints or angels for us, if we will have them to be to purpose. Certainly, neither could Job intercede for his friends, nor Samuel for the Israelites, [Job xiii. 8—10; 1 Sam. vii. 5, xii. 23; Gen. xx. 7, for that purpose; but they must be by so doing mediators, intercessors, and advocates, for them with God. For neither

1 This is an oversight. In Gen. xii. is no mention of Abraham’s praying for Pharaoh, as he did afterwards for Abimelech.
can the mediation of saints or angels, nor of any prophet or other, that can be presumed to have favour with God, be to any effect, but that which the terms of that reconciliation which our Lord Christ hath purchased for us do settle or allow.

§ 20. But he, that saith the saints and angels pray for us, saith not, that we are to pray to saints or angels; nor can he say it without idolatry, intending, that we are to do that to them which they do to God for us. On the other side, though that which we do to them, and that which they do to God, be both called praying, yet it will be very difficult for him, that really and actually apprehendeth all saints and angels to be God's creatures, to render both the same honour; though supposing, not granting, the same Christianity to enjoin both.

§ 21. But, to come to particulars, I will distinguish three sorts of prayers to saints, whether taught or allowed to be taught in the Church of Rome.  

§ 22. The first is of those, that are made to God, but to desire His blessings by and through the merits and intercession of His saints. I cannot give so fit an example, as out of the canon of the mass; which all the western Churches of that communion do now use. There it is said: "Communicantes et memoriam venerantes [N. N. et in omnium sanctorum Tuorum, quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tuae muniamur auxilio]"—"Communicating in and reverencing the memory of such and such, and of all Thy saints, by whose merit and prayer grant that in all things we may be guarded by Thy protection and help." There is also a short prayer for the priest to say, when he comes to the altar, as he finds opportunity:—"Oramus Te, Domine, per merita sanctorum Tuorum, quorum reliquiae hic sunt, et om-

---

a Bellarmine (De Sanct. Beat., lib. i. cc. 17—19; Controv. tom. ii. pp. 1967. C, sq.) lays down as rules, 1. that "non licet a sanctis petere, ut nobis tangam sanctae Divinorum beneficiorum, gloriam, vel gratiam, alicuique ad beatitudinem media concedant:" 2. that "sancti non sunt immediat intercessores nostri ad Deum, sed quidem Deo nobis impetrant, per Christum impetrant:"—but then further, that "sancti orant pro nobis, in genere, in particulari," and therefore "pie atque utiliter a viventibus invocantur." He adds however, that "Notandum est, cum dicimus non debere peti a sanctis, nisi ut orant pro nobis, nos non agere de verbis sed de sensu verborum: nam quantum ad verba, licet dicere, S. Petre miserere mei, salva me," &c. &c., "dummodo intelligamus, Salva me, et miserere mei, orando pro me; da mihi hoc et illud precibus tuis et meritis."—It were well if even this defence could be made good; but see the authorities below below in § 24. note f.  


* Added in MS.  

* Missal. Rom., p. 188.
nium sanctorum, ut indulgere digneris omnia peccata mea"
—"We pray Thee, Lord, by the merits of the saints whose
relics are here, and all saints, that Thou wouldst vouchsafe
to release me all my sins." And on the first Sunday in Ad-
vent, mentioning the blessed virgin, they pray; "Ut qui
vere eam matrem Dei credimus, ejus apud Te intercessionibus
"genitri-
"adjuvemus"—"That we, who believe her truly the mother
of God, may be helped by her intercessions with Thee."

§ 23. The second is that, which their litanies* contain: [The
second.]
which though I do not undertake to know how they are used
or how they ought to be used by particular Christians (that
is, how far voluntary, how far obligatory), yet the form of
them is manifest:—that, whereas you have in them some-
times, "Lord, have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon
us, Holy Trinity, One God, have mercy upon us," you have
much oftener the blessed virgin repeated again and again under
a number of her attributes; you have also all the saints and
angels, or such as the present occasion pretends for the ob-
ject of the devotion which a man tenders, named and spoken
to, with "Ora pro nobis;" that is, "Pray for us;" the blessed
virgin sometimes with "Te rogamus audi nos"—"We beseech
thee to hear us." One thing I must not forget to observe,
that the prayers, which follow those litanies, are almost al-
ways of the first kind; that is to say, addressed directly to
God, but mentioning the intercession of saints or angels for
the means to obtain our prayers at His hands.+

§ 24. The third is, when they desire immediately of them
[The
the same blessings, spiritual and temporal, which all Chris-
tians desire of God. There is a psalter* to be seen, with the
name of God changed everywhere into the name of the
blessed virgin. There is a book of devotion in French, with

* See e.g. the Sacrum Litaniæ Variorum breviarum quotidianum Exercitatio
s. 8vo. An. 1630.—In 1601
the Pope issued a decree, prohibiting
unauthorised Litanies, but sanctioning
some, which are apparently those published
in this collection: see Index
Libb. Prohib. 8vo. p. 103. Rom. 1664;
quoted by Bp. Barlow in his copy of
these Litanies now in the Bodleian
Library.
* As e.g. in the I. lit. B. M. V., ibid.
p. 110: and to the angels also, in the
Lit. de Angelis Sanctis, ibid. p. 243.
* Such is the case in the Litanies
just quoted, but the Litanies them-
selves belong to Thorndike's third
class of prayers.
* Psalterium B. Maris Virginis, inter
Rom. 1693. See Ussher, ibid., pp. 489,
sq. And for an account of the book,
and that Bonaventura was really its
author, Tyler as quoted below in note f.
—There is another work by the same
writer of a similar kind, entitled, Psal-
ibid. pp. 497, sq.
BOOK III.

this title, "Moyen de bien servir, prier, et adorer la vierge Marie."—"The way well to serve, pray to, and adore the blessed virgin." There are divers forms of prayer, as well as excessive speeches, concerning her especially, and other saints, quoted in the Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, pp. 330—345.

§ 25. Of these, then, the first kind seems to me utterly agreeable with Christianity: importing only the exercise of that communion, which all members of God's Church hold with all members of it, ordained by God for the means to obtain for one another the grace, which the obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, without difference whether dead or alive; because we stand assured, that they have the same affection for us, dead or alive, so far as they know us and our estate, and are obliged to desire and esteem their prayers for us, as for all the members of Christ's mystical Body. Neither is it in reason conceivable, that all Christians from the beginning should make them the occasion of their devotions, as I said, out of any consideration but this.

§ 26. For as concerning the term of "merit" perpetually frequented in these prayers; it hath been always maintained by those of the Reformation, that it is not used by the Latin fathers in any other sense than that which they allow. Therefore, the canon of the mass, and probably other prayers which are still in use, being more ancient than the greatest part of the Latin fathers, there is no reason to make any difficulty of admitting it in that sense, the ground whereof I have maintained in the second Book.

* This book has not been met with: but unhappily the authorities quoted below in note f will supply evidence of books quite as excessive.

f Scil. of the ed. of 1625: Works vol. iii. pp. 478—496. Ed. Elrington.—Compare also a singular book written by a Romanist and approved by the clergy of Ghent and of Cologne, translated into English by James Taylor (Lond. 4to. 1687), and entitled "Whole-some Advices from the Blessed Virgin to her Indiscreet Worshippers:" of which the object is, to reduce the worship of the Virgin to the model of Thornhill's first kind of prayers, but it testifies in so doing to excesses of the most extravagant kind.—See, for later times, the Theol. Critic for 1851, No. II., in its review of Morris's translation of Muzzarelli's Month of Mary; and an elaborate treatise in 2 vols. 8vo. by the same J. B. Morris, entitled Jesus the Son of Mary:—Meyrick, Practical Working of Church of Spain, Oxq. 1852.—Tyler, Prim. Christ. Worship, Lond. 1840; and Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the Church of Rome, contrary to Holy Scriptures and to the faith, &c. of the Church. Lond. 1844:—Palmer, Letters to Wiseman, Letters i. and v.:—and for what is said on the other side, Newman, Development &c., c. vii. § 4, c. viii. § 1, 2; and Rock, Hierurgia, Pt. ii. c. 5. Lond. 1833.


b See above, Bk. II. c. xxxiii. § 13. notes o. p.

As quoted in the last note.
§ 27. The third, taking them at the foot of the letter, and valuing the intent of those that use them by nothing but the words of them, are mere idolatries; as desiring of the creature that which God only gives, which is the worship of the creature for the Creator, “God blessed for evermore.” And were we bound to make the acts of them that teach these prayers the acts of the Church, because it tolerates them and maintains them in it instead of casting them out, it would be hard to free that Church from idolatry; which whose admitteth, can by no means grant it to be a Church, the being whereof supposeth the worship of one God, exclusive to any thing else. But the words of them are capable of the same limitation, that I gave to the words of our Lord; when I said, that they, whom Christians do good to here, may be said to “receive them into everlasting habitations,” because God does it in consideration of them and of the good done them. And so, when Irenæus calls the virgin Mary “the advocate of Eve” (v. 19'); he that considers his words there and iii. 33, shall find, that he saith it not because she prayed for her, but because she believed the angel’s message, and submitted to God’s will, and so became the means of saving all; though by our Lord Christ, Who pleadeth even for her as well as for Eve. Ground enough there is for such a construction, even the belief of one God alone, that stands in the head of our Creed; which we have no reason to think the Church allows them secretly to re-nounce, whom she alloweth to make these prayers; and therefore no ground to construe them so, as if the Church

I “The sense which the words strictly taken do produce, following them step by step.” Added in margin in MS.

A Above, § 16.

1 Quemadmodum enim illa (Eva) per angelicum sermonem seducta est, ut effugeret Deum, praeventa verba Eju; ita et haec (Maria) per angelicum sermonem evangelizata est, ut portaret Deum, obedias Eju verbo. Et sicut illa (Eva) seducta est, ut eflugeret Deum, sic haec (Maria) suasa est obedire Deo, ut virginis Evae virgo Maria sieret advocata. Et quemandum astrictum est morti genus humanum per virginem, salvatur per virginem; aqua lance disposita virginalis obedientia per virginali

THORNDIKE.

3 E
by allowing them did renounce the ground of all her Christianity: but not ground enough to satisfy a reasonable man, that all that make them do hold that infinite distance between God and His saints and angels, of whom they demand the same effects; which if they hold not, they are idolaters, as the heathen were; who being convinced of one Godhead, as the fathers challenge to their faces, divided it into One principal, and divers that by His gift are such. How shall I presume, that simple Christians in the devotions of their hearts understand that distance of God from His creatures, which their words signify not? which the wisest of their teachers will be much troubled to say, by what figure of speech they can allow it? especially if it be considered, how little reason or interest in religion there can be, to advance the reverence of Christian people towards the saints or angels so far above the reason and ground, which ought to be the spring-head of it.

§ 28. For so far are we from any tradition of the Catholic Church for this, that the admonition of Epiphanius to the Collyridians takes hold of it; Hær. lxxix. For they also would have been Christians, being a sort of women in Arabia, who in imitation of the eucharist offered to the virgin Mary, and communicated. Therefore Epiphanius repromes by them the custom of the Church, that no such thing was ever done in the Church; as well as by the ground of Christianity, that Christians worship only one God. This


aphelerosis to lib. iii. tom. ii. § 3. (Op.

tom. ii. p. 150. A,) describes the Colly-

ridians as "οι εις δωμα τησ.. Mariaς εν

ημερα του θεου των αγιων ανατομημεν κολ-

λυριδας τιματο προσφεροντες οις ενθαθ-

εμα δωμα τησ προσφέρεται αυτων δαιλοιμων.

Κολλυριδας αυτοι θυματαινουν." 

Ibid., lib. iii. tom. ii. Hær. lxxix. § 8.

(Oh. tom. i. p. 1065. D,) he describes

them as "οι των γυναικων αποσκοπουσιν" and

ibid. § 5. (p. 1062. A) he confutes

them thus—"Ποια δε της γραφη δι-

γαγαστο περι τουτου; οτιος προσφηνων

επιτρεπει θυσιαν προσκυνεισθαι, ου

μη γυναικα λεγειν; δεμητριον μη γαρ

οστι το σκευος, αλλα γυνη, και οδηγε

την φωνη παραλαμβανει, την δε γυνα-

ια και την άνθρωπον εν θεω τετμημ-

ηθε, διπερ τα σωματα των ιουλων, και

ει τι περισσετερον προς δοξολογηιν ει-

τουμα."—And in § 4. p. 1061. B—D;

"Ποια δε της γραφη δι-

γαγαστο περι τουτου; οτιος προσφηνων

επιτρεπει θυσιαν προσκυνεισθαι, ου

μη γυναικα λεγειν; δεμητριον μη γαρ

οστι το σκευος, αλλα γυνη, και οδηγε

την φωνη παραλαμβανει, την δε γυνα-

ια και την άνθρωπον εν θεω τετμημ-

ηθε, διπερ τα σωματα των ιουλων, και

ει τι περισσετερον προς δοξολογηιν ει-

τουμα."—And in § 4. p. 1061. B—D;

"Ποια δε της γραφη δι-

γαγαστο περι τουτου; οτιος προσφηνων

επιτρεπει θυσιαν προσκυνεισθαι, ου

μη γυναικα λεγειν; δεμητριον μη γαρ

οστι το σκευος, αλλα γυνη, και οδηγε

την φωνη παραλαμβανει, την δε γυνα-

ια και την άνθρωπον εν θεω τετμημ-

ηθε, διπερ τα σωματα των ιουλων, και

ει τι περισσετερον προς δοξολογηιν ει-

τουμα."—And in § 4. p. 1061. B—D;
admonition then takes hold, though not of the Church, yet of the prayers which it alloweth, signifying the same with their obligations. So doth the admonition of St. Ambrose, In Rom. i. p.; to them, who reserve nothing to God, that they give not to His servants. So doth that of St. Augustin, De Vera Rel., cap. iv. 9.;—that our religion is not to consist in worshipping the dead; and that an angel forbade St. John to worship him, but only God, Whose “fellow-servants” they were. So doth the argument of St. Gregory Nyssen, Contra Eunom. iv. 7.; and Athanasius, Contra Arian. iii. 8.; concluding our Lord to be God, because He is wor-

"Solent tamen pudorem passi, neglecti Dei misera uti excusatia, dicentes per istos posse ire ad Deum, sicut per comites pervenitur ad regem. Age, numquid tam demens est alicuius aut salutis sum immemor, ut honorific- centiam regis vindicet comiti, cum de haec re si qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure uti rei damnentur majes- tatis? Et isti se non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creature, et relictum Domino conservos ador- rant; quasi sit alicuius plus, quod reser- vetur Deo. Nam et ideo ad regem per tribunos aut comites itur, quia homo utique est rex, et nescit, quibus debet rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem, Quem nihil utique latet (omnia enim merita novit), promerem- dum, suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota; ubicunque enim talis loquutus fuerit Ei, respondet illi." Pseudo-Ambros., In Rom. i.; in fin. Op. S. Ambros. tom. ii. p. 38. A.


C. "Διδα και διδασκειν αντι τη αυγηλοι, ας αλλα παρ αυτου δοτι και προσκη- νεται παρ αυτων, ουχ οτη τη δεξια μελ- ζων, αλλα ας αλλα παρα πατη παρηκα- με λει και παρηκα μονο θαθουν θαθο, μονος δε του Πατρος θαθο θαθο οθα οθαν θεος. Ει γαρ ας ανεφεξη τη δεξι προσκυ-
shipped, which Cornelius was forbid by St. Peter, St. John by the angel, to do to them, saith Athanasius.4

§ 29. In fine, so dangerous is the case, that whose communicateth in it, is no way reasonably assured, that he communicateth not in the worship of idols. Only, the Church of England having acknowledged the Church of Rome a true Church, though corrupt, ever since the Reformation; I am obliged so to interpret the prayers thereof, as to acknowledge the corruption so great, that the prayers which it alloweth may be idolatries, if they be made in that sense which they may properly signify: but not that they are necessarily idolatries. For if they were necessarily idolatries, then were the Church of Rome necessarily no Church; the being of Christianity presupposing the worship of one true God. And though, to confute the heretics, the style of modern devotions leaves nothing to God which is not attributed to and desired of His saints; yet it cannot be denied, they may be the words of them, who believe that God alone can give that which they desire.

§ 30. The second sort, it is confessed, had the beginning in the flourishing times of the Church after Constantine. The lights of the Greek and Latin Church, Basil,9 Nazian-...
zeny, Nyssen, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustin, Chrysostom, Ch. P. XXXI.

in xl. Martyrs, § 8; Op. tom. ii, p. 156. B, C.—These and the following quotations are produced and discussed by Chemnitz, as above, pp. 200, sq.: whom Thondike appears to have had before him.

Γ Λοκου καὶ η του μεγαλου Κων-
σταντινου ψυχη (α της ασθησεως), δοσι
τε προ αυτου Βασιλεως φιλαχριστω." S. Greg. Naz., In Julian. Imp. In-
vict. i, Orat. iv, § 3; Op. tom. i, p. 78. C: "where," says Ussher, "the Greek scholaist upon that parenthesis puttheth this note, "ισοκρατιων, απελ
του, Εχε της ασθησεως οντα της τρε
ακωνεως; " and therein he said rightly, for Isocrates used the same form of speech, both in his Encomiums and in his Epinomvs."—Ει δε της σοι κα
ν των ημετερων δοτι λογιο, κα τοιο
τας δοτι φυσικα ιν Θεον γραφε, ται
tωσιαν εσωανθεναι, δικιο και τον
ημετερων λογον, αλη τοπων και πε
των εναψαλοι." Id., In Fun.
Gorgon, Orat. viii, § 23; ibid., p. 232
D.—"Αλλα δε φημαι κα κερα κεφαλη," k. t. l., In, Laudem Athanasii, Orat.
dxii, § 97; ibid., p. 411. C: "apostrophizing S. Athanasius."—Δε
δε μοι, Κυπριανα, τα τιμωριαν μοι κα
προσμια κα δομια, το εκατο εκι
κατο δουλους μετρητας," k. t. l. Id., In
Laud. S. Martiria Cypriana, Orat.
xxiv, § 5; ibid., p. 440. A.—The
strongest passage, however, on the sub-
ject in S. Gregory's works is a quota-
tion in the Oration last quoted (§ 11.
p. 443. D) from a sporadic oration at-
tributed by S. Gregory to S. Cyprian, and
giving a very wild story of the latter's early life. According to this account, S. Cyprian, being a magician, and trying the virtue of a virgin named Justina, the latter, "γην Παρθενω
Mαραθις λεπτωσαν βοηθηται παραδινω
κυωνιστηκον, τη της χρησεως κα
χερουσιαν προβαλλεται φαιμακον," k. t. l.
See Chemnitz, as above, p. 202: and
Palmers Letters to Wiseman, Letter v.
pp. 29, 30.

"Αντωνινον" (Theodorus) διανηθηκε
εις καλην και μακραιν προς Θευν
πορισαν ημιν δι την μνημη του αγα
νων διδασκαλου κατεληκα, λαος αδρο
ζους, εκκλησια ταδεων, δαιμονια εκ
ελαιων, αγγελους εφηρηκαν καταγ
χατων ευρισκεν παρα Θεου τα συμ-
φωνα," k. t. l., S. Greg. Nyssa, De
D: proceeding in p. 585. A, sq., to
address the martyr thus:—"Ημεις μεν
ον δι καιμερε, κ. t. l., "εν δε δευρο
dη προ ημιας, δουν τον αν δε, της λοιρ
της φρονησι, καλιστα εχα σε αντι-
καλοιμεν, ης η σαν που τους τιμωσα να αδρατος φιλως," k. t. l., "χρηζομεν πολ
λων ενεργειων, πρεσβευοντες υπερ της
πατριδος προς τον κοινω Βασιλεια," k. t. l., "Ημεις γαρ και ην αναθειν
φυλαξημεν, σοι λογισθημενε την ενε-
ργειαν αιτουμε δε και του μελλοντος
την ασφαλειαν δι' ηρεμε γενοται κα
πλεονευς ουσιατας, άμει πο των χορο
των αν αδελφων των μαρτυρος, και μετα
παντων διεσθηνην," k. t. l.—Again: "Αδε δε
τη Θειον παρεματομενα θωσιατηρησι, και
tη παροικηκη και ιουρειον λειτουργου
νων αγγελων Τριαδε, μεσημα παντων
ημιων, αιτουμενος ημιων θεομορφων
φρεσι, αυλωνιε τω Βασιλειας παλαιων,
και Χριστον ίσην της Κυριου ενημιων." Id.,
Vit. S. Ephraem. Syr., ibid., p. 616. B,
"Αποστολουσος Αντιχυνας τη Θεο
Αντιχυνας δε ει δευρι υμιων και του λαου
Αγγελικων." Id., De Meletio Epis-
coro; ibid., p. 594. A.

"Ego et frater hieredem feceram," &c.
S. Ambros., De Excessu Fratris
Sui Satriy, lib. 1, § 15; Op. tom. ii.
1117. D: and so throughout the first
book of that tract.—"Unde te evocem,
Petre, ut doces mihi quid fiens cogi-
taveris? Unde inquam te evocem?
De caro, ubi jam choro insertus es
Angelorum, et etiam de tumulto." &c.
Id., In, S. Luc. lib. x, § 92; Op. tom.
1523. E.—In the De Viduis, how-
B—E), he says, "Et tu habes proxim
mos" (sc. to intercede for her); "habe
apostolos proximos, habes martyres
proximos: ... ama ergo propinquit
atem Petri, aminimatem Andreae, ut pro
tegent, et recedant cupiditates tuae:
... obscurandi sunt angeli pro nobis,
qui nobis ad praeidium dati sunt;
martyres obscurandi," &c.

"Vale, o Paula, et cultorius tui ul
timam senectutem orati-nibus juva.
Fides et opera tua Christo te socei-
unt. Praesens facilius, quod postulas, in
petrabili." S. Hieron., Epitaph. Pauli,
in fn.; Op. tom. iv, p. ii, p. 688.—But
in his Epitaph. Nepotiani (ibid.,
266), he says, "Quicquid dixerno, qua
ile non audite, mutuo videtur;" and
again (ibid. in fn., p. 275), "Et
cum quo loqui non possemus, de eo loqui
nunquam desinamus." And in his
Vita Hilarionis (ibid., p. 90), he re
lates, that one Constantius used to
watch at his tomb by night, "et quasi
cum praecone ad adjutandas orationes
suas sermoceinari."
BOOK Cyril both, Theodoret, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great.


Direct invocations or apostrophes to saints do not appear to be found in S. Chrysostom (so Chemnitz, as above, pp. 204, 205): the passages cited to prove the contrary being from spurious works: as e.g. the Sermo in Petrum eu el. c. 365. C. D. (he cites Serm. iv. pp. 7, sq. ed. Monfauc.) and Hom. lxxvi. Ad Populum Antioch., quoted by Bellarm. De Sanct. Beattit., lib. i. c. 19 (Controv. tom. i. p. 1978, A), which, however, does not contain an invocation.—In his Liber in S. Babylam cont. Julianum et Gentes (§ 11. Op. tom. ii. p. 555. C), he says, that "η δεις της λοφροσκος" (sic. p. των λοφών τάφων) "εις την ψυχήν θεοτουσα, καταπληκτε τη αυτη και διανιστει και αυτον του κεμένου αυτον και παρεστως και δρομευδε ουτως αυτην διακεισθαι ποιει." And in his homily De S. Maximio § 3 (ibid., p. 523. A) he bids his hearers pray, "αυτων των μακροτελευτων καιμων των ευχης ταυτη λαβατες και γαρ πλεον αυτη παργισαν νυν," k. t. l. —See Chemnitz, as above, pp. 203—205.


Direct invocations or apostrophes to saints do not appear to be found in S. Chrysostom (so Chemnitz, as above, pp. 204, 205): the passages cited to prove the contrary being from spurious works: as e.g. the Sermo in Petrum eu el. c. 365. C. D. (he cites Serm. iv. pp. 7, sq. ed. Monfauc.) and Hom. lxxvi. Ad Populum Antioch., quoted by Bellarm. De Sanct. Beattit., lib. i. c. 19 (Controv. tom. i. p. 1978, A), which, however, does not contain an invocation.—In his Liber in S. Babylam cont. Julianum et Gentes (§ 11. Op. tom. ii. p. 555. C), he says, that "η δεις της λοφροσκος" (sic. p. των λοφών τάφων) "εις την ψυχήν θεοτουσα, καταπληκτε τη αυτη και διανιστει και αυτον του κεμένου αυτον και παρεστως και δρομευδε ουτως αυτην διακεισθαι ποιει." And in his homily De S. Maximio § 3 (ibid., p. 523. A) he bids his hearers pray, "αυτων των μακροτελευτων καιμων των ευχης ταυτη λαβατες και γαρ πλεον αυτη παργισαν νυν," k. t. l. —See Chemnitz, as above, pp. 203—205.

"Εγατα μημονον των και προ-
κεκουμενων πρωτων πατριαρχων, προ-

βλητοι," k. t. l. "ειλ δε ταυτων ουχ ἐνας ἢ διε γε του τους εν σωτατις φοι-
των" διαλλα πολλαια και πανηγυριασ 

Gottfried Enderz
Leo, more, or rather all after that time, have all of them spoken to the saints departed, and desired their assistance. But neither is this enough to make a tradition of the Church. For the Church had been three hundred years before it began. Ireneus is mistaken, when he is alleged for it; as I said even now. Cardinal Bellarmine alleges out of Eusebius, De Preparat., xiii. 10; "Vota ipsi facimus"—"We make our prayers to them." But the Greek bears only, "We make our prayers to God at their monuments." Athanasius De Sanctissima Deipara, whom he quotes, is certainly of a later date than Athanasius. Out of St. Hilary I see Evangelice, cap. 7" (read c. 11; both 7, and above in the text, are mistakes): "Hæc nos, inquit, quotidian factitamus, qui vero pietais milites, ut Dei amicos honorantes, ad monumenta quoque illorum accedimus, sciace ipses factimus, tanquam viris sanctis, quorum intercessionis ad Deum non parum juari profiteremur." Bellarm., De Sanct. Beatt., lib. i. c. 19; Controv. tom. i. p. 1977. B, C. 9. "Kai tauta kai kai omoi eis ti ton theophylon telentu, ois stratimantai tis elaphou eisebeias ou de amfrois eis an, paralambanewa. "Othen kai eis tis theiastai auton idio hou paternai, kai tis ephaxa par tautais pois thes, tiw tis tis makrelis auton phaxa, ois elphous kai tis ton othi hou ginogeawna." Euseb., Prepar. Evang., lib. xiii. c. 11. p. 663. B, C. Paris 1623. Bellarmine as above p. 1977. C, quotes three addresses to the blessed Virgin from "Athanasius, Serm. in Evangelium de sanctissima Deipara:" scil. "Kai de akouontov thestov deibai kal idrophi, kai eli ois ton ido sun eli tis theiastai hou, kai mi telidov to lao idon." K.T.L. (Pseudo-Altain, "Kynunikai eis ton Elagabolo tis 'Tetragiai deispoign idou Theostov," § 14: inter Op. S. Athan. tom. ii. p. 401. A. ed. Bened.)—And so again lower down.—Prefixed to the Sermon in the Denued edition is a letter of Baronius, affirming it to have been written "post proditam Monothelitarum heresim." 7 In his list of Fathers, De Sanet. Beattit. lib. i. c. 19, Controv. tom. i. pp. 1978. D, 1979. A, Bellarmine quotes passages from S. Hilary affirming the intercession of saints and angels, but nothing implying any invocation of them.
nothing brought, nor remember any thing to be brought to
that purpose. In fine, after Constantine, when the festivals
of the saints, being publicly celebrated, occasioned the con-
fluence of Gentiles as well as Christians; and innumerable
things were done, which seemed miracles done by God to
attest the honour done them and the truth of Christianity
which it supposed: I acknowledge, those great lights did
think fit to address themselves to them, as petitioners; but
so at the first, as those that were no ways assured by our
common Christianity, that their petitions arrived at their
knowledge. You have seen St. Augustin's acknowledge, that
they must come by such means as God is no way tied to
furnish. Gregory Nazianzen speaks to Gorgonia in his oration
upon her, and to Constantine in his first oration against
Julian; but under a doubtful condition,—if they were sen-
sible of what he spake. Enough to distinguish praying to
God from any address to a creature, though religion be the
ground of it. And when the apparitions about their monu-
ments were held unquestionable, yet was it questioned, whe-
ther the same soul could be present at once in places of so
much distance, or angels appear like them; as you may see
in the Answer aforesaid, pp. 391—394. Nay, Hugo de S.Vic-
tore, in Cassander, Epist. xix., hath enabled him to hold, that

1 See above, c. xxix. § 35. note f.
2 See above, note y.
3 See above, note y.
4 Sc. of the ed. of 1625: pp. 436—
5 Hugo de Sancto Victore, lib. de
76. X.), adopts S. Augustin’s words in
his De Cura pro Moruis:—“Ibi si-
quidem sunt spiritus defunctorum, ubi
non vident neque audient quas aguntur
aut eventiunt in ista vita hominibus:
ita tamen cura est eis de vivis, quam-
quam quid agant omnino necsiant,
quemadmodum nobis cura est de mor-
tuis, quamvis quid agant, utique necs-
amus: necsiant quidem mortui” ( &c,
as quoted above in c. xxix. § 35. note f):
and see Cassander’s quotation from him.
6 “De interpellatione sanctorum
jam olim in Litanii publica usitata,
scripta” (seil. in Schol. in Hymn.
cur minus liceat beatos illos spiritus
ex quadam pti desiderii redundantia
compellare atque exhortari ut id fa-
ciat, quod eos ulterius facere credimus;
ut perinde valeat, Omnes sancti orare
pro me, atque, Utinam omnes sancti
orent pro me, &c. Huc me primum
induxit, quod de hac questione, an,
quatenus, et quomodo, sancti cognos-
cant et exaudient singularum eos in-
terpellantium preces, nil apud veteres
neque recentiores definitum sed pro-
babiliter tantum disputatum videam.
Notum est, quid Augustinus, De Cura
pro mortuis Agenda, de ea re disputat.
Et Sotus manifeste asserit, ‘non esse
ex ratione beatitudinis, quod beati au-
diant orationes nostras, probable ta-
men esse quod Deus ipsis revelat,’ &c.
Movit quoque me potentissimum quod
apud Hugonem de Sancto Victore le-
geram, non ideo inanes fore nostras
preces, quibus sanctos ad orandum
pro nobis invocamus, etiamsi concedam
us eos voces postulantium non au-
dire. ‘Ecce,’ inquit, ‘dicamus, non
audient, nuncquid Deus non audit?”
the litanies do not suppose that the saints hear them; and therefore are expounded by some to signify conditional desires,—if God grant them to come to their knowledge. But of that I speak not yet; only as it enables me to conclude, that this kind of prayer is not idolatry. This necessarily follows from the premisses: because a man cannot take that saint or angel for God, whose prayers he desires, but manifestly shows, that his desire is grounded upon the relation which he thinks he hath to him by our Lord Christ and by His Church. Nevertheless, though it be not idolatry, the consequence and production of it not being distinguishable from idolatry, the Church must needs stand obliged to give it those bounds, that may prevent such mischief as that which shall make it no Church.

§ 31. For though the degrees are not visible by which the abuse is come to this height, yet I conceive it appears by Walafridus Strabus, De Rebus Ecclesiasticis, cap. xxviii. c., that


"Cassander thought he might grant what he" (i.e. Hugo de S. Victøre) "had granted." Added in margin in MS.

before St. Jerom the saints had no room in the litanies; which answer, “Pray for us,” after every saint’s name. There he telleth, that St. Jerom first translated Eusebius his martyrologium (containing what saints died on what days of the year), at the request of Chromatius and Heliodorus bishops; upon occasion of that commendation, which the emperor Theodosius had given Gregory bishop of Cordova, for commemorating every day at the eucharist the saints of the day. And afore this, he affirmeth, the saints’ names had no room in the litanies. And Chemnitius hath given us the transcript of an ancient litany out of a written copy belonging to the abbey of Corbey upon the Weser: which calleth upon the saints, “Sancte Petre, Sancte Paule,” &c.; but so that the suffrage is, “Exaudi Christe”—“O Christ hear” us, or them for us; which is the effect of the first sort of prayer, and an evident argument that the forms now in force took possession by degrees. For the litanies are properly “Κύριε ελέησον”—“Lord have mercy upon us;” as the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom call them. By that form of service which the Constitutions of the Apostles relate, where the deacon indites to the people what they are to pray for in behalf of all estates in the Church and their necessities, you shall see the people answer only, “Κύριε ελέησον”—“Lord have mercy.” That is their part. Thence came the name of litanies, whether such devotions were used

bribus). Id. ibid.—And see Hooker, E. P., V. xli. 2.—Bingham (XIII. i. 11) conjectures, that the minor litany is simply the Kyrie Eleyson. L’Estrange thinks, that it means the Rogation Days before the Feast of the Ascension: but this appears from Bingham to be an error.

4 See the first quotation in note c.

5 Ibid.


9 See below in note i.

10 See the quotations in Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x. § 23, 31, 32.

in processions or otherwise. That in the litanies of St. Gregory, whereof we read in his life (i.e. 41, 42), the saints were spoken to, the people answering "Ora pro nobis"—"Pray for us!" it is easy to believe. For of Charles the Great and Walafridus his time there is no question to be made. That the same was done in St. Basil's litanies, whereof Epist. Ixiii., or in those which Mamertus bishop of Vienna instituted (as we find by Sidonius, Epist. v. 14, vii. 1, which have since been called Rogations), there is no manner of appearance; and the innovation of Petrus Fullo, the Eutychian bishop of Antiochia, after the council of Chalcedon, which Nicephorus relates, Eccles. Hist. xv. 28, in bringing the blessed virgin quo misericordiam Eius."—See also other proofs that the Kyrie Eleison is called the Litany, in Palmer, Orig. Liturg. c. ii. sect. iii. vol. i. pp. 266, 267, 282, 284.—"His (Concilii) acceadat factum Gregorii, qui litanias invidiae tempore pestic. Lib. i. Vitae ejus, cap. 42, et Walafridus Strabo, cap. 28, testes sunt. Sed forte objectat, Litaniae hic vocari solum Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison; id enim vocat Litaniae Graeci, ut patet ex Basilio," &c. "Respondeo in Concilii prædictiis litanias vocari illas ipsas invocationes Dei et sanctorum, quas nos modo vocamus litanias; nam imprimit Walafridus Strabo," &c. "Declaring quid sit litania, ... dicit esse sanctorum invocationem." Bellarm., De Sacro Beatiti, lib. i. c. 19; Controv. tom. i. pp. 1767, D. 1777. A.—Wal. Strabo, it will be observed, says nothing of the kind as to litanies before S. Jerom, but the direct contrary.


See above in note c.


"Rogationum ... nobis solemnitate primus Mamercus pater et pontifex, reverentissimo exemplo, utilisimno experimento, inveniit, instituit, invexit. Erant quidem prius (quod salva fidei pace sit dictum) vaga, tepentes, infrequentesque, utque sic dixerim, ostendit, quae sequentes interpellantium prandiorum obicibus hebetabatur, maxime aut intres aut serenitatem deprsecarat. ... In hoc autem, quos supriorius unusquisque sacerdos nobis et protulit pariter et conculit, jejunatur, oratur, psallitur, fletur." Sidon. Apollin., Epist. lib. v. Ep. xiv. Ad Aprum; p. 352 ed. Savaro, Paris 1609. It appears from Tillemont (Mém. Eccl. tom. xvi. art. Mamert, art. i), who himself calls him Mamertus, that the spelling of the name is uncertain.—"Ex hoc loco notandum, ante adscensionem Domini ante Mamercum litaniasuisse, tot diebus quot a Mamero instituti sunt; D. Augustinus Serm. cxxxii. in Vigilia Dominicae adscensionis: quem concuile. Savaro, ad Sidon. ibid. quoted by Bingham.


See the account of Rogation Days in Bingham, XIII. i. 10; and Palmer, Orig. Liturg., c. ii. sect. iii. vol. i. pp. 269-272.

"Σφαῖρα γα μὴν τῶν Κυρίων Πέτρων
into the prayers of the Church, is enough to assure us there is no tradition of the apostles for it.

§ 32. A difference very considerable. For grant the monuments of saints and martyrs the places for Christians to meet at for God’s service in public, [or] for their private devotions, by primitive Christianity; all this while the service of God is the work, the honour of the saints determines only the time and place of it. Processions celebrated with litanies were assemblies for God’s service, to turn away His plagues, and the like; and when the saints come into them, their honour becomes part of the work for which Christians assemble. Suppose a simple soul can distinguish between "Ora pro nobis," and "Domine miserere;" between "Pray for us," and "Lord have mercy upon us:" how shall I be assured, that it distinguishes between the honour that pagans gave the less gods under Jupiter the father of gods, and that which himself gives the saints under the God of those saints? And is it enough, that the Church enjoins not nor teaches idolatry? Is it not further bound to secure us against it? I know not whether it can be said, that processions and litanies are voluntary devotions, which the people are not answerable for if they neglect. They were first brought in, and since frequented, at the instance of prelates and their clergy: and if they be amiss, the people are snared by their means; that is, by the Church, if the Church bear them out in it. And by these three sorts of prayers it appears, that, without giving bounds to private conceits, there is no means to stop men’s course from that extremity; which whether it be real idolatry or not, nothing can assure us.

§ 33. Upon these terms I stand. I have heard those relations, upon credit not to be questioned, which make their devotions to saints hardly distinguishable from the idolatries of pagans. That they, who preferred them, could not or did not distinguish, I say not. In fine, they demonstrate manifold

[Unreadable text on the page]
more affection for the blessed virgin, or some particular saints, than for our Lord. That they call not upon saints to pray for them but to help them; that they neither express, nor can be presumed to mean, by praying for them, but by granting their prayers; in fine, that they demonstrate inward subjection of the heart, wherein idolatry consists: I cannot disbelieve those who relate what they see done. What may be the reason, why to them, rather than to God? It was a means to bring the world to be Christians, that it was persuaded, that God protected Christians by the intercession of those saints, whose festivals they solemnized. But it brought them to be Christians with that love of the world and the present commodities of it, which Christianity pretends to leave without the Church among the pagans. Should they resign these affections to their Christianity, they would have immediate recourse to God; Whom having to friend, they know they need neither be troubled for plague nor tooth-ache, nor any thing, which the cross of Christ consists with. While they cannot assure themselves that they do, no marvel, if they would have such Christianity, as may give them hope of that by the saints, which God assures them not by it.

§ 34. I grant it no idolatry, that is, not necessarily any [No ex-
cuse for
the Church
of
Rome,
that
the
practice
is not
nec-
cessarily
idolatry.]

The usual argument appears to be this:—“Sicut stultæ non sunt illæ supplicationes quae regi offeruntur, etiam si non ad ipsum regem sed ad presidem duntaxat regia negotia legitime pertrectantium pervertantur.” Hessel, Pro Invoc. Sanct., c. 13. p. 43. b. Lovan. 1568. And so also Bellarm., De Sanct. Beat., lib. i. c. 20; Controv. tom. ii. p. 1899. A. B.

The “King” in the illustration is the saint, the “præses” is God.
Of the relics of the saints' bodies.

§ 35. As for the remains of the saints' bodies and the honour of them, having said this of their souls, whereof their bodies had been the instruments, I shall need to say but a little. Gennadius I will not forget, De Eccles. Dogmat., cap. lxxiii. "Sanctorum corpora et praepium beatorum martyrum reliquias ac si Christi membra sincerissime honoranda; et basilicas eorum nominibus appellatas, velut loca sancta Divino cultui mancipata, affectu piissimo et devotione fidelissima adeundas credimus: si quis contra hanc sententiam venerit, non Christianus sed Eunomianus et Vigilantianus est"—"We believe, that we are most sincerely to honour the corpses of the saints, specially the relics of the martyrs, as of the members of Christ; and to come to the churches called by their names with most pious affection and most faithful devotion: if any man do against this sentence, he is no Christian but a follower of Eunomius and Vigilantius." At the first, the places of their burial, and times of their triumphs, determined the circumstances of God's service. Afterwards, when more churches were requisite than there were saints, to bury their remains where the eucharist was celebrated seems an honour proper for the purpose. Nay, though St. Jerome confess, that those poor women, which lighted candles in honour of them, had the "zeal of God not according to knowledge" (supposing both Jews and Gentiles had a custom to light candles

* See above, § 15. note t.

on all occasions which they would honourably celebrate; why should it seem a ceremony unfit to express men's esteem of God's grace in them? If Vigilantius\(^a\) could not down with this, I have nothing to do with Vigilantius. But there were abuses even before that time. Lucilla, reproved by Caecilianus, deacon of Carthage, for kissing the relics of some questionable martyr before the eucharist, by her money and faction raised the schism of the Donatists upon his being chosen bishop: Optatus, [lib.] i.\(^b\) St. Augustin knew many Christians that worshipped tombs and pictures; De Moribus Eccles. Cath., cap. xxxiv.\(^c\) Vigilantius might desire only, that bounds might be put to prevent abuses; and in that might be borne out by those prelates, whom St. Jerome\(^d\) taxes. In that I do not find Vigilantius condemned by the Church. And those bounds were easily determined, if prayer to saints did not transgress the bounds of revealed truth. For were nothing done, that should suppose that they hear the prayers that are made them; there should be no considerable occasion to transgress the bounds of honour due unto their relics.

\(^{§36.}\) As for the worshipping of images: of necessity, the word \(^\text{\textit{DE}}\), or "carved image," in the second commandment, must either stand for any similitude, and so the making or having of any manner of image will be forbidden by the precept; or for the similitude of any imaginary godhead, and so no image\([a]\) but those are forbidden by it\(^b\). According to the\(^c\) former sense, the making of the brazen serpent and the

---

\(^a\) See last note.
\(^b\) "Hoc apud Carthaginem post ordinationem Caeciliani factum esse, nemo est qui nesciat: per Lucillam scilicet, nescio quam feminam factio- sam: quae ante concussam persecutionis turbinibus pacem, dum adhuc in tranquillo esset Ecclesia, cum corrup- tionem archidiaconi Caeciliani ferre non posset, quae ante spiritualis cibus et potum, os necio cujus martyris, si tamen martyris, libare dicebatur: et cum praeponeret calici salutari os nes- cio cujus hominis mortui, et si mar- tyris, sed necludium vindicati, corrupsa, cum confusione, discessit irata. Tras- centi et dolenti, ne disciplina succum- beret, occurrit subito persecutionis enata tempestas." Opiat., De Schism.
cherubins over the ark is a dispensation of God in His own positive law; which is easily understood. But Solomon making the bulls, the lions, eagles, and cherubins in his temple, will be no less; and will require a revelation to warrant it. According to the latter, making of images will be no more prohibited the Jews than other nations by the Law. But God having constituted a power in the nation to limit the Law, and so to make a "hedge" for it, as the Jews speak; that which they forbid, will be by that means prohibited by the Law. And so there might be such an image in David's house, as we read of 1 Sam. xix. 12; that is, such an one as was not so prohibited. And, by the same reason, the tribute money might have Cæsar's picture on it; which otherwise must be against the Law. And when Josephus says, that Solomon incurred blame by making images of living creatures in the temple; it will appear, that their constitutions in his time forbade the making of such. Tertullian, Contra Marc. ii. 22, manifestly affirms the making of the brazen serpent and cherubins not to have been against the Law, because not made for idols; alleging the words of the precept,—"Thou shalt not worship them nor serve them,"—for a restriction limiting the generality of a carved image. And this opinion I doubt not to be true; and that there is no third to be named. For if it be said, that the meaning of the precept is, "Thou shalt make no image that may give occasion to worship it:" not supposing a conceit of more gods than one, an image is not a thing that can make a man think so; supposing the conceit of a god besides the true God, without an image a man will worship the same.

---

* See Grot., Ad Matt. xv. 2, and Ad 2 Cor. xi. 24.


* "Proinde et similitudinem vetas fieri omnium quae in ccelo et in terra et in aquis, ostendit et causas; idololatriam sibi substatiam colibentes. Subjicit eum, 'Non adorabitis ea neque servietis illis.' Serpentis autem similitudinem postea reperiebat a Mosi Domino, non ad idololatriam titulum pertinebat, sed ad remediantos eos qui a serpentibus infestabantur. Et taceo de figura remedi. Sic et Cherubim et Seraphim aurea in arce figuratum ex semplum, certe simplex ornamentum, accommodata suggesti, longe diversas habendo causas, a idololatriae conditione, ob quam similidium prohibetur, non videntur simulidium prohibitantur legi reExceptu, non in ea simulidinis statu depremens, ob quem similidium prohibetur." Tertull., Adv. Marc., lib. ii. c. 22; Op. p. 392. D.
§ 37. Now either God, by saying, 'Thou shalt make no image that may give occasion to worship it,' refers it to every man to judge, whether the image that he may make gives occasion to worship it or not; and then He leaves it to every man to make any image, which he judges to give none: or He refers it to the power, which He appointeth to oblige the nation in that behalf, to judge; which is that which I say. And, therefore, seeing no man is left to himself to judge in that which God hath appointed a power to determine, of necessity this sense is the same which I maintain. The consequence whereof is, that it is in the power of the Church to judge, whether images are to be had, and that in churches, or not. For the power that concludes the Church being the same with the power that concludes the synagoge, as the synagoge and the Church are both one and the same people of God, under the Law and the gospel; it is not possible to limit this power under the gospel, not to place images in churches, by virtue of this law, which provides nothing concerning churches.

§ 38. The case would come to be the same, if we should suppose the precept to prohibit the making of an image. For then the matter would necessarily evidence, that it was positive, and given only the people of the Jews for that estate which the Law introduced; seeing, not only that which is ceremonial, but also that which is positive, in Moses' law, necessarily ceaseth to oblige Christians. The reason why the Law provideth not to the contrary, is that, which I have alleged, why Christians are not tied to part with wives or husbands that are idolaters, as the Jews were, out of St. Augustine';—that, whilst the blessings of the world were the promises which God conditioned to give them that should keep His laws, the prosperity of this world might move Israelites according to the flesh to fall from their own to their husbands' or their wives' gods, the worshippers whereof they saw prosper in the world. Not so those, who had undertaken His cross, and thereupon, if faithfully, had received His Spirit which the gospel bringeth. For so, why should the Church think, that having images should seduce those, that are such, to think them the seats of some godhead,
which supposeth a conceit of more gods than one? And upon this supposition proceedeth all that is written in the prophecies of Esay and Jeremy, in the book of Baruch under the person of Jeremy, and in the rest of the prophets, in scorn of the images of the Gentiles; to wit, that they imagined some deity contained and inclosed in them, which were indeed mere wood and stone.

§ 39. The question that remains, is but only this; whether this power of the Church hath been duly executed, and within the bounds of our common Christianity, or not. For to pretend that the apostles themselves have put it in use, by prescribing, that images be had, and in churches, would be to contradict all that appears in the point by the records of the Church. For though I be obliged to say, that there was never any constitution of the apostles, enjoining the whole Church not to bring any image into any church; because all the Church, that is considerable, hath sometimes done it: yet will it easily appear, [that] there is no act of the whole Church binding all to have them in churches.

§ 40. The council of Elvira, can. xxxvi.\(^b\) : "Placuit picture in ecclesiis esse non debere, ne quod colitur [et adoratur], in partibus pingatur"—"It seemed good, that there be no pictures in the churches; lest that which is worshipped, be pictured on the walls." The Epistle of Epiphanius to John bishop of Jerusalem is extant in St. Jerome; relating how, finding something of our Lord Christ painted upon a veil in a church of his diocese, he gave order to tear it: which, being out of his diocese, he could not have done, had he not thought it against God’s law; and therefore no law of the Church.


And Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* vii. 18, relating the statue of our Lord curing the woman that had the issue of blood, at Cesarea Philippi, saith, "it is no marvel, that Gentiles converted to the faith should honour our" Lord and His apostles (for he saith, he had seen images of Peter and Paul, as well as of our Lord, "σωζομένας"—"preserved" from their time); "as the Gentiles used to honour" their saviours or benefactors. But had it been against God's law, would not the apostles have told them so? would they not have believed the apostles, whom they believed before they were Christians? The picture of the good shepherd upon the chalices of the church, which Tertullian appeals to *De Pudicit.* cap. vii., easily shews, that they used not His picture, who used an emblem of Christ for a picture. And you heard St. Augustin, say, that he knew many worshippers of pictures and tombs among Christians. The true ground and effect of these passages is hard for me to evidence here in a few words. I believe St. Augustin saw some dough-baked Christians do that at the tombs of Christians, which when they were idolaters they did at the tombs of their friends, where part of their idolatries were done to their ghosts. For by that which follows he complains, that he saw that excess of meat and drink upon the graves of Christians, which it is no marvel if the idolatries of the Gentiles allowed. So that it is no such marvel, that such Christians should worship pictures, as did the Gentiles. The canon is one of the hardest pieces of antiquity that I know. The most probable [account of it] seems to be this:—that it follows the reason, alleged in Deuteronomy, against *Deut. iv.* any image for God, because they saw no shape of God. So the 15.

---

1 "Καὶ θαυμαστῶν οὐδὲν τοῦτο πάλαι εἰς θεόν εὐφρεντότατα πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν ἵματα τυπογραφοῦσι: ἦκε καὶ τῶν ἀπεστάλων Αὐτοῦ τὰς εἰκόνας Πάλλοι καὶ Πέτρου, καὶ Αὐτοῦ δὴ τὸν Χριστόν, διὰ χρυσόμων ἐν γαρφάις σωζομένας ἱστορίας ἐκεῖ τῶν παλαιότων ἀπαραθητὰ σοι σωθηρᾶ ἐκτελή τεσσεράθεια παρ' ἄλλους τούτον τιμᾶς ἐισωθέντων τῶν τρόπων." Euseb., H. E., lib. vii. c. 18, p. 265. C: speaking of the statue (so called) of our Lord at Panaea.—It is related of this statue, that, when broken in pieces by the Emperor Julian, the Christians carefully gathered together the fragments and preserved them in their church (Sozom., H. E., lib. v. c. 21. p. 829. C). Philostorgius (H. E., lib. vii. c. 3. p. 503. B, ed. Vales.) says of it, that "τὰ πρόσωπα θεορεῖν, σεβάστῃς μὲν ἡ προσκύνουσιν ὁδηγεῖς." See Bingham as above.

1 "Cui Ille si forte patrocinabitur Pastor, Quem in calice depingis. . . . At ego Ejus Pastoris scripturas haurio, Qui non potest frangi." Tertull., *De Pudicitia,* c. x.; Op. p. 555. A.

1 As in § 35. note z, above.

1 Ibid.

1 Scil. the canon of Elvira as quoted above in note h.
BOOK III.

word "cultus" seems strictly to signify that honour, which Christianity tenders immediately to God, not that which it may enjoin to His creature. And their reason will be this:—because the Godhead cannot be painted, therefore no pictures in churches. I do believe there was something of the quarrel between John of Jerusalem and Epiphanius about Origen (upon which Theophilus of Alexandria heaved St. Chrysostom out of the see of Constantinople) in that act of tearing the veil; but I believe Epiphanius acted according to his opinion in it, and an opinion that he owned to all the world, whatever the rest of the Church did (for we see not that proceeding against John of Jerusalem as against St. Chrysostom). Eusebius might think those statues of our Lord and His cure, those pictures of St. Peter and St. Paul, more ancient than indeed they were. But neither doth he charge any idolatry upon them; nor is there any question in the case, but of having pictures in private, not in the church.

§ 41. That after this time churches were every where trimmed with the stories of the saints, and the passions of the martyrs, I need not repeat much to prove. The controversy in the east about the worshipping of them is evidence enough, that the use of them went forward; but with such contradiction, that some held them idols and broke them in pieces (who were thereupon called Iconoclastae), others worshipped them; who after many attempts of the contrary party prevailed at length in a council at Nicæa, thence called

[How and when the practice became general.]

See above, § 11.

See Tillemont, art. S. Epiphan., art. xvi. tom. x.

See Fleury, liv. xxi. § 17—22.


"Definimus ... venerandas et sanctas imagines ad modum et formam venerandas et vivificantis Crucis, ... dedicandas et in templis sanctis Dei collocandas habendisque; ... maxime autem imaginem Domini et Dei Savoris nostri Jesu Christi, deinde interemerat domine nostra Deiparae, venerandorum angelorum, et omnium deinde sanctorum virorum. Quo scilicet per hanc imaginum picturarum inspectionem, omnes qui contemplantur, ad prototyporum memoriam et recordationem et desiderium veniant, illisque salutationem et honorarium adorationem exhibeant; non secundum fidem nostram, veram latiam, quae solum Divinae nature competit; sed quemadmodum typo venerandae et vivificantis Crucis, et sanctis evangelii," &c. "revertere accedimus," &c.: "imaginis enim honor in prototypum resultat, et qui adorat imaginem, in ea adorat quoque descriptum argumentum." Defin. Conc. Niceni II. (A.D. 787); ap. Labb., Conc., tom. viii. pp. 886. E, 887. A.: and see the Greek below, § 49. note a.—The council is reckoned among those approved, by Bellarmine, De Concil., lib. i. c. 5; Controv. tom. i. p. 1103. A, B: and De Imag. Sanct., lib. ii. c. 12; ibid. pp. 2048. D—2049. D.
the seventh general council, with the concurrence of the Pope.

§ 42. That the decree of the council enjoins no idolatry, notwithstanding whatsoever prejudice to the contrary, I must maintain as unquestionable, supposing the premisses. So far is it from leaving any room for the imagination of any false godhead, to be represented by the images which it allows, that it expressly distinguisheth the honour done the image of our Lord Christ to be equivocally called worship; that is, to be only so called, but not to signify the esteem of God (which he, that believes the Holy Trinity, can no way attribute to the image of our Lord). Supposing, not granting, that it were lawful to honour the image of our Lord, not with any gesture or word signifying any godhead inclosed in it (which the idolatries of the heathen did signify), but that it is the picture of that Man Who also is God (which he, who believes the Trinity, and puts off his hat and bows the knee to the image of our Lord, must needs signify); I say this shall be no idolatry, because (whether the worship of the image or of Him whose image it is) necessarily it is no worship of God, but proceeds from an esteem, that the image is a contemptible creature, but that the Man Whom it signifies is God. I say, upon these terms it is not possible, that it should be idolatry to worship this image: because, though the words or the gesture which are used may signify the honour due to God alone, yet the profession under which they are used necessarily limits them to the honour of that which is not held to be God, namely the image.

§ 43. It is to be granted, that whosoever it was that writ the book against images under the name of Charles the Great, did understand the council to enjoin the worship of God to be given the image of our Lord (for of any other image of God there was no question in that council). But

* See below, § 54. note h.
* See an account of the council in Spanheim, sect. vi. pp. 350, sq.
  * Corrected from MS. "that" in folio edition.
  * Scil. Capitulare Caroli Magni de non adorandis imaginibus, contra Constantini VII. Imper. et Hierem Matris Decreta, et Synodem Nicennam II. Pseudo-Septimam Ecumenicam sive Universalem, compositum et publicatum in Synodo Francfordensi et Hadriano Papae Missum, A.D. 794: ap. Goldast, Decreta Imperialia de Cultu Imaginum, pp. 67—585. Francof. 1608: and separately edited by Heinmann, Hanov. 1731.—In the Preface to lib. i., p. 94, the Nicene Synod is said to have compelled Christians "adorare imaginem," without noticing any distinctions as to the object or degree of adoration.
it is not to be denied, that it was a mere mistake; and that
the council, acknowledging that submission of the heart, which
the excellence of God only challenges, proper to the Holy
Trinity, maintains a signification of that esteem to be paid
to the image of our Lord. For the words of the council, I
refer you to Estius, In iii. Sentent., distinct. ix. sectt. ii. and
iii.a; where you shall see, besides the honour due to God
alone, and the honour due to His saints, the council enjoins
a kind of honour for the images of either, respectively sig-
ifying the esteem we have for God, and Hisb saints.

§ 44. I know there is much noise of latr'ia, to signify the
honour due to God alone, and dulia, that which belongs to
His saintsc. And I am satisfied, that there is no ground for
the difference either in the original reason or use of the364
words. But as nothing hinders them to be taken, as words
of art use to be taken, to signify peculiar conceptions in
Christianity; so, if dulia be understood, as St. Augustin
understands it (Contra Faustum, xx. 21d), for that love and
communion which we embrace the saints that are alive with,
there is no fear of idolatry in honouring the saints departed
with dulia. But the honour we give the images, is not the
honour we give the principal, but only by the equivocating of
terms; according to the decree of the councilf. Therefore
that honour of images, which the decree maintaineth, is no
idolatry.

§ 45. But he, that says it is no idolatry which they enjoin,
does not therefore justify or commend them for enjoining it.
It were a pitiful commendation for the Church, that it is not
idolatry which the decree thereof enjoins. It is therefore no
evidence, that the decree obliges, because it enjoins no ido-
latry. You saw, how near the honour of saints in the prayers
which come from this decree came to idolatryg. And though
those, that counted images idols in the east, stood for the

---

a tom. iii. pp. 28, 29. Duaci 1616.—
See the words of the council above in
§ 41. note u.
b Corrected from MS.; “and of
His” in folio edition.
c See above, § 12. note n.
d “Colimus ergo martyres eo cultu
dilectionis et societatis, quo et in hac
vita coluntur sancti homines Dei... 
sed illos tanto devotius, quanto securius
post certamina superata... At illo cultu
qua Grace Aar'pesia dicitur... cum sit
quedam proprie Divinitati debita ser-
vitus, nec colimus nec colendum doc-
cemos nisi unum Deum.” S. Aug.,
Cont. Faust. Manich., lib. xx. c. 21;

c See above, § 11.
f Quoted above, § 41. note u.
v Above, § 27.
honour of the saints; yet it is certain and visible, that the authors of the decree did intend to advance the honour of the saints thereby, and effect it. What is that effect? That the saints are prayed to by Christians in such form and with such terms, as do not distinguish whether they hold them gods or creatures. Grant they agree with their profession, and you must construe them to the due difference: suppose they understand not the common profession, or the consequence of it; who warrants them no idolaters?

§ 46. It is alleged out of St. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, cap. xviii. b, that "the honour of the image passeth to the principal." He speaketh of the honour of the Son, that it is the honour of the Father, Whose Image the Son is. And so it is indeed. The honour of the Father and of the Son is both one and the same. To say that the image of our Lord is to be honoured as He is, is perfect idolatry. But he, who believes the Son to be of the Father's substance and His picture to be His picture, cannot say so, if he be in his wits. Either he commits idolatry, or he contradicts himself: that may and must be said.

§ 47. It is easy to see, how many divines of the Church of Rome make images honourable with the honour of their principal; the images of our Lord, by consequence, with laetria, the honour proper to God 1. When this is said, it must be cured by distinguishing,—though not "properly," yet "improperly,"—though not "by itself," yet "accidentally,"—reducible to that honour which the principal is worshipped with: that is, the image of Christ, as God. Yet you are not to use these terms to the people, lest they prove idolaters, or have cause to think their teachers such. So Cardinal Bellarmine, De Imaginibus, ii. 23—25 2. There is a cure for

---


2 "Pro solutione questionis" (sc. "quo genere cultus imagines sint honorandae") "et opinionum concilia tiones notandae sunt tres distinctiones. Id enim, quod honoratur, potest hono rari per se vel per accidens; propter se, vel propter aliquid; proprae, vel impropriae." &c. Bellarm., De Imagin. Sanctorum, lib. ii. c. 20; Controv. tom. i. p. 2074. D.

Bellarmine's positions on the subject are—"1. Imagines Christi et sanctorum venerandae sunt non solum per accidens vel improprae, sed etiam per se et proprae, ita ut ipse terminent
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idolatry in the distinction, supposing him to contradict himself. For what greater contradiction, than that the honour, that may be reduced to the honour of God, should be the honour of God; seeing that it is not the honour of God, which is not proper to God, as consisting in the esteem of Him above all things.

§ 48. So for the adoration of the cross. The sign of the cross, which I spoke of before, is only a ceremony, which, being from the beginning frequented by Christians upon all occasions, the Church had reason to make use of in the solemnizing of the greatest actions of God's public service; particularly those, whereby the authority of the Church is conveyed and exercised. The cross whereon our Lord Christ was crucified is a relic, though not part of His Body, yet, for coming so near to His Body, deserving to be honoured. Other crosses are the images of that. The School doctors question, what honour it is which the true cross of Christ demands. And the head of them, Thomas Aquinas, answers, the honour proper to God by the name of latitia; either as representing the figure of Christ crucified, or as washed with

venerationem ut in se considerantur et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaria."

2. Quantum ad modum loquendi, preservat in concione ad populum, non est dicendum imaginem uallas adorari debere latitia, sed e contrario non debere sic adorari:"

3. Si de re ipsa agatur, admissi potest imaginum posse coli improprie vel per acciden
dens eodem genere cultus quo exemplar ipsum colitur:"

"4. Imago per se et proprie non est adoranda eodem cultu quo ipsum exemplar, et proinde nulla imago est adoranda cultu latitia per se et proprie:"

"5. Cultus qui per se et proprie debetur imaginibus, est cultus quidam imperfectus, qui analogice et reductive pertinent ad speciem ejus cultus qui debetur examplari."

Bellarm, as above, ed. 21 —25. pp. 2075. D—2083. C.—That others did not even shelter themselves under these subtle distinctions, see Usser as above in note j, and below, § 53.—The Council of Trent, Sess. xxv. (Decret. de Invocatione, &c. et Sacra Imaginibus; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 895. D, E) refrains from determining more, than that "Imagines . . . Christi, Deiparam Virginis, et aliorum sanctorum, in templis praeventim habendi, et retinendas, eisque debetur honor et venerationem impertendam, non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis Divinitas vel virtus, propter quam sint colende, vel quod ab eis aliquo sit petendum, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit fitgenda . . . sed quoniam honesto, qui eis exhibetur, referetur ad typologia, . . . ita ut per imaginem, quas oculos mur, &c., "Christum adoremus, et sanctos . . . veneremus."

1 See Bellarmine, as above, cc. 26. sq.; pp. 2084. B, sq.; and Aquinas and Estius as in notes n, o, below.

2 "Above, c. xxx. § 8.

a "Crucem Christi recte a fidelibus adorari, probat perpetua Ecclesiae traditione observata consuetudo. . . Versatur autem inter doctores quodius de genere adorationis Crucii Christi exihibenda; utrum videlicet latitia, in inferiori aliquo cultu adoranda sit. Quod autem latiriam cultus ei exibendis sit, his argumentis ostenditi videtur." Estius, as quoted above in § 45. note n; § 3. p. 23. C. D.; proceeding to dispute the arguments, and urge that "latiriam cultum" is not to be given, either to the Cross itself or to crucifixes.
His Blood. If the cross of Christ must be worshipped with the honour proper to God, because washed with our Saviour's Blood, then must it have received Divine virtue from His Blood. Is not this construction reasonable? And what made the idols of the heathen idols, but an opinion of Divine virtue residing in them, by being set up for the exercise of their religion, that supposed many gods? I grant the construction is reasonable, though not necessary. For I find it construed otherwise: to make a difference between the true cross of Christ, which is honoured for a relic, and other crosses, which are honoured as the pictures of it, and signs putting us in mind of Christ on the cross. So the words of Thomas Aquinas may be reasonably taken to teach idolatry. If they be not frequently so to be taken, yet, as he teacheth to honour it with latria, either he teacheth idolatry or contradicteth himself; for the same reason as in images.

§ 49. What the effect of these excessive positions hath been, is easy to see. They clothe their images, they paint them, they gild them the finest they may. They think themselves holy for touching, kissing, and caressing them; as children do their babies. They touch their bodies with them, and think themselves hallowed by the means. They put a cotton on the end of a stick, and touch first the images, then the eyes, the lips, and the noses of them that come; and that in their surplices. Thus are they induced to pray directly to the saints for their carnal concupiscences, as did the heathen idolaters; to vow to give themselves to

[C H A P. XXXI.

* * "Creatura, insensibili non debetur honor vel reverentia nisi ratione rationalis naturae: et hoc dupliciter: uno modo, in quantum representat rationalem naturam; alio modo, in quantum ei quocunque modo con-
jungitur. . . . Si ergo loquamur de ipsa Cruce, in qua Christus crucifixus est, utroque modo est a nobis veneranda: uno scilicet modo, in quantum representat nobis figuram Christi ex-

* * "Et si Cruc Domini partim inter reliquias veneretur, partim inter imagines (nam Crux illa vera, in qua Dominus pependit, propert contactum sacri Corporis et Sanguinis, inter preciosissimas reliquias habenda est; . . . at crux illa eadem, quatenus figuram Domini representat, et simuliter cruces illi similes, inter sacras imagines numerantur)," &c. Bellarm., De Imag. Sact., lib. ii. c. 26; Controv. tom. i. p. 2084. B. C: and see ibid. c. 25. p. 2084. A, B.
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them, to put themselves under their protection and defence, to set them up in their privacies, yea, in lascivious postures, and the habits of their mistresses, as promising themselves protection from them in their debauches. In fine, by this means they are come to make images of God; not pictures of His apparitions in the Scripture, but of the Father, and of the Holy Trinity: a thing so expressly forbidden by the Law. For the ark of the covenant had on it, indeed, the figures that signified angels, the throne of God; itself signifying Christ, in Whom God is propitious to mankind. Therefore they were to worship towards the ark. But the majesty of God was hereby understood to be like nothing visible; they were only taught where to find Him propitious. Now, setting up their images, and enjoining images to be worshipped, the construction is so reasonable—that they honour the image with the honour due to God alone,—that it is not possible to make any other reasonable construction of that which they do. Against the second council of Nicaea all this, and without any order of the present Church of Rome; but so that, were not men sensible by whom they were authorized, it were as easily disowned on the one side, as it were hard on the other side to persuade men to do it.

§ 50. Here it will be said, these are probable reasons; such as, in moral matters, may always be made on both sides:—for what is there concerning human affairs, that is not disputable?—but, the decree of the Church being once inter-
posed by the second council of Nicæa, it behoveth all sons of the Church to depart from their own reasons; because the unity of the Church as a body can by no means be maintained, unless inferiors yield to the judgment of superiors. An objection, which I must own; because I have acknowledged the argument of it hitherto, and have nowhere been straitened by it. But I say therefore, that the power of the Church hath never been exercised by a voluntary consent in any decree enjoining the worship of images.

§ 51. For the having of images in churches, I acknowledge, there is a clear and unquestionable consent of the Church visible; though, as I said afore, there appeared dissatisfaction in some parts, which appears to be voided by the subsequent consent of the whole. And I find sufficient and clear reason for it: the adorning of churches for the solemnity of God’s service; the instruction of the simple, that cannot read in any book, by the pictures of things related in the Bible, and the acts and sufferings of the saints and martyrs; the admonishing of all, whether learned or unlearned, of that which they knew before; the stirring up of devotion towards God, by being admonished, whether of things related in the Scriptures, or in the relations concerning the saints and martyrs, which the Church justifieth. In a matter subject to the power of the Church, as I have shewed this to be, the light of common reason attesting these considerations, more ought not to be demanded. And therefore, though the Homily "against peril of idolatry" "contain a wholesome doctrine," in this particular* I must have leave to think it fails; as it evidently doth in others†.

* Above, in § 43.
* "The second Book of Homilies" (of which the second is "against peril of idolatry")... doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," &c. XXXIX. Articles, art. xxxv.—In the folio edition a comma is placed in the text after the word "particular," as well as after the word "doctrine;" but the stopping above given appears to express Thordiike’s meaning.
* The Homily argues for example (Pt. iii. pp. 217, 218), that images of Christ or of the saints must be "lies," 1. because they cannot represent either the Godhead of our Lord or the souls of the saints, and 2. because it is "un-
known now of what form and countenance" either our Lord or the "saints of antiquity" were: and then proceeds to say—"Wherewithal is also confuted that their allegation, that images be the laymen’s books." And the general argument of the whole Homily goes to the absolute exclusion of images from churches; on the ground mainly, that "images placed publicly in temples cannot possibly be without danger of worshipping and idolatry; wherefore they are not publicly to be had or suffered in temples and churches" (ibid. p. 222).
† Possibly Thordike alludes to such passages as that in Pt. iii. of the Homily
§ 52. But all these reasons are utterly impertinent to the worshipping of images. For suppose the image of our Lord, or His cross, may reasonably determine the circumstance of place, where a man may pray to God, as I said of the holy eucharist; the worship so tendered will be manifestly the worship of God, and have no further to do with the image, than a furniture or instrument, not which a man serves, but whereby he serves God. And therefore St. Gregory,—supposing and (as it seems) taking no notice of him that prays before the image of Christ upon the cross, in his Epistle to Secundinus,—in another epistle, to Serenus bishop of Marseilles, forbiddeth all worshipping of images, as making them subjects capable of any worship that may be called religious, as proceeding from or euonied by that virtue. For "the honour of the image passeth" not "upon the principal"

p. 254; which alleges, that "in Tertullian's time, an hundred and three score years after Christ, Christians had none other temples but common houses, whither they for the most part secretly assembled:" where it seems to be held that Christians up to that time had no buildings set apart for worship. But see above, c. xxii. § 6.—8.


* Above, § 4.

b "Imagines quas tibi dirigendas per Dulcidum diaconum rogas, misimus. Unde valde nobis tua postulatio placuit: quia Ilium toto corde et tota intentione quaeris, Cujus imaginem praeculitis habere desideras. ... Ab re non facimus si per visibilia invisibilia demonstramus. Sic homo qui alium ardenter videre desiderat, aut sponsam amans videre conatur, si contigerit eam ad balneum aut ad ecclesiam ire, statim per viam incendit preparat se, ut de visione ejus hilaris recedat. Scio quidem, quod imaginem Salvatoris nostri non ideo petis, ut quasi Deum colas; sed ob recordationem Filii Dei, in Eius amore reculescas, Cujus te imaginem videre desideras. Et nos quidem non quasi ante Divinitatem ante illam prostrinmus: sed Ilium adoramus, Quem per imaginem aut natum aut passum sed et in throno sedentem recordamus. Et dum nobis ipsa pictura quasi Scriptura ad memoriam Filii Dei reduciet, animum nostrum aut de resurrectione estificat, aut de passione de


any otherwise in this case, than as the presence thereof may be a sign to shew why we worship the principal where it is: which the images of saints are not fit to signify, because their principals the saints are not capable of it.

§ 53. But setting aside all dispute what ought to be done, because the question is, what the Church hath decreed that it ought to be done; I say, the decree of the second council of Nicea obligeth not the Church at present, because it never had the force of a sentence. I have said in due place, that all decrees of councils are but prejudices, no sentences. The reason whereof is as necessary as evident, supposing the premisses. For the consent of the whole is that, which gives any decree the force of a decree; as you saw by the instance of the council of Sardica. The consent of the representatives in a council is a presumption of the consent of the whole, but it is not the formal consent of it. No council ever was composed of representatives, proportionable in number of votes to the weight of each part to the whole. The ground of a presumption making the calling of councils worth the while, is, because whatsoever may come in consideration is supposed to have been weighed there, and the express consent had of the present, against which the absent cannot weigh.

§ 54. In the second council of Nicea the pope's legates consented; and I granted afore, the west was wont to receive the conclusions from Rome; but not tied so to do, in case the matter required further examination, as in this case. For, within a while after, a council of Charles the Great's dominions (then the far greatest part of the western Church), assembled at Frankfort, condemns the council of Nicea, allows the having of images in churches, as St. Gregory had done, and in like manner condemns all worshipping of them.

---

4 See above, § 41.

5 Bk. I. of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii. § 15, 16: and above, c. xx. § 5.

6 See above, c. xx. § 19—21.

7 See above, c. xx. § 4.


9 Above, c. xx. § 15.

A.D. 794. See Labb., Conc., tom. vii. pp. 1057. C, &c.: and Goldasti, as above quoted in § 43. note 2, pp. 63—66.—The council consisted of all the bishops (to the number of about 300), and priests, "Francorum seu Italiae et Aquitaniae."

11 "Allata est in medium quasstio de nova Graecorum Synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopolis fe-
Here was a fair step to the recalling of the Church of Rome's concurrence to it. Which though it was not effected; yet under Ludovicus Pius, son of Charles the Great, an embassy comes from the eastern emperor with a letter yet extant, signifying many horrible abuses, which the decree had produced, and desiring his concurrence, and the concurrence of the Church under him, to stop the current of them. A treaty being had hereupon by the prelates of his dominion, the resolution is yet extant in the negative, under the name of the synod of Paris, grounded upon consent with the fathers.

§ 55. By this, and by divers particulars laid forth by the archbishop of Spalato, De Republ. Eccles., [lib.] VII. [cap.] xii. [sect.] 59—71, it appears, that the worship of images never came in force by virtue of this council of Nicaea. And amongst them it is not to be forgotten, that the acts thereof were not known in the west; as appeareth by the extravagancies of Thomas Aquinas, and the School

...
doctors that followed him⁹, in determining, that images and the true cross of Christ are to be worshipped with the same honour as their principals; the image of Christ therefore, and His true cross, with the honour due to God alone, though in reference to God. Had the acts of the council been known in the west (as they would have been, had it been admitted), these men would never have gone about to bring in an opinion, so extravagant from the doctrine of the council. Which shews plainly, that it is the see of Rome, that hath employed the whole interest thereof, right or wrong, to give that force to the decree, which of itself it had not. You have, besides, a work of Jonas bishop of Orleans against Claudius bishop of Turin⁷; you have the testimony of Walafridus Strabo⁴, allowing images, but disallowing all worship of them. Nay, in the time of Frederic Barbarossa, 367 Nicetas, relating how he took Philippopolis, notes, that the Armenians stirred not for the taking of the city, having confidence in the Almans as agreeing with them in religion, because neither of them worshipped images: De Imperio Isaaci Angeli, [lib.] ii.¹

⁹ "Sic sequitur, quod eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi et Ipsius Christo. Cum ergo Christus adoreretur adoratione latræe; consequens est, quod Eius imago sit adoratione latræe adoranda." S. Thom. Aquin., Summ., P. iii. Qu. xxv. art. 3; Op. tom. xii. pp. 97, b. 98. a.; and see above, § 48, notes n, o.—See also Bellarm., De Imagin. Sanctorum, lib. ii. c. 20; Controv. tom. i. p. 2073. D; Bramhall, Answ. to La Millet., Works Pt. i. Disc. i. vol. i. p. 45, and note s; and Ussher, Answ. &c., c. x. pp. 498—501. The latter quotes (among others) Azorius (Instit. Moral. tom. i. lib. ix. c. 6. p. 1384. C. Paris. 1602), affirming, that "Constans est theologorum sententia imaginem eodem honore et cultu honorari et coli quo colitur id cujus est imago." And Jac. Naclantus (In Rom. i., Op. tom. i. p. 204. Venet. 1667), whom the homily has quoted, is still more extreme.

⁷ Claudius had destroyed images in his Italian bishopric, in the time of Ludovicus Pius, and had been vehemently opposed by Jonas bishop of Orleans, who after his death published Libri Tres de Cultu Imaginum, contra Claudium Taurin. Iconomachum, ap. Biblioth. PP., tom. ix. P. i. pp. 90, sq.: maintaining the use but denying the adoration of images. See Chemnitz, P. iv. pp. 44, 45: and De Dominis, as above, § 59. p. 298.—Jonas "ita non confringendas esse predicate imaginem, ut tamen eas non esse venerandas assumeret. Ex eorum classe unus ipse, qui ad ornatum dumtaxat et ad instruendum de rebus gestis fideles, non autem ad venerationem, esse debere imagines in ecclesia sensam." Baron., in an. 825. § 1xii.—And the editors of the Bibl. PP. above quoted, stigmatize him accordingly as guilty of a "preposterous error" in the matter.

¹ De Rebus Eccles., c. viii.: ap. Hittorp., pp. 668, 669: beginning his statement by saying, that "eareum (imaginum) varietas nec quodam cultu immoderato colenda est, ut quibusdam multissimis videtur, nec iterum speciositas ita est quodam despectu calcanda, ut quidam vanitatis assertores existimant:" and ending with the conclusion, that "imagines et picture habendi sunt et amandae," but "nec cultu immoderato fidei sanitas vulneretur, et corporalibus rebus honor nimie impensus arguat nos minus spiritualem contemplari."
§ 56. Therefore, in removing the force of this decree, it is not the authority of the whole Church, but the will of the see of Rome, that is transgressed. And that power of the see of Rome, by which this is done, is not that regular pre-eminence thereof over other Churches, which cannot decree any thing in the matter of a general council, but by a general council, either expressly assembled or included in the consent of those Churches whereof it consists. But of that nothing is or can be alleged. It remains therefore, that it is come to effect by that infinite power thereof, which the whole Church acknowledgeth not; and therefore, in effect, by the means which it employeth to justify such a pretence.

§ 57. I say no more of the ceremonies of God's service. I maintain no further effect of them than the ground for them warrants. The composition of our nature makes them fit and necessary means to procure that attention of mind, that devotion of spirit, which God is to be served with, even in private; much more at the public and solemn assemblies of the Church. Whatsoever is appointed by the Church for the circumstance, furniture, solemnity, or ceremony of God's service, by virtue of the trust reposed in it, is thereby to be accounted holy, and so used and respected. The memories of God's saints and martyrs are fit occasions to determine the time and place and other circumstances of it: and the honour done them in recording their acts and sufferings (with the conversation of our Lord upon earth), whether out of the Scriptures or otherwise, a fit means to render His solemn service recommendable for the reverence which it is performed with. If, instead of circumstances and instruments, the saints of God, or images, or any creature of God whatsoever, become the object of that worship, for which churches were built, or for which Christians assemble; by that means there may be room to let in that idolatry at the back door, which Christianity shutteth out at the great gate. Whether or no it be a fault in Christians, that they cannot do violence

to their senses, and count those things holy, as instruments of God’s service, because so they should be, which they are convinced in common reason that they are used to His disservice; I dispute not now. But, without dispute, “woe to them by whom offences come;” and they, who prosecute offences given without measure, are they “by whom offences come.” The charge of superstition is a goodly pretence for abolishing ceremonies. But when not only the reverence of God’s service, but also the offices of it, are abolished withal; then is there cause to say, that the service of God itself seems superstitious. To sit and sleep out a sermon, or censure a prayer, is more for a man’s ease, than to fall down on his knees, to humble his soul at God’s footstool, and to withdraw his mind from the curiosity of knowledge or language to the sense of God’s majesty and his own misery. It is then for our ease, but not for God’s service, that the ceremonies thereof should be counted superstitious.

CHAPTER XXXII.


I CANNOT make an end by distinguishing the bounds of ecclesiastical and secular power in Church matters, till I have resolved, whether or no the body of it, the materials of which it consists, be sufficiently distinguished by the estates of clergy and people; or whether there be a third estate, of monkery, constituted by God’s law, entitling the Church to a right in those who profess it, upon the ground of Chris-

---

tianity and in order to the effect of it. For the resolution hereof opens the ground, as well of that reverence which the people owe the clergy, as of that instruction and good example which the clergy owe the people; the neglect whereof is that, which forfeiteth the very being of the Church, that is, the unity of it.

§ 2. I am not now to dispute, whether it be lawful for a Christian to vow to God the vow of continence or not; having proved in the second Book that it is⁷, and shewed, in what sense the perfection of a Christian may be understood to consist in the professing and performing of it⁵.

§ 8. The case of Ananias and Sapphira hath been drawn into consequence, not only by St. Basil⁷, as I shewed you in the first Book⁸, but also by St. Gregory of Rome, Epist. i. 38 (quoted by Gratian⁹, xvi. quest. i. cap. iii.); though, acknowledging that community of goods was a part of the profession of the Christians then at Jerusalem, it cannot be said, that they who professed this communion of goods did profess that which is strictly called monkery. For they letted not to continue married⁵, all monks professing continence. But I have besides made it to appear⁴, that all were not tied then at Jerusalem to give up all their goods to the stock of the Church, but only what the common Christianity should prompt every man to contribute to the subsistence of the Church and Christianity; which what it required, was visible. But I do not therefore yield, that the argument is not of force, so far as the case (and therefore the reason drawn from it) takes place. All Christians consecrate themselves to the service of God by being baptized and made Christians.

---

⁷ Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxii. § 34, sq.
⁸ Ibid.
⁹ Quoted in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xvi. § 30. note b. The Ascetics of S. Basil, whence the quotation is taken, are supposed by some authorities to be spurious: see Bingham, VII. ii. 12, from Hospiinian; and below, § 12. note a.
¹⁰ As in last note.
¹¹ "Ananias pecunias Deo voverat, quas post diabolica victus persuasione subtraxit; sed qua morte multactus est, scia. Si ergo ille mortis periculo dignus fuit, qui eos quos dederat num-
By that they stand obliged to consecrate their goods to the subsistence of His Church, as the necessities thereof become visible. If it appear to be part of this Christianity to consecrate a man's self to God further, by professing such a course of life as he thinks may give him best means and opportunity of discharging the common profession of Christians (though all Christians are not tied to profess the same); shall he not stand bound to make it good, upon the same ground, for which Ananias and Sapphira are condemned in withdrawing that which they professed to consecrate to God?

§ 4. But St. Paul's instruction,—to "refuse the younger widows,"—hath no answer;—"because, when they grow wanton against Christ, they will marry, having damnation, as having set their first faith at nought." 1 Tim. v. 11, 12.

For what can that "first faith" be, but their promise engaged to the Church, whereby they dedicate themselves to the service thereof in the state of widows?

§ 5. Under the Old Testament, it is no mistake of the Jews to believe, that all God's people were ordinarily under the precept of "increase and multiply," requiring of them the state of marriage. St. Augustin and other fathers of the Church have found marks of it in the Old Testament.


See Selden, as in note e.
It is not therefore to be imagined, that there is either precedent or precedent for the state of monks in the Old Testament. Nor yet to be denied, that Nazarites, especially from the mother’s womb,—that those women, who kept guard at the tabernacle, Exod. xxxviii. 8, 1 Sam. ii. 22 (as Anna the daughter of Phanuel, that “departed not from the temple, serving God with fasting and prayer day and night,” Luke ii. 37),—that the Rechabites,—are instances and precedents of some principles and ingredients of their profession even under the Old Testament. For if man and wife should now dedicate themselves to tend upon the poor, sick, and helpless in hospitals or the like, they would be no less.

§ 6. The prophets, though under no perpetual tie, lived in a kind of community with their disciples; not for that knowledge of the Law, which the rulers of the people possessed (whom they were ordinarily in difference with, and oftentimes persecuted to death by them), but for those rudiments of Christianity, which by their means were kept alive under the Law.

§ 7. The Rechabites, being of the race of the Kenites (which it seems upon Moses’ invitation to Jethro took part with the Israelites in the land of promise, under the condition of worshipping only the true God), knowing what all strangers are subject to, living under the dominion and protection of strangers, received a law from their predecessors, not to have further to do in the world, than their subsistence by the simplest sort of life, by being shepherds, required: and, being commended for obeying their rule by the prophet Jeremy from God’s mouth, have much justified them, who under Christianity do voluntarily put themselves under the like rule, out of a pretence the better to discharge their Christianity by that means.

§ 8. During the time of our Lord there was a third sect of people among the Jews; whom we find no mention of in the scriptures of the New Testament, because they lived retired out of the world, some married, others in single life, both under a most strict observation of their rule: which you have in Josephus, under the name of Essenes. It is
well enough known, that Eusebius, finding a relation written by Philo the Jew of that manner of life which they used in Egypt hard by Alexandria, hath reported them for Christians: and how this report hath been disowned of late years, as a mere mistake of Eusebius, or an ungrounded conjecture.
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I, who have shewed you that it is possible Philo himself may have been a Christian, must not reject the opinion of those, who think they might really be Christians, converted by the first arrival of Christianity in Egypt. For in the case which I spoke of, there is no cause why they might not be both Jews and Christians, the separation of the Church from the synagogue not being yet formed; and when it was formed, continue Christians, forsaking the synagogue.

§ 9. And truly the mention of virgins, as of a peculiar order visible in the Church, is so ancient in the writings of Tertullian, Methodius (whose book of Virginity is published of late), and St. Cyprian, that it must needs be impossible to find any beginning for it. For Tertullian, writing his book De Velandis Virginibus, to prove that order not exempt from St. Paul’s injunction that women veil their faces at Divine service, appeals to the custom of the Church at Corinth, to which St. Paul writ it, as having always observed it in virgins. And therefore the same St. Paul, directing him who had resolved to keep his daughter a virgin (1 Cor. vii. 37), seems to suppose this resolution to imply that education, whereby she might be enabled so to continue. For it is true the profession is difficult, but not impossible for him to go commendably through with, that by God’s grace undertakes it with that zeal which the end requires.

1 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxxiii. § 12, 13.
§ 10. I do much admire the resolution of Gennadius, De Dogmat. Eccles., cap. lxiv.¹: that it is not the mere love of a continent estate, which Christianity esteems, "unless it be chosen as the means and opportunity of serving God with the more freedom; otherwise, signifying rather the declining of marriage, than the love of chastity." For so it is indeed. He that chooses a continent estate, to avoid the difficulties of marriage, seems rather to tempt God, and to expose himself to many desertions, waving the remedy which He hath provided. But he, who trusts to God's assistance for the accomplishment of that intention which Christianity commendeth, though it command not, may assure himself of it, not destituting his prayers of the endeavours which he may and is to contribute.

§ 11. This being the case of particular persons, that withdraw themselves from the world to make their salvation the more assured; the interesse, which accrues to the Church in them that do so, seems to be no more than may be grounded upon the profession of such a purpose. For, so long as it is secret between God and the soul, the Church can have nothing to do in it. But, being once professed and known to take hold, the transgression thereof, becoming notorious, is a sin which owes an account to the Church. Not that the manner of this profession is any way provided for but by the custom of the Church. For he, that should actually and visibly declare such an intention by really entering upon the course and living according to it, would become necessarily liable to that account for the transgressing of it, which the solemnity renders due. And therefore that solemnity reduceth itself to the nature of those ceremonies, whereby actions of great consequence, wherein the authority of the Church is exercised, ought in reason to get reverence. For by that means the parties concerned receive a due impression of the charge they undertake, when God and His Church become rather parties than witnesses to it. In the mean time, they remain in the Church what they were

¹ "Melior" (i. e. than marriage) "est continentia, sed non sibi sola sufficit ad beataitum in, si pro solo amore pudicitiae recensentur, sed si et cum tali effectu causa vacandi Domino eligatur; aequo diversit magis conjugii videhitur esse, quam appetitio castitatis." Gennad., De Dogm. Eccl., c. lxiv. p. 36.
before, private Christians; only professing such a course of life, only engaged to God in it, under the knowledge of His Church. And when those, that have spent their time in this kind of life, out of their experience and knowledge undertake to direct others the way of governing themselves in it; when others, joining themselves to them, undertake to order their lives according to such directions: neither hath the Church any thing to do in the matter of them, further than to take account that they be according to Christianity; nor do the parties enter into any new obligation, but that of performing that profession which is become notorious. The consequence whereof is this; that, the profession being transgressed by an act that creates a new state (as that of marriage, the bond whereof is insoluble), the obligation which is violated being to God and not to the Church, the Church shall have no power to free him from the obligation contracted, whatsoever censure the transgression of his profession may require.

§ 12. John Cassian*., who lived in the monasteries of Egypt (wherein this exercise seems to have received first that form, which other parts according to their capacities imitated), mightily justifies the apostolical original of the profession by the antiquity of their monasteries, and the traditions by which they lived, received from age to age without express beginning. But above all, the three several forms of them, extant in Egypt during his time*, seems to demonstrate, by what degrees it came to that height. The first of them, called in his time Sarabaite, professing no communion with others but at each man's discretion, seems to him

---

† See Hospiian, De Monachis, lib. iii. c. 1, pp. 59, sq.: Marshall, Pro-
πόλεμον, sign. C. I, prefixed to Dug-
dale's Monasticion; Bingham, VII. i. 4.
‡ Corrected from MS.: "with" in folio edition.
* "Triam sunt in Egypto genera mon-
hachorum: unum Cenobitae, quod illi
Sausae gentili lingua vocant; nos, 'In
commune viventes,' possumus appellare.
Secundum, Anachoretæ, qui soli habi-
tant per deserta; et ab eo quod procul
ab hominibus recesserint, nuncupatur.
Terrium genus est, quod Remoboth di-
cunt, determinum atque neglectum;
et quod in nostra provincia aut solum
aut primum est. Hi bini vel terri nec
multo plures simul habitant, suo arbi-
tratu ac ditione viventes," &c. S.
Hieron., Epist. xviii. Ad Eustoch., c.
xxv.; Op., tom. iv. P. ii. p. 44.—And
see the account of them, and of the third class of those above described
under the name of Sarabaite, in Cas-
sian as in notes y, z. below.—See also
Palladius, Hist. Lausiaca.
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a defection from the common profession; but signifies, that at the first the profession did stand without living in common, though it could not stand so long without abuse. To avoid which abuse, first convents began, then anchorites left them to live alone in the wilderness. You may see what he writeth, De Instit. Mon. ii. 3, 57, Collat. xviii. 3—7. The

7 "Itaque per universam Ægyptum et Thebaidem, ubi monasteria non pro uniusquisque renunciantis instituuntur arbitrio, sed per successiones ac traditiones majorum usque in hodiernum diem vel permanent vel mansura fundantur, legitimum orationum modum in vespertinis conventibus seu nocturnis vigilii vidimus retentari. Non enim quisquam conventiculo fratrum sed ne sibi quidem ipsi presece conceditur, priusquam non solum universa facultatibus suis redstatut externus, sed ne sui quidem ipsius se esse dominum vel potestatem habere cognoscat... Operis quoque et sodoris asseverandem ita subire compellit, ut propriis manibus, justa apostoli praecepto, quotidianum victum vel suis usibus vel adventium necessitatis preparamus, et fastus vitae prateritum possit et delicias oblivisci et humilitatem cordia contritione laboris acquirere," &c. Joh. Cassian., De Conobiorum Institutis, lib. ii. De Nocturnis Orationibus, c. iii. Op. p. 19. Atreb. 1628.—"Igitur per universam, ut diximus, Ægyptum et Thebaidem duodenarius psalmorum numerus tam in vespertinis quam in nocturnis solemnitatis custodit;" &c. "Qui modus antiquitus constitutus, idcirco per tot saecula penes cuncta illarum provinciarum monasteria intemeras nunc usque perduravit: quia non humana adiuvantia statutus a senioribus affirmatur, sed coeliis angelorum magisterio patribus suisque delatus." Id., ibid. c. 4. p. 21.—"Jam cum in primitiis fidei pauci quidem, sed probatisimi, monachorum nomine censerentur, qui sicut a beatae memoriae Evangelista Marco, qui primus Alexandrinus urbi pontifex preservavit, noman susceper vivendi, non solum illa magnificae retinebant, que primitus Ecclesiam vel credentium turbas in Actibus Apostolorum legitimus celebrosse ("Multitudinis" scilicet "credentium erat cor unum, et anima una, nec quisquam eorum qui possidebat," &c. &c.): "verum etiam his multo sublimiora cumulaverant. Et inueni sece-
orders of their convents, which he describes, as also St.

quouquam ulteriorius usurpata, quandiu illius tam districte formido sententiae meminisse fidelium inserta duravit, qua beatus apostolus predictos novi facinoris principes, non penitentia, non ulius passus est satisfactione curari, sed perniciosissimum germen celeri morte succidit. Ilo igitur exemplo, quod in Anania et Sapphir apostolica dissertatione punitum est, a nonnullorum contemplatione paulatim longa incursa et temporis obliterationem subtracto, emerit illud Sarabatamur genus, qui ab eo, quod semetipsum in conventibus congregatiis sequestraret, ac aliquilatam suas curarent necessitates, Aegyptium linguae proprietate 'Sara-
baite' nuncupati sunt, de illorum quae praediximus numero procedentis qui evangelicam perfectionem simulare potius quam in veritate arripere maluerunt, summatione sclavit eorum vel laudibus provocati, qui universis divisitis mundi perfectam Christi praefrentur nuditatem. Hi igitur dum imbecillo animo rem summae virtutis adequant, vel necessitate ad hanc professionem venire compulsi, dum senescent tantummodo nomine monachorum absque illa studiorum summatione festinant, cernobiorum nullatenus expetunt disciplinam, nec seniorum subjiciuntur arbitrio, aut eorum traditionibus instituti suas disucunt vincere voluntates; nec ullam sane discretionem regulam legitima eruditione suscipiant, sed ad publicum tantummodo, id est, ad homines faciendam remunctum, aut in suis domiciliis sub privilegio hujus nominis iisdem obstricti occupationibus perseverant, aut construentes sibi cellulas, easque monasteria nuncupantes, suo in eis jure ac libertate consistunt, nequaquam evangelicis praecipitationibus succumbentes, ut nulla sclivet quotidiani victus sollicitudine, nullus rei familiaris distinctionibus occupantur. Quod illi soli absque indebile dubitatione consummunt, qui cunctis hujus mundi facultatibus absoluti, ita se cernobiorum praepositus subdiderunt, ut ne sui faciendum factauerit esse se domina. Illi autem qui distinctionem, ut diximus, cernobii declinantes, bini vel terni in cellulis commorsantur, non contenti abbatis cura atque imperio gubernari, sed hoc precipue procurantes, ut absoluti a senioribus jugo, exercendi voluntates suas, et procedendi vel quo placuerit evangendi, agendive quod libitum fuerit, habebant liberta-
Basil's Instructions, make the work of their life to be the service of God by prayer and fasting with the praises of God: but so, that labouring with their hands in some bodily work, and living in so much abstinence, they were able to contribute the greatest part of their gain for alms to the poor; though not at their own discretion, but at the discretion of their superiors, to whose guidance they had once given up themselves.

§ 13. How far this is distant from any form of this profession extant in the west, is easy enough to imagine. For all this while they remain mere laics, without all pretence of that superiority over the people of the Church, which the clergy signifieth; that superiority, which they have one over another, standing only upon that voluntary consent and profession, the solemnizing whereof signifieth that it is approved by the Church. Nor is there any thing of endowment in all this, their profession to give alms of their labours rendering them incapable of any such.

§ 14. But it must not be denied, that the monasteries of the west have been the means to preserve that learning, which was preserved alive during the time; at least the knowledge of the Scriptures, and other records of the Church, upon which the knowledge of the Scriptures depends. And

"Οτι δει τη δικαια τον σάματος μετρείν την ψυχρατίαν, και δει καλν και ένιμον η τον σάματος έγκαλα;" — c. 25. (ibid. pp. 575. c. sq.), "Περ τας κατα τα τρώματα άτροφιας και άτλητος:" — and c. 34. (ibid. pp. 580. C. sq.), "Έτσι ου χρη του ν συστήματι καλλιέννυμεν πολιτεν ουμενον άκτιπην ιδια τι κεκτήσαν των δικών."

b See Bingham, VII. ii. 7.

c A striking passage from Schlegel's Lectures on the Hist. of Literature on this subject is referred to by Massinger in his Hist. of Reformation in England (c. vi. p. 86). See also Hallam, Literature of Europe, vol. i. c. 1. § 4 and 82: and authorities there cited. The lists of learned Benedictines, Cistercians, Carmelites, in English Monasteries, to be found in Stevens' Supplement to Dugdale's Monasticon, will supply further proof of the same thing. See also Fuller, Ch. Hist., Bk. vi. Hist of Abbeys, pp. 334—336: and Maitland's Essays on the Dark Ages.
certainly the knowledge of the Scriptures is more dangerous than a sword in a madman's hand, unless it be joined with that humility which only Christianity teacheth: a thing more rare, in them that think themselves guilty of learning, than pearls or diamonds; a thing so difficult for them to attain, that it ought to be counted a sufficient price for all the exercise a man can bestow in this profession all his life long. That sobriety of mind, that gravity of manners, that watchfulness over a man's thoughts and passions, which is absolutely requisite for the discharge, as of all Christians, so especially of them that are liable to the temptation of spiritual pride for knowledge in matters of God, is a competent reward for all that retirement from the world, which this profession can require.

§ 15. This being the design of monasteries, it cannot be denied, that the goods which they may be endowed with are consecrated to the service of God, as estated upon His Church: but not therefore upon the Church of Rome. The pretense of allowing the rule of monastical orders (which ought indeed to be approved of by the Church), and of reducing them into several bodies under one government in several dominions and the Churches of them (a thing no way concerning the foundation of the Church, or any right thereof derived from the same), hath been the means for the Church of Rome to exempt them from the government of their ordinaries, and to reduce them to an immediate dependence upon it, by whose charter each order subsisteth. But there is no manner of ground in the profession for this; nor was it so originally: but is come to be so by the swelling of the regular power of that see to that height, which the pretense of infallibility speaketh. For why should not every Church, or every synod, to which any Church belongs, and the respective heads of the same, be capable of visiting, regulating, or correcting, whatsoever may concern the common Christianity in bodies of mere lay people (as I have shewed all monasteries or convents of monks originally to be) subsisting within the respective diocese of every Church? Unless the case of a monk falls out to be a cause that concerns the whole Church, as

4 See the history of this in Petrus perii, lib. iii. c. 16. pp. 189—194. de Marca, De Concord. Sacerd. et Im-
that of Pelagius*: for then there will be no marvel, that it should resort to the same trial, that determines the like causes of other Christians.

§ 16. And upon these terms, though the Church of England hath no monasteries, as not essential to the constitution of the Church, but advantageous for the maintenance of that retirement from the world in the reasons of our actions, wherein our common Christianity consisteth, by that visible retirement, wherein this profession consisteth (for, the constitution thereof succeeding that horrible act of abolishing the monasteries under Henry VIII., it is no marvel, if it were difficult to agree in a form which the Reformation might allow and cherish); yet is no son of the Church of England bound to disown the whole Church, in maintaining monastical life as agreeable with Christianity and expedient to the intent of it."

§ 17. They that understand the intent of monastical life to be contemplation§, do not seem to consult with the primitive custom and practice of it in the Church. For when bodily labour was by the rule to succeed in the intervals of God's service, and as soon as it was done; I cannot conceive, how a man should imagine a more active life. That the activity thereof is exercised, not in any business tending to advantage a man in this world, but to keep him employed, so as to live free to serve God; maketh it not the less active, though not to the ordinary purpose. The case is the same, supposing, that instead of bodily labour men give themselves up to studies of the mind for exercise of their time in the intervals of God's service.

§ 18. The whole intent of it may be comprised in two cases. Either a man hath forfeited his Christianity, with the promises due to it, and desires to regain the grace and to it. appease the wrath of God; in one word, to make satisfaction for his sin, in the language of the ancient Church: or he

---

§ That "all monks were anciently maintained by their own labour," see Bingham, VII. iii. 10; and Gieseler, Second Period, Div. i. c. iv. But contemplation was their principal duty.
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desires to prevent and avoid such forfeitures; and knowing his own, and seeing other men’s infirmities, and the danger to which they render him liable, resolves to attend upon nothing else, as not confident of passing through the rocks and billows of the world without making that shipwreck.

§ 19. St. Jerome is an eminent example of the former case. His writings are most an end the fruits of his retirement to that purpose. Only that, being a priest afore and tied to the service of his Church, he must have been dismissed by his bishop. Gennadius shews upon what ground, De Dogm. Eccl. cap. liii.\(^k\): "Sed et secreta satisfactione solvi mortalía crimina non negamus, sed ut mutato prius seculari habitu, et confessó religionis studio, per vitae correctionem, et justo immo perpetuo luctu, miserante Deo, veniam consequamur; ita duntaxat, ut contraria [pro] his qua paenitet agat, et eucharistiam omnibus Dominicis diebus supplex et submissus usque ad mortem percipiat."—"But we deny not, that mortal sins are loosed by satisfaction in secret, though so that a man obtain pardon by the mercy of God, changing first the habit of the world, and professing the study of religion by amendment of life and continual or rather perpetual mourning; only on these terms, that he do the contrary to that which he repents of, and humbly like a suppliant receive the eucharist every Lord’s day till his death."

\(^*\) S. Jerome himself (Epist. xiv. Ad Damasum, Op. tom. iv. p. ii. p. 19) says of his first retirement into solitude, in the desert of Chalcis in Syria which Tillemont dates A.D. 374), that "quia pro facinoribus mei ad eam solitudinem commigravi, que Syrian juncto Barbarie fine determinat," &c. But nothing appears in the accounts of his former life to attach any decided or special meaning to the words. Further, he quitted his retirement in 377, went to Antioch, where he was ordained priest by Paulinus, in 378, thence to Constantinople, and finally, in 382 to Rome: where he remained until after the death of Pope Damascus, left it in 385, and after passing through Jerusalem, Palestine, and Egypt, finally settled as a monk at Bethlehem about 386 or 387, and there remained until his death in 420, at the age of 91. Throndike then must refer to this his second retirement, after his ordination to the priesthood. Now he was driven from Rome, certainly, by a clamour caused principally by his doctrines about monachism and virginity, and which reached even to imputations upon his moral character. But these last seem to have been wholly groundless. See Tillemont, Mémo. Eccl., tom. xii. art. S. Jerom.; Cave; and Dupin, tom. iii. Pt. i.

\(^1\) The dates attached to the list of his works in Cave, will shew how small a portion of them were written between 377 and 387. Some tracts to Marcella and Paula, the Life of Paulus Eremita, the tracts against Helvidius and against the Luciferians, and the Chronicle, are the principal exceptions to the statement in the text.

\(^2\) Corrected from MS.: "be" in folio edition.

\(^k\) p. 32.
§ 20. By this custom, so general that Gennadius makes the ground of it a position of the Church¹, we may see by the way, that the ancient Church never took the power of the keys to be necessary to the remission of all sins after baptism²: seeing, of those sins, upon which the power of the keys had passed by penance, there can no doubt remain whether remitted or not; that a man should change his state of life to assure it.

§ 21. In the mean time, the other case is contained in this. For he, who retires from the world to bewail his sins, does it with an intent to provide, that he may not commit the like for the future; and that is also the intent of all those, that propose this life to themselves, or have it proposed to them by their parents, for the future.

§ 22. How this state of life may be counted a state of perfection,—not as if the perfection of a Christian did consist in any observation of an indifferent nature, but in the complete observing of that which our baptism professeth,—I have shewed in the second Book³. The objection which here is to be made to it, is of weight. For, the perfection of Christianity consisting in charity, as St. Paul teacheth, and that charity in this state of life being confined to a man's self, and those little offices which a man hath occasion to exercise towards a little convent:—for what consideration is to be had of the alms, which the work of their hands, where that was in use, might contribute to the necessities of the poor?—it seems, that the ordinary state of those that have engaged in the world is of more perfection than monastical life, as furnishing greater opportunities for the exercising of that charity, wherein our Christianity chiefly consisteth. To which I answer, that, though the occasions of the world minister more opportunity of exercising charity to them whom a man converses with, yet the engagements, which a man that liveth in the world hath by his estate and profession, even according to Christianity, make it more difficult for him to follow the reason of charity (supposing that it were easy for him to discern it in every thing), than for

¹ Scil. a "dogma ecclesiasticum."  
² Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. x. § 29, sq.  
³ See above, c. ix. § 29, sq.; and xxxii. § 34, &c.
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those who have retired themselves from such engagements. And though, the profession of monastical life not being vulgar, and therefore being difficult, many were seen to fall short of it, even when the intention of undertaking it was innocent and the condition simple; and, falling short of it, become far worse than those, who fail of their Christianity in the ordinary state of Christians: yet there is in the state itself, not encumbered with accessory corruptions, ground for a presumption in reason, that those who live in it come nearer that which our baptism professeth by the means thereof, than others can do. And this answer serves, comparing private persons with private persons in the one and in the other estate.

§ 23. But comparing private persons in this estate with public persons in the Church, which are the clergy; whose profession doth and ought to disengage them of those obligations to the world, which I allege for the presumption, why the laity having opportunity do not attain the reason of charity in the intent of their actions: I acknowledge their estate is of itself simple and absolutely the state of perfection in the Church, though more difficult to discharge than that of monastical life, whatsoever perfection it pretendeth. For the profession thereof, being the solemn dedicating and consecrating of a man's self to God for and in the ministry and service of His Church, containeth in itself, and ought to express unto the world, the disclaiming of all manner of engagements inconsistent with it, so far as the foundation of the Church alloweth. That limitation I except, because I have provided elsewhere, that the foundation of the Church presupposeth civil government for an ordinance of God; and, therefore, no quality standing by the foundation of the Church can exempt any man from the service of his country. So the privileges of the clergy, it is granted, stand by the civil laws of Christian powers; though obliged, as not to persecute for Christianity, so not to hinder Christians from dedicating themselves to the service of the Church: who upon those terms, being so dedicated, cannot be subject to those

* Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr. c. xi. § 35, 38: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. § 27—31.

* So in folio edition, and uncorrected in MS. "cannot refuse to be subject," would seem to be rather Thorndike's meaning.
services of their country, which all are necessarily subject to, upon any pretence to discontinue their attendance upon the service of the Church. But, this exception being made, for the rest, that engagement to the Church, which the undertaking of holy orders constituteth, remains absolute; supposing a disposition and resolution in him, that undertakes the estate, to behave himself with that simplicity, innocence, humility, charitableness, and sobriety of judgment, in the midst of the world, which he undertakes to converse with, which monastical life professeth towards a man's self and those few from whom we cannot retire. This the constitution of the Church and the reason of it, this the examples of the apostles and their companions and substitutes in the Scriptures of the New Testament (as, partly, of the prophets and their disciples under the Old), evidenceth no less than the canons of the Church, or the customs thereof, more anciently in being than expressly enacted by any common decree of it. Whereupon it follows by virtue of the premisses, that the state of monastical life is of its own nature subordinate to the state of the clergy; tending as a means, by private exercise, to fit men to the discharge of themselves towards the world, which the clergy obligeth every man to converse with, in that manner which monastical life professeth. Of this there is sufficient evidence by those many examples, that are extant in the records of the ancient Church, of such as have been taken from monastical life to be promoted to the service of the Church. Which course, expressing no dispensation in the profession of monastical life, formerly made, necessarily intimateth a reasonable ground for this construction:—that the Church, allowing men to dispose of themselves to the exercise of monastical life, intended not to part with that interest which it hath in every particular Christian, to oblige

---

\(^a\) See Bingham, VII. ii. 8; who gives citations from the fathers: referring to Gothofred, ad Cod. Theolos. lib. xvi. tit. ii. De Episc. leg. 32. This law, which is one of Arcadius, enacta, that "si quos forte episcopi deesse sibi clericos arbitrantur, ex monachorum numero rectius ordinabunt." Instances also are given in Bingham, ibid., of bishops and clergy adopting the ascetic mode of life.—\(^b\) Ita de Gelasio II. legitimus, eum in monasterio Cassinensi institutum fuisset, viris ad omnia peritissimis, quorum in eo monasterio non parva copia inerat, ad liberales artes addissentum adjunctum. Et Severus in Vita Martini testatur, ex ejus monasterio episcopos et sacerdotes assitios fuisset. Et Pelagius Pontifex optat, ut qui in monasteriis nutriuntur tales sint, ut proiecta seate et vita probata ad sacerdotium valeant promoveri." Cassander, Consult., Art. xxv. De Monachatu; Op. p. 1007.
those to the service thereof by promoting them to holy
orders, whomsoever she findeth fittest for it; and that the
allowance of monastical life is in order to this intent and
purpose:—a thing still more visible by all those institutions
and foundations, whereby monasteries have been made and
accounted seminaries of the Church and the clergy of it.

§ 24. This being said, you see how great a question re-
 mains; whether the clergy be bound to the continence of
single life or not; to wit, bishops, priests, and deacons. For
the deacon's office hath indeed been divided into several
orders of inferior clergy, sub-deacons, readers, door-keepers,
waiters9: and that, for the necessity of the Church in that
estate which was before Constantine; so that the constitu-
tion of them cannot be imputed to any corruption that
might follow upon the temporal prosperity of the Church1.
But of these inferior orders there is no question4. For,
as concerning deacons, you have a canon of the council at
Ancyra1 (the canons whereof were afterwards part of the
canons of the whole Church1); allowing them (not to marry
being deacons, but) to be made deacons being married: and
another of the council of Elvira2 in Spain (ancienter than

9 Lectores—Ostarii—Acolythi.—
See Bingham, III. i—v.
Bingham refers all the minor or-
ders above mentioned to the third
century: except that acolytes did not exist in the Greek Church until the
fourth. And see above, c. xx. § 64.

note f.

See abundant authorities respecting
the freedom of the minor orders
from the celibate, in De Dominis, De
i. p. 293. The same De Dominis how-
ever cites a rescript of Alexander III.
to the Abp. of Canterbury, enjoining
it as a law even upon them, the custom
having by that time so extended as to
include them in continental Churches.
And see Thomassin, Vet. et Nov. Eccl.
Disc., P. I. lib. ii. cc. 61, sq., for the
varying custom in the Roman Church
respecting them.

1 "Διάκονοι, δοκεῖ καθὼς ταῦτα, παρ'
αὐτὴν τὴν κατάστασιν έί π' ομάρτῳ
κάλ' φρασαν χρήσιν γαμήσαι, μη δυνάμει
νοι οὕτως μένειν οὕτως μετὰ τούτω
γαμήσαντες, δέουσαι εν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ,
διὰ τὸ εντραπέναι αὐτούς ὑπὸ τού ἐπι-
σκόπου τούτῳ δι' εἰ τινὲς σωματίσατε
καὶ κατασκέψατεν εν τῇ χειροτόνη
μένειν οὕτως, μετὰ τάτα ἠλθον εἰς γά-
μον, πεποίησαν αὐτούς τῆς διακονίας."
Conc. Ancyran. (A.D. 314), can. x. ;
ap. Labb., Conc., tom. i. p. 1469. D.
This canon surely does give leave to
deacons (under a particular condition)
to "marry, being deacons."—The
council of Gangra (circa A.D. 334),
can. iv., enacted, that "Εἰ τις διακο-
νοιν παρὰ προσβήτηρόν γεγαμεῖτος,
ὅς μὴ χρήσατο λειτουργήσατο αὐτοῦ
προσφοράς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀδήμων εἰς-
tον" (Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 419. A).

That the canons of Ancyra were
adopted by the Church, see the Cod.
Can. Eccles. Univ. a Conc. Chalc. et
Justiniano Imp. confirmatus, in the
Bibl. Juris Can. Vet. of Voellius et
Justellus, tom. i. : and above in Bk. I.
Of the Pts. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 38.

note c.—So also were the canons of
Gangra; see ibid.

2 "Placuit in totum prohiberi epi-
scopis, presbyteris, et diaconibus, vel
omnibus clericis positis in ministerio,
абstinere se a conjugibus suis, et non
generare filios: quinqueque vero see-
rit, ab honore clericatus exterminetur."
the council of Nice), enjoining upon bishops, presbyters, 374 deacons, and sub-deacons, to abstain from their wives under pain of their clergy. At the council of Nicæa it was in debate to do the same: and the council was moved by Paphnutius, a bishop of great merit in Egypt, himself always a single man, to rest in the rule presently in force; which was,—preferring those, who being single should lose their ministries if they married, to all degrees of the clergy, especially priests and bishops—to make use never the less of those, who were married or professed an intent of marriage, when there was ground by the rest of their qualities of confidence in them for the discharge of their office. For this, as it agrees with the canon of Anacrya and the form of it, so it assured us, that the council of Elvira could not have taken in hand to impose so great a burden, had not the precedent practice of the Church by unwritten custom before the canon disposed the Church to receive it.

§ 25. And therefore I will in this point, which hath been [The words of Epiphanius,]
the subject of many volumes, and in which it would be endless to examine the canons, the precedents, the authorities, that concern it, discharge myself chiefly upon Epiphanius; whose words in the fifty-ninth Heresy, of the Novatians, are these:—"'Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἑτερούντα καὶ τεκνογονοῦντα μᾶς γυναικὸς δυτα ἀνάρ οὐ δέχεται, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ μᾶς ἐγκατανεμομένου, ἥ χρεούσαντα, διάκονον τε καὶ πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἐπίσκο- πον καὶ ὑποδιάκονον, μάλιστα ὅταν ἀκριβεῖσι κανόνεις οἱ ἐκ- κλησιαστικοὶ· ἀλλὰ πάντως ἐρείς μοι, ἐν τις τόποις ἐπί τεκνογονεῖν πρεσβύτερος [καὶ] διάκονον καὶ ὑποδιάκονον τούτο ὅ παρὰ τὸν κανόνα, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν τῶν ἄνθρωπων κατὰ καιρὸν ῥᾱβδυμένας διάνοιαν, καὶ τοῦ πλῆθους ἑνεκε, μὴ ἐὑρίσκομένης ὑπηρεσίας"—"Moreover neither doth (the Church) admit him, that is the husband of one wife, yet living and getting children, deacon or priest or bishop or sub-deacon; unless he abstain from that one, or is become a widower; especially where the canons of the Church are exact; but you will by all means say to me, that in some places, priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, do still get children; that is, not by the canon, but by the slack disposition of men's minds, sometimes, and for plenty's sake, when"—men fit to "minister are not found."

In the conclusion of his work also, he reckons this for one of the laws of the whole Church, without mentioning this exception.

§ 26. Now if you go to seek for any rule in writing to bind the whole Church to this before Epiphanius' time, you will find none. But a custom you will find in force, which is more than all the law of the world in writing; whereby it will appear, that the endevour of the Church was to be

---


* "Εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔλεγεν καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἀπὸ μνημόσυνον, ή ἐγκατανεμομένον τῶν ἱδίων γυναικῶν, δὲ χρεούσαντας ἐν ἑνεκε τούτο ἐνεκε δέχεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ" (i.e. the Church) "εἰς λειτουργίαν, καὶ τοις ἐγκατανεμομένοις εἰς τήρον ἄπαρχήν" (locus corruptris) "τάξεως ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πρεσβυτέρου καὶ διάκονον καὶ ὑποδιάκονον." Id., ibid. lib. iii. tom. ii. in Expo. Fid. Cathol., § 21; ibid. p. 1104. A.

See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxi. § 25: and above, c. x. § 1—4.
served with single men, but, when the best qualified were not such, to balk the rule, for the appearance of that common good in balking it, for which the rule itself was made.

§ 27. And so the resolution of this point attesteth, first, the corporation of the Church; when, for the good of the body, it prescribes itself rules, what sort of persons to make use of for the exercise of those offices, in the communion whereof the society of it standeth: then it eminently attests the superiority of the bishop and his clergy in every of those Churches, whereof the whole consisteth; unless men be so wilfully senseless, as to attribute the wisdom, which such dispensations required, to the rashness of any multitude: last of all, it attests the regular pre-eminence of the Church of Rome over the rest of the western Churches; by the interposition whereof, visible in those times, when it had no help from the secular power to make it irregular and infinite, so great a burden became so far owned.

§ 28. First, then, I must free the Church from the heavy charge of bringing in "the doctrine of devils," foretold by St. Paul, in "prohibiting marriage;" 1 Tim. iv. 1, 3: which I shall do the more slightly, because I have had opportunity elsewhere to shew, that he speaks of the heresies on foot in the times of the apostles; which made marriage the ordinance of those powers which made the world, which their doctrine distinguished from the true sovereign God. For what hath the rule of the Church to do with any such supposition as this? "Τὸ πρεσβυδέστερον γὰρ ἂν ἦν Ἡ Ἐκκλησία ὀρώσα, Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι εὐ διαταχθεὶσα, ἦννο ἀπεριστάτως Θεῷ τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι σπουδάζει, καὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ τῶν χριστιάνων μετὰ πάσης εὐνοούσης συνειδήσεως τελειώθησα. φημὶ δὲ, ὅτι πρέπουν ἐστὶ, διὰ τοῦ ἐξάπτυσθα λειτουργίας, καὶ χριστιανικῶν, σχολάζειν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διάκονων καὶ ἐπισκόπων Θεῷ: εἰ γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ προστάσεις ὁ ἄγιος ἀπόστολος λέγων, ἵνα πρὸς καιρὸν σχολάσως τῇ ἐν χρῆ, πόσῳ γε μᾶλλον τῇ ἱερεῖ τὸ αὐτὸ προστάσει; τὸ ἀπεριστάτου δὲ λέγω, εἰς τὸ σχολάζειν κατὰ Θεόν ἐν ταῖς χριστιανικαῖς πνευματικαῖς τελειωργουμένη ἱερωσύνη." So Epiphanius prosecuted his purpose.—"For the Church, always

[What follows from this.]

[The Church free from the charge of prohibiting marriage.]

f Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xii. xii. § 2. &c.
§ 10, sq. And elsewhere also.
§ See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. p. 496. C. D.
aiming at the most fitting, as well ordered by the Holy
Ghost, decreed to endeavour, that the service be performed
without distraction from God, and spiritual necessitates effected
with all the most charitable conscience; I mean, that it is
fit, in regard of sudden ministries and necessitates, that the
priests, the deacons, and the bishops, wait upon God: for if
the holy apostle command those of the laity, saying, that
they may attend upon prayer for a time’ (1 Cor. vii. 5);
"how much more commandeth he the priest the same?
now I mean without distraction, that he may wait upon
the priesthood, which is performed in spiritual necessitates,
according to God." Here you have no mention for in-
capacity of the priesthood, or any service which it enjoin-
eth, by marriage; or any thing to disparage the estate in
the sense of God’s Church. But here you have St. Jerome’s
argument:—if St. Paul require the use of wedlock to be for-
borne for extraordinary devotions, then hath the Church
reason to endeavour, that they, whose ordinary devotions
ought to be extraordinary in comparison of the people, be
such as forbear it always. Especially in regard of those
offices of the Church, the occasions whereof may fall out at
any time and sudden. Truly, were there nothing to do but
to preach twice a week, there could no such fall out. Nor
can I shew you better evidence than this, that that order is
not the order of God’s Church.

§ 29. Again, Epiphanius in the premisseschargeth the

1 "Si autem laicos imperatur, ut propter orationem abstineant se ab uxorum coitu: quid de episcopo sen-
tiendum est; qui quotidie pro suis populiis peccatis libitatis Deo obla-
turis est victimas? Relegamus Reg-
num libros; et inveniemus sacerdotem Abimelech de panibus propositionis
noluisse prius dare David et pueros eis, nisi interrogaret, utrum mundi
essent pueri a muliere: non utique
alia, sed conjuge;" & c. “Tantum
interest inter propositionis panes et
Corpus Christi, quantum inter um-
bram et corpora; inter imaginem et
veritatem; inter exemplaria futurorum,
et ea ipsa quae per exemplaria prefigu-
rantur. Quomodo igitur mansue-
tudo," & c., "præcipue esse debent in
episcopo, et inter cunctos laicos emi-
nentia: sic et castitas propria et (ut
ita dixerim) pudicitias sacerdotalis; ut
non solum ab opere se immundo ab-
stineat, sed etiam a jactu oculi et cogi-
tationis errore mens Christi Corpus
confectura sit libera." S. Hieron., in
Epist. ad Titum, c. i.; Op. tom. iv.
P. i. p. 419.

k "Kai òha aπολ την αδην, δι δει
ekheti, tiastin λέγουσιν ἰχειν ὅτι
δὲ οἱ βούλονται διδασκαλίαν ἐπικουρεῖν.
Ei òha tis meta to Bapstīma Δικασθεί
γυμνὲς, παρὰ τὸτοῖον ὅπει
διέκαθοται ἐντ’ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸν έν τόν ἡλ-
ῶν." S. Epiph., as above, § 3. p. 495.
B: proceeding to compare them with
people, who apply a rule, with which
they are imperfectly acquainted, indis-
criminately. He then describes the
Catholic practice respecting clergy, as
Novatians with ignorance, in not permitting the laity to marry second wives (which their fathers the Montanists are evidently chargeable with)\(^1\); not considering, that the clergy were intended for the cream of Christians, not in knowledge or language, but in Christianity. Therefore he that had been baptized in danger of death \(\text{[and]}\) not afore\(^8\), and he that had done public penance\(^9\), was not admitted. No more was he, that had married a second wife\(^8\).

§ 30. Which, when all is said, is St. Paul’s meaning, 1 Tim. iii. 2\(^7\): for he, that had more wives than one, was no Christian; and therefore in no capacity for the clergy, who was not to communicate with the Church. And they who think St. Chrysostom (In Epist. ad Titum, Hom. ii.\(^9\)) expounds him of those, who being parted by divorce should marry a second wife, must say whether afore baptism or after; for that alters the case. For though it was a doubt in St. Jerome’s\(^7\) time, whether he, that had married one afore


= See Review of Ct. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 28.

See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iv. § 16. notes s, u.

See Bingham, IV. v. 1.

\(\text{“Apud omnes gentes secundum nuptiam minus honorabant: alicubi et paginis nonnullis coercitum... Neque vero Christiani in ulla laudis parte cedere debebant gentibus, apud quorum multas ad feminam sacerdotia non admissa nisi univir, ut Tertullianus nos docet... Neque honeste presbyteri in seipso eam spevisse regulam, quam in eligendis feminis servabant. Hinc factum est ut uniis matrimonii esse oportet eos, qui allegabantur in ordinem sacerdotalem: et si qui digami fierent, loco decicerentur.”}\)

Grot., Ad 1 Tim. iii. 2: giving ample authorities, and mentioning no other difference of interpretation in the early Church, than that some Churches took no notice of marriage before baptism.

\(\text{“Επιστομιζει τοις αἱρετικοί τούτων γάμους διαβάλλονται, διεξέχονται, ὅτι τὸ πράγμα οὐκ ἦσθι ἐναγάγει, ἀλλ’ ἀστεῖα τιμηθεῖσσαι, ἐν μιᾷ τινὶ διότι συναφθῆ συναφθηκίας καὶ τὸν ἄγιον ἀναβαθμὸν διὸν ἐν τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς ἕως ἀποκρύπτει.”}\)


7 Gennadius, De Eccl. Dogm. c. lxxii. p. 38, lays it down, that “maritum duorum post baptismum matronarum clerici non ordinandum.”—S. Ambrose, Epist. lxxii. Ad Vercellenses, § 63. (Op. tom. ii. p. 1037. A, B), and De Officiis Ministerum, lib. i. c. 50. § 257 (ibid. p. 66. B, C), decides that all persons twice married, whether before or after baptism, ought to be excluded.
baptism, another after, were under this incapacity or not 
[(as you see by his epistle Ad Carterium*); yet the prac-
tice as well as his opinion overruled it on the favourable side]: but after baptism, it is not to be thought, that the 
Church had so little respect of our Lord's laws as to admit adulterers, though not as to the Roman laws, yet as to God's. 
Athenagoras* calls it "εὐπρεπὴς μοιχείαν" — "fashionable 
adultery," in regard to the world. For as to the Church, 
"adultery" it was always, but never "fashionable." Where-
fore St. Chrysostom's† argument is to this purpose:—"'O 
πρὸς τὴν ἀπελθοῦσαν μηδεμίαν μυθότας εἰνοιαν, πῶς οὖν 
προστάτης καλῶς"—"How should he govern well" (the 
Church), "that kept no good will for her that was gone?" 
For a man is not chargeable for not "keeping affection" for 
her whom he puts away, when she is "gone;" but, well and 
good, for her that is dead. And if he say, that St. Paul 
hereby punishes "τοὺς ἀσεληγέεις"—"the incontinent;" and 
that the case hath "πολλάς κατηγορίας"—"many blames": it 
is plain, that civil people have always had them in esteem 
above others, that have staid at their first marriage*. And 
therefore, though no civil law forbid it, as St. Chrysostom ob-
serventh, nor Christianity: yet is it no marvel, if the laws of 
the Church, which the apostles hereby enacted, set a mark 
upon it which civility disesteemeth. See Grotius his annota-
tions on the place and Luke ii. 36c. If we consider, that

S. Jerom himself, Epist. xxxiv. Ad Nepo-
tian. (Op. tom. iv. P. ii. p. 265), and 
Epist. xci. Ad Ageruch. (alit. ad Ge-
ront., ibid. p. 743), interprets St. Paul's 
prohibition to extend to those who are 
twice married, and without any refer-
ce to baptism. See next note; and 
Bingham, IV. v. 2, 3.

The Epistle meant is that Ad 
Oceanum, De Unius Uxoris Viro 
644, sq.): which is wholly about this 
precise question. Oceanus had in-
stanced one "Carterius, Hispaniae 
episcopus," who "unam antequam bap-
tizaretur, alteram post lavacrum priore 
mortus duxit uxorem:" and had ar-
gued, "cum contra apostoli fecisse 
sententiam," &c. S. Jerom replies, 
that "Miro te unum protractisse in 
medium, quum omnis mundus his or-
dinationibus plenus sit," &c.; and

argues that he is not "bigamus" in 
the apostolic sense, who has married 
but once after baptism, although more 
than once altogether.

† Added from MS.

‡ See above, c. xiii. § 10.

* Legat. pro Christianis, in fin. : ad 
1615.—See Coteler. PP. Apost., ad 
4. tom. i. pp. 90, 91: and ad Constit. 
Apostol. lib. iii. c. 2. ibid. pp. 278, 279.

As quoted above in note q.

§ Ibid.

"Calixtus will not believe that 
these words of Chrysostom belong to 
digamy; I do." Added in margin ia 
MS. The reference to Calixtus, is to 
his De Conjugo Clericorum (as below, 
§ 36. note b), pp. 46, 47.

b See above, note p.

c Magna laus mulieris apud n-
the widows which the Church maintained were to be such, 1 Tim. v. 9; then, that it hath always been an incapacity by the canons of the Church:


[though the copy be not clear], says plain enough, that the apostles exacted no more than this; signifying, what the canons at that time did require. For I do not pretend, that the apostles themselves either enjoined themselves single life, or gave over their wives, when they went about their office: though nothing can appear to the contrary; the many examples of 376 bishops and priests, that gave over the use of wedlock from the time of their ministry with the consent of their wives, giving appearance, that they thought the apostles had done the same. It is enough, that their instructions were a ground for the Church to proceed in it, and a step towards it. That course, which the council of Niccia confirmed by resting content with it, seemeth agreeable, both with justice, and that holiness, to which the Church pretendeth.

§ 32. But before I come to that, I must not forget the

†, fasi toio ta eipfouvay. S. Chrys., In 1 Epist. ad Tim. c. iii. v. 2; Hom. x. § 1: Op. tom. xi. pp. 598, f. 599. A.—

"Itinis mihi oin fain, de 't Win apd yunai-kOn ywloato miwnta xlewbrov. Ei ò mi toito en, ònswi yunauka xwov, ò mi òxovta, enai toto mi yar kalov toito sunexhovn, òp òst 'tirn toio pragmatot fìsou the toto osan. Ònswi ò aL toado metaxeiriassa kalov, ò tiu bovloio. "Opatet gar o ploutos dwocheris eladheis eis the basileian twn othanwv, polla-xon ò ò ploutontes eisfèlhos, ou tw kal o gamos." Id., ibid. pp. 599, E, 600. A.

† In the margin of Savile's edition o. S. Chrysa. (tom. iv. p. 286), for the words, "the toio pragmatos fìsou . . . ònswi ò aL", are substituted the words, "the katadoisi twn pragmatwn the toto osan, òn ði oiken dei svug- chwcin, plin ònswi toio pragmat." k.t.l.

§ So Pagi, In Annal. Baronii, an. ecxviii, num. vi.; and Schelstrate, Eccles. Afric., Dissert. iii. c. 4: quoted by Bingham, IV. v. 6, who replies to them.

* See above, § 24. note e.
second reason moving the Church to endeavour it; to wit, the dispensing of the Church-goods according to the intent for which they are dedicated to God in being estated upon it. For by the ground hereof, settled in the first Book, it evidently appeareth, that the clergy are not proprietaries in the fruits of them; but have only full right to maintain themselves upon them, with that moderation and abstinence in their private expense, which continual attendance upon God's service, involved in their profession, necessarily inferreth. Otherwise it is manifest, that they are trusted by Christian people with the dispensing of their oblations and consecrations to the maintenance of the poor; part of the original consideration, upon which they were estated upon the Church. Nor can any civil law, providing contribution of the people for the necessary subsistence of the poor of every parish, ever extinguish this obligation; so long as the Church is a Church, and stands upon its own title: that hospitality, to which Church goods are and always have been accounted liable, consisting, not in secular entertainment, which bringeth on ambition of worldly expense and costly superfluities, but in providing for the poor and strangers and distressed whether at home or abroad: the intent whereof redounds to the account of him, that provideth the means; and therefore the execution thereof, to his account, that dispenseth the same. For if the intent of the Church and all the laws of it demonstrate, that the clergy are to be the first-fruits of Christianity; then doth the renouncing of the world, which all Christians by their baptism profess, in the first place take hold of them. But that, the enjoying of superfluities in the world is utterly inconsistent with. Therefore the profession of the clergy necessarily limiteth their right in Church-goods to a spare and moderate maintenance; the trust, which is upon them by intent of pious consecrations, expressed in the original custom and practice of the Church, taking place in point of conscience, where their own necessities cease.

1 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr. c. xvi. § 22, sq.

2 See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. x. § 6: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 48, sq.

1 See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iv. § 15. note y: and above, c. xvii. § 10. note l.
§ 33. Now it is indeed become evident by corruption prevailing in the Church, that single men, becoming trusted with Church-goods, can abuse them so well to their own riot, or to the enriching of their relations, that married men could have done no more*. But that never came to pass, till, chiefly by the coming of the world into the Church, those manners and customs, in which the eminency of the clergy above the people did and ought to consist, suffered shipwreck in the multitude of offenders; after they had been maintained a great while by the eminent abstinence of prelates and inferior clergy, able for authority and means to have produced bad examples. Whether common reason is tied to judge it more probable, that the moderation and abstinence which the clergy professeth should prevail and take effect, they living single or married; that I suppose only comes in consideration, when the dispute is, what course the law of the Church should take. And, therefore, the profession of that continence, which single life requir eth, grounding a reasonable presumption of eminence in Christianity [for them*] above those that are married, there was all the reason in the world, why the Church should endeavour to put the government thereof into such hands by preferring them before others. On the other side, as all truth in moral and human matters is liable to many exceptions, it cannot be denied, that more abstinence from riot and from riches both, more attendance upon the service of God, is found sometimes in those that live married than in those that live single. In which consideration it may well seem hard to conclude all them, that are married, unserviceable for the Church.

§ 34. The moderation therefore of the Eastern Church seemeth to proceed upon a very considerable ground; not excluding married persons from a capacity of holy orders, but excluding persons ordained from any capacity of mar-

* Compare Cassander's complaint, that "Sunt et contra plerique caelibes, qui usque adeo caelibatu suo ad ea quae Dei sunt expeditius curanda non incidunt, sed etiam contra curis hujus seculi supra reliquos homines immer-
* Added from MS.
riage. For those, who were promoted to the clergy, being single, and knowing that they were not allowed marriage; what can they pretend, why they should hold their estate, not performing the condition of it? As for the promoting of those who are already married, it is the trial of their conversation in wedlock, that may ground a presumption, as well for that conscience, which their fidelity in dispensing the goods of the Church,—as for that diligence in setting aside the importunities of marriage, which their attendance upon the service of the Church,—requireth.

§ 35. It was therefore to be wished, that the Western Church had used the limitation, which the Nicene council by resting contented with confirmed, to admit of persons married before orders, preferring before them those that are single. But it must be granted, that as well in the west as in the east, though the aim was to prefer single life, yet here and there, now and then, those that were married were not excluded. It is not to be thought, that one Spanish

* This practice arises from the Trul- lant Council (A.D. 692), can. vii.:—


"τοιούτους ἐνδιδικάσων ἡ διακόνους τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα μὴ ἐβαλλέτων προ- φάτες εὐλαβέται ἄνω τὸ ἐκθάλλη, ἄφο- ρίζεται ἐκμένος δι’ καθαρίσθησαν." And ibid. can. xxi. (ibid. p. 29 D),

"Τῶν εἰς κλήρον προσελίθεσαν ἄγαμων, κελευθεὶς βουλουμένοις γαμεῖν, ἀναγιά- στας καὶ φάλται μόνους."—The Trull- lant Council placed the stricter restriction only upon bishops (see below in note q.)—Pope Stephen IV. (ap. Grat. Decret. P. i. Dist. 31. can. 14. p. 43) recognizes the eastern practice thus

—"Aliter se Orientalium traditio ha- bet Ecclesiaram, aliter hujus sancte Romanæ Ecclesie; nam eorum sac- cerdotes, diaconi, atque subdiaconi, matrimonio copulandum" &c. And the 4th Conc. of Lateran, A.D. 1215, can xiv. (ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xi. p. 168. D) provides for the Greek Priests in Constantinople (then under the Latin Emperors) by allowing them "τῷ κυρίῳ συνοικίσας χρησαθίν." See Van Esen, on the canon, Jus Eccles., tom. viii. p. 147.—Sigismund Baro is quoted by Chennitz, as alleging that among the Russians frequently on the same day a man was married and then ordained deacon. See also Pinkerton's Preliminary Memoir to Platon's Present State of the Greek Church in Russia, p. 17. Edinb. 1814.

1 See above, § 24. note z.

4 Instances of married clergy, bi- shops, priests, and deacons, in the first three centuries, among others S. Cy- prian, are given in Bingham, IV. v. 5.

—In Conc. Carth. 111. A.D. 397 are canons respecting the "filii episcopo- rum et presbyterorum" (Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 1169. C. D).—For the next century, one main authority is Socrates, H. E., lib. v. c. 22. p. 287. C. D: affirming bishops in the eastern Church
council, which had no effect at all without the bounds of it, could as easily be reduced in effect in practice as couched in writing: especially, the general council of Nicaea* having waved the motion of enacting the same. But this demonstrates the credit of the Church of Rome in the Western Church, at that time that the rescripts of Syricius¹ and

---

¹ Syricius, Epist. ad Hierimum (c. D. 385, ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. pp. 1020, 1021), denounces, in § 7, those who "post, longa consecrationis tempora, tam de conjubibus propriis, quam etiam de turpi coitu sobolem didicimus proceresse;" and enacts in § 9, that "Quicumque itaque se ecclesiae votis obsequi a sua infantia, ante pubertyta annos baptizari, et lectorum debet ministri sociari: qui ab accessu adolescentiae usque ad tricenimum aetatis annum, si probabileri vixerit, una tantum, et ea, quam virginem communi per sacerdotem benedictione perceperit, usque contentum, acolythus et subdiaconus esse debet: post quae ad diaconii gradum, si se ipsa primitus, continentia praeeunte, dignum probari, accedat: ubi si ultra quinque annos laudabiliter ministrari, congrue presbyterium consequatur: exinde, post decennium, episcopalem cathedram poterit adiici, &c. He enacts further in § 10, that "Qui jam aetate grandevus... ex laico ad sacram militiam pervenire festinat," shall be admitted through the same grades, but only, "Si eum unam habuisse, vel habere, et hanc virginem accipias, constat uiorem;" proceeding in § 11. to degrade him, who "aut viduum aut certe secundam conjugem duxerit."
Innocent\textsuperscript{x} popes are found the first acts to enforce the same which that Spanish council had enacted. For the African\textsuperscript{z} and other western canons\textsuperscript{z}, that enjoin the same, are for time after Syricius. Whereby it appeareth, though they do not use that exception which the council of Nicea had supposed, yet that the rule of single life for the clergy was so trodden under foot, that it was found requisite to seek means by the synods of several parts, and by the concurrence of the see of Rome, to bring it into force. For let no man think, that those canons took effect so soon as they were made, which were made on purpose to restrain the marriages of the clergy; who for the most part had from the beginning lived single, but neither before nor after could be totally restrained from marriage.

\S 36. It would be too large a work in this place, to repeat either the particular canons which were made, and the discourses of the fathers to enforce them, on the one side; or, on the other side, the sayings\textsuperscript{x} of the fathers and other records, in point of fact, whereby the inexecution of them doth appear. Those that would be satisfied in it, may see, what the archbishop of Spalato\textsuperscript{a} hath collected\textsuperscript{b}; and find


\textsuperscript{a} Scil. Conc. Turon. I. (A.D. 461), can. i. et ii.; ap. Labb., Conc. tom. iv. pp. 1050. C—E, 1051. A; B: Turon. II. (A.D. 567), can. xix.; ibid. tom. v. pp. 857. D—858. D: Agathens. (A.D. 506), c. ix.; ibid. tom. iv. p. 1384. D; and Aurelianens. III. (A.D. 538), can. ii.; ibid. tom. v. p. 296. A.; in actibus, in the words of the last of them, "ut nullus clericus a ubi diaco, et supra... propris, si forte jam habebat, miscetatur uxor." As, with respect to priests, the 2nd council of Arles (quoted above, \S 24. note x), had done before them.—Conc. Tolet. II. (A.D. 531), c. i. ibid. tom. iv. p. 1733. A—D; IV. (A.D. 633), c. xlv.; ibid. tom. v. p. 1717. A; and VIII. (A.D. 653), c. vi. ibid. tom. vi. p. 405. D, E: of which the first enforces a vow of continence taken at ordination, but expressly leaves it to free choice whether to take the vow or not: the second forbids a clergyman to marry "sine consultu episcopi aut viduam vel ejjectam vel menstrucam": the third enjoins a subdeacon neither to marry nor to cohabit with a wife. Conc. Tolet. IV. c. xxvii. (ibid. tom. v. p. 1714. A), requires parish clergy to live "caste et pure."

\textsuperscript{b} Corrected from MS.: "saying" in folio edition.

\textsuperscript{z} De Rep. Eccl., lib. II. c. x. \S 1, sqq. tom. i. pp. 291, sqq.

\textsuperscript{b} "And Calixtus;" added in margin.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.  833

Epiphanius his saying still take place during the flourishing time of the Church.

§ 37. But all this while you hear nothing of any vow annexed to the undertaking of holy orders, by virtue whereof marriage contracted under them should become void. For the vow of single life being an act, that disposeth of a man and his estate in this world to a total change of his courses, if he mean to observe it, what reason can admit any ground for presuming of it, when it is not expressed? And the custom of the Eastern Church reduceth the penalty thereof unto the ceasing of that ministry, and by consequence of that maintenance, which the order entitleth to; which is not the penalty of breaking a vow.

§ 38. But the effects of these rules and endeavours of the Western Church was never such as to exclude the clergy from marriage; how much soever they might exclude married persons from holy orders. When Gregory the seventh undertook to bring them under a total restraint from marriage, it is manifest, that other manner of means were employed to make that restraint forcible, than the constitution of the Church endows it with. For that was the time, when the Church undertook to dispose of crowns and sceptres, and to extend the spiritual power thereof to the utmost of temporal effects. And therefore it is to be granted, that by such means indeed it might and did come to effect; but in point, of fact only, not in point of right, as being a rigour, which the practice of all parts was sufficient protestation that the Church in that estate was not able to undergo. For the horrible and abominable effects thereof have been so
visible, that it is not possible the cause of them should seem to the production of that reason, which the being of any law requireth and supposeth.

§ 39. Nor can the see of Rome justly be admitted to charge, that no bounds have been observed in releasing of it; which it cannot be denied, that the ancient Church in all places did observe. For I truly for my part have granted, that even laws given by the apostles for the better government of the Church, though written in the Scriptures, may be dispensed in by the Church; when the present constitution of things shall make it appear to the governors thereof, that the observation of that rule, which served for that state in which it was prescribed, tends to the considerable and visible harm of the Church in the present state of it. And, therefore, I will not take upon me to say, that the state of bigamy, which St. Paul I have shewed maketh an impediment to some orders⁴, can by no means be dispensed with.

§ 40. But the see of Rome, which dispatcheth with it as the truth of which however see above, § 30, 31), but nevertheless "non proprium Divinem," but simply an ecclesiastical law: therein following S. Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan, and others, against Clichotovius. Also so Cassander, as above, p. 989: denouncing the "novus quidam in Italia dogmatum (Francisc. Turrianus), qui unus contra omnia vetera et recentem ecclesiasticorum scriptorum sententiam coelitam ordinis sacri obseruant, hoc est, substantialiter et lege Divina, ad junctum esse contendit, nec esse in potestate Pontificis nec Ecclesiae, ut conjugi usum sarcodarius permitat, non magis quam furandi aut latrocinandi:" and urging on the contrary, that "cum hae matrimonii contracti post ordinam alios statua prohibeat, et exempla prisa exspectat, qua testentur hujusmodi statuta non tam anxie observata fuisse, quis ob Ecclesiae necessitatem aliquando relata fuerint, quis non concedat in extrema hac Ecclesiae necessitate hoc ideae hodie fieri posse?"

¹ Above, § 30.

= "The Church of Rome dispenses with digamy of course, and therefore cannot blame the Reformed for releasing the canon of single life." Added in margin in MS.
of course, paying the ordinary fees, I conceive, cannot in justice charge the releasing of the rule of single life to all the clergy, though in some measure a law of the whole Church. And how many canons of the whole Church besides are there, which must be trampled under foot by bringing that unlimited power into effect, which now it exerciseth? I could therefore earnestly wish, for mine own part, that some reservation had been used in the releasing of it; that the respect, due to single life by our common Christianity, might have remained visible to Christian people by the privilege of it in the Church. Nor do I think myself bound, by being of the Reformation, to maintain the acts, by which it stands, upon other terms. But this I say; that, when the extremity of one party occasions the other to fall into the opposite extreme, neither party seems clearly excusable of the fault, which the other commits in betaking itself to the opposite extreme. And then I say further: that, when secular force was applied to impose a burden, which the experience of [men] in corrupt times had shewed that they could not bear, the issue must needs be the treading down of Christianity for maintaining of the hedge that should fence it; and therefore, the proceedings being void in all reason of law, it is no marvel, if that moderation, which the agreement of both sides might have preserved, could not take place.

§ 41. I am yet indebted to those of the Congregations in a short account of the right of the people in Church matters. I have acknowledged, that during the time of the apostles they were present at ordinations, at inflicting of penance, at councils; that the resolution of matters in debate passed under their knowledge; that their consent concurred to put

---

* "Quaunquam autem fateantur hi pontifices bigamiam a Paulo proscripsisse esse a clero, non tamen hanc ab eo tanquam juris Divini legem promulgatam suisse arbitrantur. Unde et penes pontifices est de ea dispensa." Thomassin, Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Disc., P. II. lib. i. c. 83. § 2; declaring that bishops cannot dispense with it, only the pope: and see the whole chapter.

* Misprinted "more" in folio edition.

* "I have not yet resolved what is the interest of the people, which I have resolved not to be chief." Added in margin in MS.

* Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xi. § 15, 16; c. xii. § 3, 4, 12—21: Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 23—38; c. iii. § 71—76.

THORDIKE.
them in force. But I have also maintained⁷ that the unity of the Church is the sovereign law, to which all other laws, though never so much enacted by the apostles, never so evidently couched in the Scriptures, are necessarily subordinate; as tending only to maintain unity, by maintaining order in the exercise of those offices, for communion wherein the Church subsisteth: [and] that, in order hereto, every Church is a body (tending to constitute one body of all Churches), consisting of all Christians contained in one city and the territory of it; howsoever cities and their territories may be distinguished; as, sometimes, merely upon this account, and to this intent and purpose, they have been distinguished. And by this means I have prescribed, that the consent of the people of each Church was never requisite in this consideration, because they usually meet together for the service of God; but as part of the people of that Church, who were to be acquainted with proceedings concerning their Church, that they might have reason to rest satisfied in the same.

§ 42. I have provided in due place⁴, that laws, expressly provided by the apostles and recorded in the Scriptures for that state of the Church which they saw, may and ought to be superseded by the Church, in case they prove useless to that purpose, for which they were provided, by that change which succeeds in the state of the Church. For how should the sovereign law of unity take place, how should the Church continue one and the same body from the first to the second coming of Christ, otherwise? Now this interest of the people in matters concerning their Church,—though related in the Scriptures, and known by them in point of fact to have had the force of law during the time of the apostles, and accordingly in the primitive Church of the ages next 379 the apostles⁴,—yet cannot be said to be anywhere commanded in point of right for a law of God, to take place in all ages.

§ 43. I must therefore prescribe upon this account, and do prescribe; that, when the world is come into the Church,

---

⁷ See references in last note: and c. vii. § 41, c. xxiv. § 9, sq., c. xxv. &c.
Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxv. § 1, sq.
⁴ See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr.

Acts xv. 4, 12, 23; and see also Acts xi. 9, and Coloss. iv. 17.

[Change of circumstances]
and the whole people of England, for example, have declared themselves Christians, it cannot be any more for the unity of the Church, that the consent of the people be required to the validity of those acts, which concern the community of their respective Churches. For then would it be no less impossible to constitute one Church of all Churches, than it is for all Independents to constitute a body, that may be called "the Church," of all their congregations, each whereof they call "a Church." And therefore there is no cause, why they should demand the same regard to be had to each one of the people, when all the people of a city and the bounds thereof concur to constitute the Church of a city; and when the chief part of Christians within the bounds of a city, assembling at once for the service of God, might also be acquainted with the proceedings of matters concerning their Church.

§ 44. But all this while I am not so simple as to grant, [How far the people's consent was required in the times of the apostles.]
that the consent of the people, then required to the validity of things done in the Church, did consist in plurality of votes: having easily huffed out that ridiculous imagination, that St. Paul and Barnabas created elders by votes of the people, testified by lifting up their hands; the action of χειροποιία being attributed to themselves, not to the people.

But the consent of the people I mean, in body, as the people; that is, a quality distinct from the clergy in the Church, as their superiors and guides, in matters concerning the community of it. For is there any example in the Scripture, that ever they went to the poll, or counted noses, in passing of matters concerning the Church, which the people were acquainted with? Is there any such example in all the practice of the primitive Church, in which it is acknowledged the same course continued as under the apostles?

§ 45. Ordinations were held in presence of the people, [In ordinations.]
that, if there were cause, they who knew every man's person might object against those who were in nomination; if not, they might consent by one vote of all, that was called their

---

**notes:**

* The errata in the folio edition seem to intend to correct this word into "as."
* See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 33, sq.: and Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr.

Tr., c. vii. § 22, c. viii. § 15.

7 See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 12, and Review of it, c. xii. § 8: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 36.
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suffrage*. This being the manner, upon this occasion they might and did sometimes step before their leaders, and demand such as liked them best*; but so that, if they forgot themselves, the clergy was bound not to admit their demand. And in case of a bishop, the neighbour bishops were bound by St. Paul’s instructions to Timothy not to lay hands on any for whom they could not answerb.

§ 46. Tertullianc testifieth, that matter of excommunication was handled at the assemblies of the Church (that is, with the knowledge of the people); as the case of the incestuous person at Corinth, in St. Paul, is. But neither were all matters handled before the people, if the matter of St. Paul’s communicating with the Jews were handled with the elders before the people were acquainted with it (Acts xxii. [18—26]); nor is it possible to imagine, supposing a Church not to be a congregation but that which I have saidd, that the people can have satisfaction in all matters of that nature, when all the world is come into the Church.

§ 47. As for councils, it is a thing ridiculous to demand;—because the people concurred to the resolution of that at Jerusalem, Acts xv., therefore that the acts of councils should pass the peoplee. For when the Church of Jerusalem and the whole Church were both the same thing, it was no marvel that the people was to be satisfied in the conclusion of it. And by the form of holding the Spanish councils, which you have at the beginning of the councilsf, it appears, that there was provision made for the people to assist and see what was done at their councils. But so unreasonable is it to demand, that the people consent to the acts of councils; that it is manifest, that there can be no such thing as a council according to the supposition of the Congregations. And, therefore, in the acts of councils, which are the laws whereby the Church is to be ruled, the people can have no further satisfaction, than to see them openly debated under

* See Review of Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 8: and above, c. xvi. § 15, c. xvii. § 4.

* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 17. notes m, n.

b See above, c. xx. § 62: and Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 6.

c Quoted above in Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xi. § 12, and § 14. note h.

* Above in § 41: and see Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vii., sq.

* See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 33.

f Quoted above in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 37. note u.
the knowledge of the people. Indeed, the interest of sovereign
to the public peace, but as they are members of the catholic
Church, and so trusted with the protection of all that is
catholic) in behalf of the people, gives them that power over
the acts of councils, which by and by I shall declare: which,
though grounded upon another account and belonging to
them in another quality than that which the constitution of
the Church createth, is notwithstanding provided by God,
to secure His people of their Christianity, together with the
unity of the Church.

§ 48. But the suffrage of the people of every Church, that [Advan-
is, their acknowledgment, that they know no exception against
the persons in nomination for bishops or other orders of the
Church; as it agreeith with the proceedings of the apostles
and primitive Church, so must it needs be a most powerful
means to maintain that strict bond of love and reverence
between the clergy and the people, in the recovery whereof
the unity of the Church consisteth. And supposing public
penance retrieved, without which it is in vain to pretend
reformation in the Church, there can be no stronger means
to maintain Christianity in effect, than the satisfaction of
the people, though not in the measure of penance to be
enjoined, yet in the performing of it. Always provided,
that this interest of the people be grounded upon no other
presumption, that any man is the child of God or in the
state of grace and endowed with God's Spirit, than that
which the law of the Church, whereby he enjoys communion
[with\(^h\)] the Church, createth. For this presumption must
needs be stronger concerning the clergy by their estate, than
it can be concerning the people; because by their estate
they are to be the choice of the people. And though, as all
moral qualities are subject to many exceptions, some of the
people may be better Christians than some of the clergy;
yet a legal presumption, that any of them is so, must needs
be destructive to the unity of the Church.

§ 49. But no disorder in religion can be so great, as to
justify the obdurate resolution of the Church of Rome to

\(^e\) Below, in c. xxxiii.  \(^b\) Misprinted "which," in folio edition.
withdraw the Scriptures from the people. There is nothing more manifest, than that the lamentable distractions which we are under, have proceeded from the presumption of particular Christians upon their understanding in the Scriptures, proceeding to think their quality capable of reforming the Church. Only those, that can have joy of so much mischief to our common Christianity, can think otherwise. But I am not therefore induced to think our Christianity any other than the Christianity of those, whom our Lord, whom St. Paul and other apostles and prophets, exhort and encourage to the study of the Scriptures; whom St. Chrysostom, and others of the fathers, so earnestly deal with to make it their business.

§ 50. All the offence consists in this, that private Christians observe not the bounds of that which is catholic, when they come to read the Scriptures. For if they be not content to confine the sense of all they read within that rule of faith, in which the whole Church agreeeth, because they understand not how they stand together; if they think the laws of the whole Church can command things contrary to that, which God by Scripture commandeth: it is no marvel they should proceed to make that, which they think they see in the Scriptures, though indeed they see it not, a law to the Church. For they think it is God's will that ties them to it. But if the Church be the Church, as I have shewed it is; then was the Scripture never given private Christians to make them judges, what all Christians are bound to believe, what the Church is to enjoin the Church for the condition of communion with the Church. If any man object the inconvenience,—that it appeareth not, who or where that Church

---

1 See above, c. xxii. § 23; and c. xxiv. § 2, note e.
2 See above, c. xxiv. § 2.
4 Ushar's Hist. Dogmatics, cc. 2, 3. pp. 162—271, is made up of quotations to this purpose from the fathers of the first six centuries.
5 "Which it ought to be, or if it ought to have that power which they take to themselves." Added in margin in MS.
6 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vi. sq.
7 "J'ai un mot de réflexion à faire sur ce qu'on vient de lire de l'ouvrage de Mr. Thorndike. Je ne sais si mes lecteurs auront plus de pénétration que moi, mais je ne comprends pas ce qu'il entend par 'l' Eglise,' dont 'la foi et les lois' doivent servir de règle, qui doit terminer infailiblement les controverses, et fixer le sens des passages douteux de l' Ecriture Sainte. Si je ne me trompe, il n'entend par là aucune communion particulière, car
is, and so we are confined to those bounds that cannot appear;—this inconvenience is the clearest evidence that I can produce for the catholic Church. For unless we grant this inconvenience to come by God's institution and appointment, we must confess the unity of the Church to be God's appointment, because the dissolution thereof produceth this inconvenience. For were the unity of the Church in being, I could easily send any man to the catholic Church by sending him to his own Church; which, by holding communion with the whole Church, must needs stand distinguished from those, which hold it not, though under the name of Churches. And he, who resorts to the Church for resolution in the Scriptures, supposes, that he is not to break from the Church for that, wherein the whole Church is not agreed. Now that the unity of the Church is broken in pieces, it remains no more visible to common sense, what it is, wherein the whole Church agrees, as the condition for communion with it. But the means to make it appear again, having disappeared through disunion in the Church, is that discourse of reason, which proceeds upon supposition of visible unity, established by God in the Church. And the means to make it appear again to common sense, is the restoring of that unity in the Church, by the interruption whereof it disappeareth. Then shall the edification of particular Christians in our common Christianity proceed without interruption by means of the Scriptures; every one supposing, that his edification in the common Christianity dependeth not upon the knowledge of those things, wherein the Church agreeeth not, but of those things wherein it agreeeth. In the mean time it remaineth, that offences proceed to be infinite and endless; because men, giving no bounds to their studies in the Scriptures, imagine the edification of the Church to elles sont toutes en différend; sont-ce donc toutes les sociétés chrétiennes prises ensemble? Mais leur foi, leurs règlements, n'ont ils point des diversités? Ou devons nous regarder comme infailliblement décidés les points, sur lesquels toutes les Eglises répandues dans le monde sont d'accord? Mais alors comment les points en dispute seront ils décidés? J'avoie que je n'y vois pas clair, je souhaite que d'autres ayent les yeux meilleurs que moi." Note C, in Chauffepie's Suppl. to Bayle's Dict. Hist. et Critique, art. Thorndike.

"'Unless we say, that the great difficulty of choice in religion at present is ordained and procured of God, we must say, that it comes by destroying the Church, and the power thereof by Him ordained to prevent it.'" Added in margin in MS.
BOOK III. consist in that, wherein themselves, not regarding the consent of the Church, have placed their own edification in the Scriptures.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

How great the power of the Church and the effect of it is. The right of judging the causes of Christians ceaseth, when it is protected by the State. An objection; if ecclesiastical power were from God, secular power could not limit the use of it. Ground for the interest of the State in church matters. The inconsequence of the argument. The concurrence of both interests to the law of the Church. The interest of the State in the endowment of the Church. Concurrence of both in matrimonial causes, and ordinations. Temporal penalties upon excommunication from the State. No sovereign subject to the greater excommunication, but to the less. The rights of the Jews' State and of Christian powers in religion, partly the same, partly not. The infinite power of the Pope not founded upon episcopacy, but upon acts of the secular powers of Christendom.

And now I may make good that, which might seem an excessive word when I said it*: that the power, which I demand for the Church, is no more than the subsistence of every corporation constituted by sovereign power requireth; only that it stands by God's law, these by man's. For what corporation subsisteth without public persons, to govern or to execute those things, wherein it communicateth? without power¹ to limit that, which the laws of the foundation determine not? to admit and to shut out, whom the foundation thereof qualifieth? without a stock to defray the charge of those offices, for communion wherein it subsisteth? That which renders the power of the Church considerable even in the Church, that is, by the original constitution of it, is the extent thereof, comprising all Christians. For by that means, in what quality a man is owned by his own Church, in the same he is owned by all Christians, supposing the unity of

---


² Above in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vi. § 4—11: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 5.

¹ Corrected in MS.: "without any power" in folio edition.
the Church to take place and prevail. That which renders it considerable in the world, is the professing of Christianity by the sovereign powers of the world; that is, of those states which Christendom containeth. For supposing that, which hath been made to appear*;—that the Church, being a society formed by the act whereby God constituteth it, dissolveth not into the state, when by professing Christianity it becomes obliged to protect the Church;—the rights and powers thereof, and the qualities of persons ministering the same, necessarily remain distinct from those, which the state, wherein it subsisteth, either involveth or produceth: and the protection of the state signifieth further that allowance or that maintenance of the rights, that concur to the acts thereof, which a Christian state needs must afford that Christianity which it professeth. The power of ministering the immediate instruments of grace, the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist; the power of the keys, in exacting that profession which qualifieth for them, the means subordinate to the ministering of them; the power of solemnizing those offices with the prayers of the Church, which the promise of grace implied in the foundation of the Church attendeth: all these make the act of the Church merely ministerial; the blessing that attendeth, the mere effect of God's grace, only limited to the communion of His Church. When the Church determineth the times, the places, the persons, the occasions, the forms, the circumstances, the manner, of celebrating any of those offices, which qualify for communion in the service of God with the Church; of those, which provide for the celebration thereof; of those wherein it consisteth: the acts, whereby it determineth that which God hath not determined, done within the sphere of God's law, oblige all to conformity by God's law; as the acts of corporations oblige the members, by the act of the state upon which they stand. Not as if this conformity were the worship of God, but that which prepareth and maketh way for it.

§ 2. The laws of the apostles, though recorded in Scripture, [When and are necessarily by the subject matter of them of this nature.

* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ii. § 11; and cc. xi., xix., xx.
Therefore I maintain them subject to change; upon the same account as the laws of all visible corporations are necessarily subject to change. He, that should think the observing of them pleasing to God for the thing which they enjoin and determine, not for that act of God's service, the circumstance whereof they limit; might commit superstition in observing the laws given by the apostles, as well as by the Church. There may be ground for a presumption in reason, that there is superstition in doing that, which for the nature and kind of it may lawfully be done; when there is so much business about the circumstance, that there is no appearance to reason, how it can stand and be done in order to the principal which it pretendeth. For example; pilgrimage to the holy land hath in it a pretence of extraordinary devotion, to which a man sequestereth his time from his attendance upon this world and the advantages of it. But if in effect the exercise of devotion appear not the principal; is there not ground in reason for a construction, that a man hopes to bribe God with his bodily exercise to grant those effects of grace, which He cannot be obliged to but by the condition which the gospel importeth? This is superstition, and will-worship in the bad sense, or the vain worship of God by doctrines delivered by men, which our Lord and the prophet Esay charge the Jews with: when a man stands upon the circumstances tending to limit the order and uniformity of that worship of God "in spirit and truth," wherein Christianity consisteth; as if the observation of them were the substance of it. And yet that uniformity which the laws of the Church procure, so necessary to the maintenance of God's service, for which it standeth, that there is no less superstition in standing upon the not doing of them; which cannot be stood upon, so far beyond the sphere of their kind and nature, without appearance of an imagination, that a man becomes acceptable to God by refusing them. But to proceed to violate the unity of the Church upon such a cause, is nothing else, than to place the worship of God as much in committing sacrilege as in abhorring of idols.

§ 3. This being the utmost of what the Church is able to

* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 41, c. xxiv. § 9, sq., &c.
do by the original constitution thereof, it will not be pre-
judicial to that service of God which Christianity enjoineth,
that the acts thereof should take hold upon the conscience;
because it is easily understood by that interruption of God’s
service, which the disorders of this time have made visible,
how every Christian is bound in conscience to concur to that
uniformity, which, as it procureth the service of God, so is
procured by the laws of the Church. But this effect is in-
visible, between God and the conscience. The visible effect
of the original power of the Church is considerable in regard
of the greatness of that body, which is the whole Church,
and owns the act of every Church, done within the true
sphere, by giving effect to it. But it becomes considerable
to the world by that accessory force, which the protection of
the Church by the power of the world (necessarily ensuing
upon the profession of Christianity, so long as the acknow-
ledgment of one catholic Church is a part of it) addeth to
the acts of the Church, by owning them for the acts of a
corporation which the state protecteth.

§ 4. Before I come to limit this effect, I must acknowledge
one part of the Church’s right to have ceased, and become
void, by the coming of the world into the Church, and the
conversion of the Roman empire to the faith; that is, the
power of ending all suits between Christians within the
Church. St. Paul is express in it; and the generality of
our Saviour’s command,—to resort “to the Church, if thy
brother offend thee,”—can never be satisfied with any other
sense. The synagoge had the same order, upon the same
ground; to wit, that the offences that fall out among God’s
people might not scandalize the Gentiles. Therefore St.
James, writing his epistle to converted Jews, supposeth, that
they exercised the same power of judging between Christian
and Christian as they did (being Jews) between Jew and
Jew; and exhorts them thereupon to use it like Christians

7 Corrected from MS.: “Church” in folio edition.
8 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. ii. § 11, xi. § 36.
9 “Est hoc quod Paulus hic præcipient, ex laudabilibus institutis syna-
gogae. Dicebant Hebraei, ‘Qui adducit Israelitam ad tribunal gentium, is pro-
fanat Nomen Dei: occasionem enim dant, qui id faciunt, extraneis dicendi,
eece quam concordes sunt illi qui unum Deum colunt’. . . . Tractatur hæc
res Clementis Constitutionum ii. 45.” Grot., ad 1 Cor. vi. 1.
§ 5. And St. Cyprian teaches Quirinus in the testimonies which he produces against the Jews out of the Scripture, iii. 44; "Fideles inter se discipentes non debere gentilem judicem experiri; in Epistola Pauli ad Corinth. i., 'Audet quisquam vestrum,'" &c.—"That Christians, being in debate amongst themselves, are not to come to the trial of a heathen judge; for in the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians you have, 'Dare any of you,'" &c.

§ 6. In the Constitutions of the Apostles, ii. 45—47ª, this authority is most truly attributed to the Church by describing the manner of proceeding in it. Nor will any man of reason question, that the author of them, though not so ancient as the title under which he goes, understood the state of the Church before Constantine. There he shews, that the Church in the use of this power aimed at the precept of our Lord, to be reconciled to our brethren before we offer sacrifice to God: Matt. v. 23, 24. For though the offering of beasts in sacrifice to God be ceased, yet the reason of the precept holds in the eucharist, and the offering of those oblations, out of which it was consecrated for Christians. To this purpose he prescribeth, that consistories be held on the Monday, to see what differences were on foot in the Church; that they might have the week before them to set them to right, that so they might offer at the eucharist on the Lord's day with a clear conscience. For at the eucharist they were to salute one another with a kiss of peace; and the deacon cried aloud, "Μὴ τις κατὰ τινος, μὴ τις ἐν ὑποκρίσει"—"Let no man have any thing against any man, let no man give the kiss of peace dissembling." All evidences for the practice of the Church.

§ 7. That which Gratian hath alleged out of the epistle

---

ª See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 37. note b.—Beveridge, Cod. Can. Prim. Eccl., dates the Apostolic Canons within the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Gieseler brings them down to the 5th and 6th. Cave holds both Canons and Constitutions to belong to the same period, viz. the end of the second century.

---

ª See the place referred to in note e.

ª See ibid. note l.

---

① Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 38—40.


① Quoted in Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. iv. § 16.
of Clemens to James of Jerusalem, Causa xi. Quest. i. cap. xxxii., is found also in the life of St. Peter out of the book of the popes' lives, which you have in the councils; though in that copy of it, which hath since been published under the name of Anastasius, it appeareth not. The words are these, in the epistle:—"Si qui ex fratribus negotia habent inter se, apud cognitores seculi non judicentur; sed apud presbyteros Ecclesie, quicquid illud est, definiatur"—"If any of the brethren have suits among themselves, let them not be judged before judges of the world; but whatsoever it is, let it be judged before the priests of the Church." The life of St. Peter saith thus:—"Hic Petrus B. Clementem episcopum consecravit, cui et cathedram vel ecclesiam omnem disponendum committit, dicens, Sicut mihi gubernandi tradita est a Domino meo Jesu Christo potestas, ligandii solvendique, ita et ego tibi committo, ut ordinem dispositores diversarum causarum, per quos actus non ecclesiastici profigitur, et tu minime curis seculi deditus reperiaris, sed sollemento orationi et praedicationi ad populum vacare stude"—"This Peter consecrated B. Clement bishop, and committed to him the see or the whole Church to be ordered, saying, As the power of governing or binding and loosing was delivered me by my Lord Jesus Christ, so do I also depute thee to ordain those that may dispose of divers causes, by whom actions that are not of the Church may be dispatched; so that thou be not found addicted to secular cares, but only study to attend upon prayer and preaching to the people." I know the first is forged, and the second of little credit. And he, that writ the epistle, might intend to create an authority against trying the clergy in secular courts; which could not be the subject of any thing that Clement might write. But both authors write, what they might know in their time to have fitted the apostles' time. There is nothing more suitable to that estate which the apostles signify, than that Clemens should appoint who should attend upon the dispatching of suits between his

---

2 Labb., Conc., tom. i. p. 63. C.
4 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 39. note k; and above, c. xlv. § 10. note u.
people, that he might attend upon the principal of his office. For that all resorted not then to the Church, it is ridiculous to imagine.

§ 8. It is enough, that there is no instance extant of any suit between Christians tried before Gentiles before Constantine. And this is the reason, why Constantine, undertaking the protection of Christianity, made the law that is yet extant in the Code of Theodosius, De Episcopali Audientia i. p.; that any man might appeal to the bishop in any cause before sentence. Is there any appearance, that so vast a privilege would ever have been either demanded or granted, had not the matter of it been in use by the constitution of the Church among Christians?

§ 9. Therefore it was no marvel, that it was limited afterwards (for it made the Church judge in all causes, in which one party would appeal to it); as it appears by Justinian’s law, and other constitutions afore Justinian. For when the empire was become Christian, the reason of our Lord’s and His apostle’s order was expired. In the mean time, the referring of causes to the bishop upon appeal, was but to refer the causes of Christians to the bishop, which belonged to his knowledge afore. And when all were Christians, to demand that all should resort to the bishop, had been to

---

* Quoted in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 74. note y.—For its genuineness, see authorities in Bingham, II. vii. 5. Selden, Ux. Hebr., lib. iii. c. 28. Op. tom. ii. p. 630, allows its genuineness. Gothofred denies it.
* See Selden as quoted in the last note.—“Duo autem genera legum ad Justiniano de rebus ecclesiasticis latarum merito distingui video:orum in nullam palam ipsa furt secutum se canones cadem sancire; ut majorum vim habeant, quam summam potestas ad ultionem sibi creditam in legum contemptores revocat. . . . Sed in confesso est alterum esse genus legum ejus, quas ipsa suo jure a se ferri palam furt, quamvis de causis ex statu Ecclesiae natis: cujusmodi sunt quod Ecclesiarum oeconomic, canone Chaldedonensi constitutus, modum administrationis sum”; &c., “prescriptit: tum de emphyteusibus, impediendaque honorum Ecclesiae alienatione multa:
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dissolve the civil government; which the Church supposeth. The causes that were afterward heard by bishops, of the trouble whereof St. Augustin complains, and which St. Peter had cause to provide that Clemens should not be oppressed with, resorted to them either as arbitrators, by consent of parties, or as judges delegated by the secular power in causes limited by their acts.

§ 10. And now is the time to answer the objection against the being of the Church, and the protection, which is drawn from those bounds, which the power of excommunicating, challenged by the Church, hath been and is confined to by all Christian states: though, having made the question general, I find it requisite to extend also the answer to those other points, wherein I have said the right of the Church is seen, and upon which the society thereof is founded, no less than upon the power of excommunicating. And then the objection will be to this effect; that, seeing no Christian can deny, that the laws, the ordinations, the censures of the Church are lawfully prohibited to take effect by the secular powers of Christian states, therefore the right of doing those acts stands not by God's law, but by the suffrance and appointment of the same secular powers, choosing whom they please to execute their own rights by. And, besides this consequence, another will rise; that this is the sense of all Christendom (to wit, where Christians are governed by Christians), that there is no such thing as any power of the Church by God's law: because all Christendom agrees, sovereigns in doing, subjects in admitting, that it is limitable by the secular; which cannot limit God's law, but its own.

§ 11. This being the force of that objection, which is so [Answer.] largely pursued in the first Book De Synedriis, cap. x.c, my

  * See above, § 7. note k.
  * See Bingham, II. vii. 1—5.

* So in folio edition, and uncorrected in MS. It would seem as if the words

"and the protection" ought to be omitted.

* See Selden's argument to this effect above in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 16. note e.
  * Corrected from MS.: "argument" in folio edition.

* See references to Selden in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ii. § 11. notes n—q.
  * See ibid., c. xi. § 1—3, &c.
  * See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 16. note e: and also ibid. c. ii. § 11.
BOOK III.

answer is; that, —having shewed, how the decrees of the apostles themselves, as for the matter of them, are limitable and determinable by the Church to such circumstances, as may make them useful to the Church for another state than that for which they were first made,—I am to grant, that the laws also and other acts of the Church may be limited by the secular power, as for the execution and exercise of them. For as the society of the Church, and all the acts thereof, done in virtue of God’s charter by which it stands, supposeth Christianity: so Christianity supposeth commonwealths; that is to say, the government of this world in and by those sovereignties, which subsisted when Christianity came into the world, or may lawfully come to subsist afterwards. For not to dispute for the present, whether civil government subsist by the law of God or by human consent: seeing it cannot be said to subsist by the same act (that is, by the same declaration of God’s will), by which the Church, that is, Christianity, subsisteth; it is manifest, that the title by which the Church standeth must not be inconsistent with that title by which civil government deriveth itself from the will of God; and, therefore, that they may and must suppose one another. Whoever challenges to the Church a power in all civil causes and over all persons, to ordain and by force of their arms to execute, what the Church (that is, those that have right to conclude the Church) shall think the consideration of Christianity shall require: he, I grant,
erecteth a power destructive to the civil government; which, to stand tied to execute a decree, that may be contrary to the decree of those that govern, is necessarily inconsistent with. But that which I say, is this;—that the Church hath power to determine all matters, the determination whereof is requisite to maintain the communion of Christians in the service of God, and to oblige Christians to stand to that determination under pain of forfeiting that communion; but no power to give execution to them by force of arms, which the sovereign power of every state only moveth (supposing for the present, that no arms can be moved but originally from the sovereign, nor any thing executed by any force, which is not ultimately resolved into the power of the sword, which the sovereign beareth, as known to common sense). And by consequence I say, that the sovereign power, having right to make the acts of the Church laws of the state, by declaring to concur to the execution of them by the force which it moveth, must needs have right to judge, whether they be such as Christian powers ought or may concur to execute, and accordingly limit the exercise of them.

§ 12. But thereby I intend not to grant, that Christian powers may not exceed their bounds of right, in opposing and suppressing the effects of those acts, which may be duly done by the Church; nor to dispute this point upon supposition, that the particulars, related in that tenth chapter [of Book] 1 De Synedriis, ought to have the esteem of precedents, as things well done and within the limits of secular power in Church matters. For I have already granted, that the power of the Church (that is to say, of those who pretend it on behalf of the Church) hath so far transgressed the bounds, as to suffer the temporal power of the Church "in ordine ad spiritualia" to be disputed and held, being really destructive to all civil government; and to act too many things, not to be justified but upon supposition of
dere sicut antequam essent conjunctae," (scil. politica et ecclesiastica potestates), "dummodo non obint fini spirituali, aut non sint necessaria ad eum consequendum; si autem tale quid accidat, spiritualis potestas potest et debet coercere temporalem omni ratione ac via quae ad id necessaria esse videbitur." And in particular the pope may both depose princes and abrogate civil laws, "si id necessarium sit ad animarum salutem." Ibid. cc. 3—7: pp. 1035, B. sq.—And see below, § 38. note z.

* See above, § 11. note e.
† See note e; and above in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 18, 19.
it. And, therefore, I think I demand but reason, when I
take leave to suppose, that sovereign powers are subject to
err, as all men are, especially in so nice a point as is their
own interest in Church matters; and that those errors may
have proceeded to the hindrance of Christianity, even by such
acts as were intended to have the force of standing laws.

§ 13. But what hath been well or ill done in this kind,
is not my business here to dispute. That which I have to
do now, is, in general, to determine, in what consideration
the civil power (which the Church of England granteth to be
sovereign "in all causes and over all persons both ecclesiastic
and civil" in the dominions thereof) giveth the acts of
the Church the force of the laws of the state. Which I have
already expressed to be two-fold: as sovereign, to suppress
whatever may seem to import an attempt upon the right
of it; which, subsisting without the Church, is to be main-
tained against all encroachment of whomsoever may claim
in behalf of the Church; and as Christians, because, civil
power being presupposed to the being of the Church (which
standeth upon supposition of the truth of Christianity), the
sword of Christians stand[s] obliged to protect the Church
against all pretences. For seeing the society of the Church
is a part of Christianity, as hath been shewed; of necessity
it followeth, that Christian powers stand obliged by their
Christianity, both to protect those that are lawfully pos-
sessed of right in the behalf of the Church within their
dominions, in the exercise of it; and also to restrain them,
when their acts (whether expressly attempted, or maintained
by use of long time) prove prejudicial to that common Chris-
tianity, which the being of the Church presupposeth.

§ 14. But as this necessarily presupposeth, that those that
claim on behalf of the Church may proceed to actions so
prejudicial to the state, as may deserve to be punished or
restrained by civil and temporal penalties of all degrees; so
will it necessarily infer, that civil powers may proceed to
[such] excesses (not only in their particular actions, but also

---

b Corrected from MS.: "these" in folio edition.
1 XXXIX. Art., art. xxxvii.; and Can. 1603, can. 1, 2.
2 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr,. c.

xix. § 13: and see references there.
1 Ibid., ce. vi., &c.
2 Corrected from MS. "of" is folio edition.
3 Added from MS.
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in violating and oppressing the Church), that the Church may be obliged to proceed against them, by cutting them off from the communion of the Church; so that therein [their\(^*\)] subjects do stand obliged not to obey them in violating and oppressing the Church, and to abstain from communicating with them in the mysteries of Christianity, continuing nevertheless obliged to them in all the offices, which the maintenance of the state (which Christianity presupposeth) will require at the hands of good subjects.

§ 15. This being said, I will summon the common sense of Christendom to give sentence of the truth, or likeness to truth, of this argument:—All Christian princes and states do limit the use of ecclesiastical power within their own dominions; therefore they do not believe any such thing as a Church, or any power derived from any law of God by which it standeth. For it is manifest, that the powers, from whose acts this argument is drawn, are such as hold communion with the Church of Rome and acknowledge the pope in behalf of it\(^*\). As manifest it is, that the pope not only lengthen to be head of the Church in Church matters, but maintaineth friars and canonists to challenge for him sovereign power in civil causes over all persons in order to Christianity\(^*\). To say then, that by the acts, which they limit the use of ecclesiastical power by, they pretend, that there is no power in the Church but what they give it; is to say, that by those acts they contradict themselves, and proclaim their own professing themselves sons of the Church, not only to be without cause, but to signify nothing, as words without sense: which with what modesty it can be affirmed in the face of Christendom, I leave to Christendom to judge.

§ 16. Only I will here summon the Liberties of the Gallican Church, as they are digested by that worthy advocate of Paris, P. Pitheœus\(^*\), to give sentence in this case; being

\footnote{Added from MS. \(^*\) Sel. France, Venice, &c.: see below, § 16, 17, 45. \(^*\) See above, § 11. note e. \(^*\) Pitheœus 'Libertés de l’Eglise Gallicane was first published in 1594. Pierre and Jacques Du Puy republished it at the head of a collection of tracts to the same purpose, under the title of Traictés des Droits et Libertés, &c., in 1 vol. 4to. Paris, 1609, and again in 1 vol. folio in 1639, with a second folio volume of Pièces Justificatives et Preuves. This was re-arranged and published again in 1631, 1715, and 1731: and lastly by M. de Maitanee, in 5 vols. 4to. Lyons, 1771. —See Bramhall, Vindic. of Ch. of Engl., c. vii.; Pt. i. Disc. ii. Works, vol. i. pp. 225, sq.}
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a piece much appealed to by the father of this argument, as that which deserves to be accounted of prime consequence in the business. I desire those, that will take the pains to look into them, to tell me whether they find not these two to be the first two points of them:—that the king of France is sovereign in his own dominions; and that he is protector of the canons, liberties, and privileges of the Church. And then I desire them to employ the common understanding of men, to pronounce, whether these be not the same points of secular interest in Church-matters, which I have advanced: namely, as sovereign, to have no competitor in the right of the crown; and, as Christian, to be born protector of the catholic and apostolic faith, and of the Church and of the laws of it, which have no being but upon supposition of that faith, whereof one part is the belief of the Catholic Church. Only I shall take notice, that they protest, that they are called “liberties,” and not “privileges,” on purpose to signify, that they are no exceptions to the common right of all sovereignties in Church-matters, but essential points of it; which they call the liberties of the French Church in particular, because the kings of France they think have maintained them better than other princes of Christendom have done. In consequence of this collection of Pithou, besides the proofs of them in two great volumes, we have of late a commentary of Petrus Putcanus upon these Liberties, as they are digested by Pithou; the business

* Scil. Selden, who cites Pithou in his De Synedriis, lib. i. c. x. Works vol. i. p. 975.

* * "La première (liberté) est, Que les Papes ne peuvent rien commander ny ordonner, soit en general ou en particulier, de ce qui concerne les choses temporelles, ες pays et terres de l'obéissance et souveraineté du Roy tres-Chrestien: et s'ils y commandent ou statuent quelque chose des sujets du Roy, encore qu'ils fussent clerics, ne sont tenus leur obeir pour ce regard." Libert. de l'Egl. Gallic. p. 5. ed. 1639.

* * "La seconde, Qu'encores que le Pape soit recouze pour souverain es choses spirituelles: toutes fois en France le puissance absoluë et infinie n'a point de lieu, mais est retenuë et bornée par les canons et regles des anciens conciles de l'Eglise tenues en ce Royaume." Ibid.—"Au Roy... qui est le principal fondateur, protecteur, gardien, et defenseur des libertés d'icelle Eglise," &c. Remonstr. du Parlement, ibid. p. 26.

* * "Ce que nos peres ont appele libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane, et dont ils ont esté si fort jalous, ne sont point passe-droits, ou privileges exorbitans, mais plustoit franchises naturelles, et ingenuités, ou droits communa, "qui-bus" (comme parlent les prelates du grand Concile d'Afrique, ecrivans sur pareil sujet au Pape Celestin) "nuilla Patrum definitione derogatum est Ecclesie Gallicane:" esquels nos ances tres se sont tres-constamment maintenus, et desquels partant n'est besoin monstrez au lieu, que la retenuë et naturelle jouissance d'icieux." Ibid. p. 5.

* See ibid. pp. 6, and 21.

* See note r.

* See note r.
whereof is, first, to make good, that they are of unquestionable right in France, then that they have been and are practised also by other princes and states of Christendom: which is answer enough to this whole argument, as it stands upon the authority of Christendom, expressed by the acts of it.

§ 17. Nevertheless I shall further allege in this cause that collection, which friar Paul of the order *delli Servi* hath made, of the articles accorded between the pope and the state of Venice, concerning the inquisition, and the bounds of secular power in the cognizance of those causes, wherein that court may pretend concurrence of jurisdiction with it. I will not undertake to say, that the state of Venice, maintaining the inquisition upon such terms as this collection or capitular declareth, doth maintain those persons in the use of ecclesiastical power, to whom by the common right of the whole Church it belongeth. Neither will I maintain, that whatsoever those articles distinguish, and allow the inquisition, is by virtue of the common right of the whole Church. For who can tie him to express everywhere, what is by ecclesiastical right, and what of secular privilege, by free act of the state bestowed upon the Church; as all states, that would be held Christians, have always done? This I say; that he, that shall take the pains to look into it, shall find the bounds of secular and ecclesiastical power so expressly distinguished upon the reasons which I have alleged, that it shall be too late to say, that they, who acknowledge a Church, and certain rights by God's law belonging to the foundation of it, do contradict themselves, when they do limit the exercise of those rights: being ready further to maintain, that they do nothing but right, when they limit the exercise of them according to the reasons which I have advanced.

§ 18. As for the Leviathan, who hath made himself so
BOOK III.

merry with comparing a state Christian, in which the ecclesiastical power is distinct from the secular, with the government of Oberon and Queen Mab and their pugs in the land of fairies: if he speak of a state framed according to the opinion of those, that make the pope sovereign in all causes and over all persons in order to Christianity, I grant he hath reason; for there is not nor can be any such state, and it would be indeed a kingdom of confusion and darkness. Nay, where the Church itself is sovereign, as in the pope's dominions; the difference of the grounds, upon which several rights and powers are held and exercised, will be in some points, though not in all, no less visible than elsewhere. But if he intend by consequence to say the same of all Christian states, that acknowledge an ecclesiastical power derived from the law of God, and not from the secular: then I remit to those, that shall have perused the practice of Christendom but in those short pieces that I have named, whether they believe those states, which so govern themselves, to be the land of fairies; or his wits, that writ such things, to have been troubled with fairies.

§ 19. And now, in particular, to say, what the maintenance of the Church in giving laws to the Church requires (that is to say, in determining those matters, the determination whereof becomes necessary for the maintenance of unity in the communion of the Church); it is easy to deduce from the premisses, that every Christian is under two obligations:

Church now militant is the kingdom of God spoken of in the Old and New Testament (in marg. "Comparison of the Popacy with the Kingdom of Fairies"), "was received in the world; the ambition and canvassing for the offices that belong thereunto, and especially for the great office of being Christ's lieutenant, and the pomp of them that obtained therein the principal publique charges, became by degrees so evident, that they lost the inward reverence due to the pastoral function: in so much as the wisest men, of them that had any power in the civil state, needed nothing but the authority of their princes to deny them any further obedience. For from the time that the Bishop of Rome had gotten to be acknowledged for Bishop Universall by pretence of succession to St. Peter, their whole hierarchy, or kingdom of darkness, may be compared not unfitly to the kingdom of Fairies; that is, to the old wives' fables in England, concerning ghosts and spirits, and the feats they play in the night. And if a man consider the original of this great Ecclesiastical dominion, he will easily perceive, that the Papacy is no other than the ghost of the deceased Romane Empire," &c. &c. "The language also, . . . being Latin, . . . what is it but the ghost of the old Romane language," &c. &c. Hobbes, Leviathan, Pt. iv. c. 47. pp. 385, 386. fol. Lond. 1651: following out his absurd comparison into a degree of similarly silly particulars.

* Corrected from M.S.: "shew the difference" in folio edition.
one, to the Church, which as a Christian he is bound to communicate with; the other, as belonging to that state of government, which he believeth to be lawfully settled in his country. By the act of those, whom he believes to have right to oblige respectively these two societies (which, if we speak only of that part of the Church which is in one sovereignty, consist of the same persons, if they be all of the same Church), every Christian is respectively obliged. For by the premisses it remains manifest, that it is the act of the Church to determine the matter of ecclesiastical law, and give it force to oblige the respective part thereof under pain of forfeiting the communion of the Church: but the act of the state, either not to hinder this effect, when and where Christianity is only tolerated, as a corporation which it alloweth; or to make them laws of the state, when and where the whole state is of the same Church, as a corporation consisting of the same persons as the state.

§ 20. That this is from the beginning the sense of Christendom, easily appears, supposing that which I have shewed by the premisses:—that the canons of the Church were not first in force and limited to the terms which we have in writing, as the acts of general or particular councils, from the date of those councils, but by unwritten custom derived from the orders given out by the apostles and their successors unto the Churches of their founding, and by the intercourse of all Churches with the authority of the clergy and consent of the people in each, settled over the whole. This, for the time that the Church was a corporation, sometimes persecuted, sometimes tolerated by the empire: during which time it were ridiculous to question, whether councils were held or not; but nevertheless impossible to derive the customs of the Church from their acts.

1 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vii., xxi.; &c.
2 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii. § 10—16, c. xi. § 35, 36.—Five councils in the second century are given by Cave: and a much greater number in the third. Mosheim (De Rebus Christian., pp. 266, &c.) on the authority of a passage in Tertullian (De Jejun. c. xiii. Op. p. 552. A) refers the origin of councils to the Church in Greece during the latter part of the second century (see the note in Soames’ edition of Mosheim’s History, vol. i. p. 160. Lond. 1850), from whence he assumes the custom to have gradually extended itself, but without any apostolic authority for the practice, the Churches of different countries having been previously independent of one another. Albert Pighius, Hierarch. Eccles. lib. vi. c. 1. fol. 272. b. Colon. 1551, maintains also, “quod nullam supernaturalem specialemque a Christo
§ 21. After Constantine, the protection of Christianity was become so firm a law of the empire, that Julian, though absolute sovereign, and miserably desirous to root it out, could not have his will of it during his short reign\(^k\). And though general councils were called only by the emperors for the reasons aforesaid\(^i\), and particular councils might be called as oft as they pleased\(^j\); yet the canon of Nicæa, which provides for the holding of them twice a year\(^i\), shews the acts of them to be all the acts of the Church, though with allowance of that state.

§ 22. And what prejudice to any state in all this?—That God should have provided a corporation for the Church, to determine all matters determinable concerning that wherein the communion thereof consisteth: providing the state of a right\(^m\) and power, as sovereign, to suppress whatsoever prejudice the peace or weal of the state (no way prejudicial to Christianity, because there is nothing in Christianity pre-

---

\(^i\) See Field, Of the Church, Bk. v. c. 30. p. 513.

\(^k\) See Field, Of the Church, Bk. v. cc. 52, 53. pp. 667. sq.—The historical case may be found at length in Dr. Pusey's tract, entitled, The Royal Supremacy not an Arbitrary Authority, but limited by the laws of the Church, of which kings are members, P. t. Ancient Precedents, Oxf. 1850.

\(^j\) "Deo vero tuta in præsens igitur tam laudabilis, quam egrege iudex, indicet eum iustissimum et justissimum ait quod pater nos esse docebat. Praeceptor huius temporis, videlicet Antoninus, tamen cum eodem animo, quod iussisse est, sumptibus, eamque etiam veritatis inquit: "Conc. Nic. (A.D. 325) can. v.: ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 32. A, B. The "syntoma" in question are those which respect persons excommunicated whether clerical or lay.—The Apostolic Canons, can. xxvii., also enjoin, that "Deutero ton tous oinodos genos tou ton eisathke, kai enkatoisontos allelous tou logamata tis isakeias, kai tis isakeias ekklaseias tis isakeias, kai tis isakeias ekklaseias antidologias dialothenous etais mein ton tetragra thema tois pneumatikon, deuterou de oun eis eteron exo- bapheleiai oikouktagyn," Labb., Conv., tom. i. p. 34. A, B.

\(^m\) Corrected in MS. into, "Having provided that the state shall have a right."
judicial to any state); and, as Christian, to see the persons trusted on behalf of the Church observe the due bounds, as well of their authority, as of the matter of their acts, wherein it is limited either by the word of God or by greater authority within the Church.

§ 23. He that looks upon the French, the Spanish, the English, the German councils, will find sufficient marks, as well of the ratification of secular power, as of the determination of the Church. Thus far the business is clear. For if the rescripts of the popes in the west which are extant after Syricius, if the canonical epistles of some great bishops in the east, and afterwards the rescripts of the patriarchs of Constantinople, make up the canon law, by which they were respectively governed; the allowance of the state is evident enough, where the authority of the Church only acteth. But there are in the Roman laws abundance of acts, especially of the emperors after Justinian, which give a form and not only force to the ordering of Church matters; which is indeed to give law to the Church, obliging the Church to execute the same.

§ 24. And there is a most eminent instance in France, when Charles VII. took occasion, upon dissension between the pope and the council of Basil, by a convocation of his nobles and clergy to give a form to the exercise of ecclesiastical law within his dominions by an act called the Pragmatic Sanction, which took place in that kingdom till the X. Concordats between Francis the First and Leo X. pope.

1 See e.g. Spelman’s Englis’ Councils; and De Dominia, &c., and Dr. Pusey’s Tract, quoted above in note i.
2 The Decreta Pontificum Romanorum in the Biblioth. Jur. Can. Vet. of Voelius and Justellius, tom. i., begin with those of Syricius and end with those of Gregory II.
3 The Epistola Synodica of S. Cyril and the council of Alexandria against Nestorius precedes the Collectio Decret. Pontif. Roman., ibid. tom. i.
5 See § 8, note p., above.
6 That which is called serv. suppl. the Pragmatic Sanction, was passed by Charles VII. of France and a council of his bishops and nobles at Bourges, A.D. 1438, in conformity with the decrees of the council of Basle then sitting. It is in Labb., Conc., tom. xii. pp. 1429. F, sq.: and prohibits annates and papal provisioes, takes the patronage of bishoprics out of the hands of the pope, and affirms a council to be above the pope. See Roscoe’s Leo X., c. xiii. vol. iii. pp. 66, 67. 3rd. edit.: Du Boulay, Hist. Univ. Paris., tom. vi. pp. 81, sq.: Burnet, Hist. of Reform., vol. iii. Pt. i. Introd. pp. xii., xiii.; and bk. i. pp. 5—24: and above, Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 88.
7 Louis XI. at the request of pope Pius II. abrogated the Pragmatic Sanction in 1466: but the parliament of Paris refused to register the decree, and the design consequently fell at that time to the ground. But in 1516 Francis I. succeeded in carrying his
And that with such approbation, as seems to carry the face of a protestation of that whole Church and kingdom against the said concordats. Here is, indeed, wherewith to justify an extraordinary course of proceeding; when present disorder required an expedient. And the disorder in Church-matters, which some allege for the occasion whereupon Charles the Great caused the French Capitulars to be made, tends to the same purpose.

§ 25. Nor do I deny, [that] the acts of the eastern emperors or other sovereigns may be beneficial to the Church, by the inexecution of the proper laws of the Church, and the difficulty of providing new that may be available; but I provide withal, that they may be more prejudicial, in the example of superseding the authority of the Church, than beneficial, in the providing against present abuses. I have given you an instance in marriages upon divorce: and, for the consequence of it, I claim, that no such acts be taken for precedents, but stand liable to examination upon the principles premised; though possibly useful for the time, and obliging the Church to use them for the common good.

§ 26. Neither is it enough to prove that God hath not instituted both these interests in Church-matters, that both may err, and abuse their power, and oppose one another; that it may become questionable, what the one or the other of these powers may or ought to do, and which of them those that belong to both are to follow. For answer, I hold it enough for me, resting in the general afore established, to say: that there is appearance of reason, that secular powers,—knowing how much it concerns both the interest of their estates and the salvation of their own souls, that the Church under them be maintained in unity,—will not interrupt the Church in the use of that right, which, duly limited, can add

Concordat with pope Leo X.; which gave the nomination of bishops and abbots to the king, but subject to the pope's confirmation, and lodged in the king also the ultimate appeal in judicial causes affecting the Church. See it in Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. pp. 291. E., sq.; and Dumont, Corps Diplomatique, tom. iv. P. i. pp. 229, sq.; and the Protest of the Univ. of Paris against it in the Fascic. Rer. Expet. et Fugiend., tom. i. pp. 68, sq., and in the Appendix to Roscoe's Leo X., vol. ii. num. cxxxi.ii.

* Corrected from MS.: "the" in folio edition.

* See Mosheim, Bk. III. Cent. viii. P. ii. c. 2. § 13; and De Dominis as quoted above in note i. § cxxix. p. 622. D.

* Corrected from MS.: "but to provide" in folio edition.

* Above, c. xiii. § 20, sq.
nothing to their sovereignties, if they should seize it into their hands, nor take any thing from them, being maintained in their hands who by God’s law are to hold it. As for the Church, and those that claim under the Church; what appearance is there, that they should attempt upon their sovereign, but disorder in state upon difference of claim and title; which what law preventeth? For as for that one instance of the bishops of Rome, and the occasion of their exempting themselves from the allegiance of the empire, I am to speak [to it*] anon⁶. So that the quiet of Christendom as for this point will require no more, but that the common understanding of men be conducted to discover these bounds in all public actions; public persons believing, that it is for the public interesse, as indeed it is, to observe them in their proceedings. If that cannot be obtained, it is in vain to demand, why God hath given a law, which by the partialities of the world may become useless, and not serve to direct particular men’s proceedings with quiet; much more to argue, that there is no such law, because it doeth not. For we know, both that God gives no laws but to them to whom He gives free choice to observe them or not: and also, that He hath given the gospel and Christianity upon condition of bearing Christ’s cross; whereof the vexations, which the partialities framed upon occasion of this law do produce, is a part. § 27. Now the endowment of the Church being part of the subject of ecclesiastical law, it will be requisite here to say, how it is, and how it is not, exempt from secular right. Seeing then, that all Christian states and kingdoms, acknowledging the Church a corporation founded by God and to be maintained by the first fruits and oblations of Christians’ goods, have not thought it fit to leave this maintenance to the daily will of Christians, but to make good that, which they have vested in the Church, for a standing endowment by protection of law⁶; it is manifest, that they have left themselves no particular right in that, which either

---

* Added from MS.  
⁶ Below, § 63, 64. And see Bk. I. Of the Pr. of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 30. note t; and above, c. xx. § 37. notes c—h.  
⁶ Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 38, sq.: Epilogue, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xvi. § 27—47.
themseleves have consecrated, or allowed their subjects to
consecrate, to the use of the Church. But it doth not follow
from hence, that they have abandoned and disclaimed that
common right, which every commonwealth hath in all goods
of particular persons for the maintenance and defence of the
public in the necessities of it. Whereby it seemeth, that,
be the gift of ecclesiastical goods never so large or so abso-
lute for the form which private men's gifts go in, the sove-
reign, by making them good, doth not abandon the right of
public aid in them; and, therefore, that the common-wealth
may notwithstanding serve themselves of taxes imposed on
Church-goods. Likewise, seeing the use of Church-goods is
declared by all records of the Church, as well as by the
Scriptures, to tend to the maintainance of the poor, which
is included in the intent of maintaining God's service in the
Church; it follows, that, if Church-goods be used otherwise
by those, that are not proprietors but trustees for the poor,
itt is in the secular power to reduce and restore the use of
them according to the original intent of the Church.

§ 28. But to seize them into the hands of the secular
power (as if the corporation of the Church could be dissolved
by man's law, which is founded by God's), to be employed
to the advantage of the seizers of them, is an attempt of
sacrilege; upon God's goods first, and by consequence upon
God's law, by which the Church standeth. For the endow-
ment of the Church may be invaded by secular power upon
the title of public aid, but extended beyond any bound of
it that reason or common sense can allow; and this is
sacrilege, though consistent with an opinion that they are
the Church's. For it is no new thing for men to transgress
their profession by their actions. But it may also be invaded
out of an opinion, that they are only public goods, and not
God's; and that opinion supposeth, that there is no such
thing as a corporation of the Church founded by God, which
hitherto Christians by their creed do profess to believe.
And therefore this is a sacrilege of a higher nature, tend-
ring to root out all difference of good and bad according to

"See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. x. § 6: and Bingham, V. vi. 3.
""Being a just title but which title

may be extended." Added in margin in MS.
Christianity, that is, grounded upon the constitution of the Church.

§ 29. Seeing then, that all Christian kingdoms and states have thought themselves tied to enable the Church by their laws to transmit those estates to posterity, which either sovereigns or private Christians have upon supposition of God's law endowed it with;—for how should all Christians agree to do that, which no law of Christianity obliged them to do?—it will be of no force to argue from any limitations, which Christian states may have bounded the right of tithes with, that they did not believe the Church to be a corporation enabled by God to hold an estate bestowed upon it, but only to be made such a one by their privileges. For as it appears by the premisses, that those limitations may be according to God's law; so, whether they be so or not, it is to be judged by the grounds upon which I proceed here.

§ 30. And this is the case of the right of patronage, reserved over churches to those that first endowed them, by consent of the Church, in remembrance of their merits. For as it may be so limited, as to be no prejudice to the Church and to Christianity; so, that it is every where so limited, I do not find myself tied to maintain.

§ 31. Of the concurrent interests of Church and state in marriage, or matrimonial causes, I cannot say much here. Supposing the premisses upon which I maintain it, I can undertake thereupon to evidence the weakness of this presumption:—that those Christian powers, which take upon them to limit the exercise of ecclesiastical power in matrimonial causes, do not believe any ecclesiastical power in them as of Divine right; that is to say, any corporation of the Church endowed by God with power to allow or disallow the marriages of Christians. Suppose, then, that our Lord Christ hath introduced a new law among Christians, of the marriage of one with one, and that indissoluble, saving upon breach of wedlock. Suppose that, which I proved afore;—that the laws of Moses are not laws to the

1 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ii. § 11. note n: and Selden there quoted.  
2 See above c. xiii. § 19.  
3 See ibid. § 9, sq.  
4 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii.; &c.  
5 See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 18.
Church, but arguments evidencing the laws of the Church by the correspondence between it and the synagogue:—and therefore, granting that those degrees in which marriage was prohibited Jews by the Levitical law are not licensed for marriage among Christians, that it doth not follow, that no further degrees are prohibited in the Church. Suppose further from common sense and experience of the world, that upon any new law there will arise a multitude of new cases, to be decided either by particular jurisdiction or by a general law; and the power of deciding the same vested in that corporation, which first received the law. Suppose again, that marriage, though among Christians limited to a mutual interest in one another's bodies for the preventing of concupiscence, is notwithstanding a civil contract, supposing the same freedom from error or force in the persons that contract, that is requisite to the validity of all civil contracts: and, further, that it may concern the state to limit the qualities of persons that may contract it; so that, not being contracted within those bounds which the state shall limit, it shall either be unlawful or void. It will follow, then, upon these suppositions, that civil powers may create lawful impediments of marriage, as of civil contracts; but, nevertheless, that the use of marriage is not to be deemed lawful, until the allowance of the Church give them assurance, that the limitations given by our Lord and His apostles to the marriages of Christians, and the determinations which thereupon have proceeded from the lawful power of the Church, are not violated by the same.

§ 32. Neither is it available to say, as some have pretended to say1, that this right of the Church falls to the state when it professeth Christianity and the maintenance thereof, all parties being members or subjects of it; no more than that the society of the Church ceaseth, and is swallowed up in the commonwealth, when the sovereign be-

---

1 See above, c. xv. § 1, sq.
2 So Louis Du Moulin and Hobbes. See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ii. § 9, c. xi. § 35; note e. Hooker, VIII. vi. 13, lays down the principle, that "that which as kings they might do in matter of religion, and did in matter of false religion, ... the same they are now even in every respect as fully authorized to do in all affairs pertinent unto the state of true Christian religion." See below, § 50, sq.
comes Christian. Indeed among Gentiles, whose religion, being contrived by the devil and his ministers, was admitted by civil powers as an expedient to keep their people in obedience; among Jews, whose religion, given by God as a condition of maintaining them in the land of promise, pretended expressly no more than the civil good of one people: it is no marvel, that the determination of all things questionable concerning marriage should lastly resort to the civil powers; whose decision might secure the people of that good which the Law tendered, if they should practise the law of marriage according to their determinations. But Christianity being tendered to all nations for their everlasting happiness, and one society of the Church founded of all that should receive it of all nations; and the limitations peculiar to Christianity occasioning many things to become questionable, and many times necessary to be determined for Christians: the right of determining them can no more be thought an escheat to the civil power than the Church to the commonwealth.

§ 33. If then the laws of all Christian kingdoms and states have allowed the laws of the Church thus much force and interest in matters of marriage (how much more soever they may have allowed than here is demanded): it will be in vain to argue from any laws of Christian states, limiting the freedom of marriage or the exercise of ecclesiastical power in matrimonial causes, that they do not believe the Church to be by God’s law a society, the allowance whereof upon the premised considerations becomes requisite to the lawful use of marriage among Christians. For seeing both the Church and the state are subject to mistake the bounds of their concurrent interest in matrimonial causes; and, therefore, that there may be cause for the state, by the force, which it is endowed with, to bar the abuse of ecclesiastical power in the same, or that the state may do it without cause: it is ridiculous to infer, that they who limit the exercise of ecclesiastical power do not believe the Church, or any lawful power of it in such causes, independent upon their own.

§ 34. The same is to be said touching the ordaining of persons to exercise the power and right of the Church, and to minister the offices of Christianity to Christian people. No [Church
man will refuse civil powers the right of maintaining the public peace, and their estates, by making all such acts ineffectual through the force which they possess, as may be done to the disturbance of it. No man will refuse them, as Christian, the interest of protecting the Church against all such acts, as may prove prejudicial to the common faith, or do violate the common right of the Church according to which such ordinations are to proceed. But having proved, that those ordinations are made, and to be made, by virtue of that power which the apostles have left in the Church, and which our Lord gave the apostles: as it hath been cleared, what interest in this power their acts will allow to those several qualities, which they have settled in the Church; so it remains manifest, that those, who have the interest, cannot otherwise be hindered by secular force in the exercise of it, than by the violation of that law of God, whereby the society of the Church and those rights whereupon it is founded subsisteth. Not as if I did imagine, that this right hath been violated, so often as Christian princes or states have nominated persons to be ordained, which they for the public peace and good of the Church, and to hinder disorderly proceedings in the Church, have thought fit to name. For we have eminent examples, even in the happy times of the Church, of ordinations thus made to the incomparable benefit of the Church. And why should not the reasons premised be thought sufficient to justify such proceedings? But because it is alleged by some, even that mean no harm to the Church, that the right of all parties devolveth to the state by the profession of Christianity. Which plea if it were good, there would be no reason, why the Church and all the right of it should not be thought to accrue to the state by declaring itself Christian.

§ 35. Here I will remember one of the most eminent actions that ever was done in Europe against the right of the Church; which is the Concordats between Francis I. king of France and Leo X. pope. The Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII. had maintained the right of the Church.

[The Pragmatic Sanction, and the Concordats between Francis I. and Leo X.]

* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xv. § 30; and above, c. xvi. § 7—9.
* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 18; Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 87.
* See above, § 32. note m.
* See above, § 24. note t.
* See ibid., note a.
in that dominion against divers prerogatives pretended by popes; but it maintained the Church also in the election of prelates, which that prince had a desire to seize into his hands. Hereupon an agreement passes, the king to make good the prerogatives pretended by the pope, the pope to accept and to maintain the nominations of prelates which the king should make. Which concordats, with what difficulty, and after how many protestations and remonstrances of the clergy, of the university of Paris, and sovereign courts of the kingdom, they were accepted; I leave to them, that will take the pains to peruse the relation thereof historically deduced by Petrus Puteanus; to judge: not forgetting what Thuanus, one of the principal ministers of that kingdom, as prime president of the parliament at Paris, hath said to posterity in the first Book of his Histories;—that so great a prince, after having dissolved the course of ecclesiastical elections introduced into the Church by the apostles, never prospered in any of his greatest undertakings.

§ 36. And if, in the contention between the emperors and the popes about investitures, the case truly stated will evidence, that the common right of the Church was trodden under foot, as well as that of the sovereign: I report myself to the conscience of any man that can judge, whether it be reason to infer, that the proceeding of Christendom acknowledges no such thing as a Church; rather than to conclude, that the particulars, whether well or ill done (which is not my business here), are to be tried by the reasons premised.

§ 37. Now for the power of excommunication, whereupon the force of all acts of the Church depends; every man knows, that, since Constantine received Christianity, he, and after him all Christian princes and states, do necessarily pretend the advancement of it by temporal penalties and privileges of their indulgence. Among which one is that punishment, which in other states as well as in England a man incurs by being excommunicate. He, that would challenge the power of doing this for the Church from the original

---

* See above, § 16. note r.
* See Selden, De Synedr. &c., lib. i. c. 10: and above, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 10; &c.
* See below, § 61.

THORNDIKE.
right of it, must transgress the principles premised; whereby it may appear, that the Church is not able to do any thing of itself, that requireth secular force, or tendeth to alter any man's secular estate in the commonwealth.

§ 38. Neither is there any more evident character of that usurpation, which the popes in behalf of the Church have been chargeable with, than the enforcing of their acts with temporal penalties. But all such attempts naturally resolve into the highest; whereby some popes have pretended, that by the sentence of excommunication subjects are absolved of the allegiance they owe their princes, and stand free, and may stand obliged, to take up arms against them as they shall direct.

§ 39. Which is so far from standing with any pretence of mine, that I profess further to believe, that no sovereign is liable to the utmost excommunication, called the greater excommunication among divines and canonists: though limited and defined by them upon sundry and divers suppositions of their own, which I intend not hereby either to admit or to dispute; because it is enough for my turn, that we agree in this,—that the precept of avoiding the excommunicate is limitable upon such considerations, as the constitution and being of the Church presupposeth. As the apostle, when he orders the Corinthians "not so much as to eat with" one that professeth Christianity and yet lives in the sins he nameth (1 Cor. v. 11), meaneth the same that he expresseth and signifieth by "avoiding a heretic," Titus iii. 10; and St. John, by not "bidding him God speed;" and our Lord, by holding him "as a heathen man or a publican." But he, that shall consider the vast difference between the state of

---

¹ See Epilogue, ibid. c. xvii. § 13: and Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. iv. § 17: and Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 49.


³ See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 81.
Christianity under the apostles, and when the empire and now several sovereignties profess it (remembering, that Christianity dissolves not but maintains civil government and every man's estate in it), must see this to be one of those laws, which without limitation become useless to the maintenance of the Church; and, therefore, must necessarily be limited, that it may be serviceable.

§ 40. The ordinary limitation of it by that verse of the casuists is well enough known;—

"Utile, lex, humile, res ignorata, necesse." 

But he that will observe shall find, that all these exceptions to the general rule of avoiding the excommunicate are grounded upon that one title of the necessity of this world and the subsistence thereof, which the being of the Church presupposeth. A man converseth with the excommunicate for his profit, to recover a debt; this is the necessity of his estate, of which he owes God an account in behalf of his obligations. A man or wife converses with wife or husband excommunicate, for the bond of marriage; this is that necessity, which that law presupposed to the foundation of the Church createth. Superiors and inferiors converse with one another excommunicate; this is the necessity of their estate, which Christianity maintaineth. Other necessities are warrantable under the general title of necessity. The necessity of violence or fear, why should it not have a place here, as well as that of ignorance? only that both are general, justifying all, and not: only this kind of actions. The necessity of giving and getting good counsel, or alms, is all reducible to the same head. Wherefore all these considerations resolve themselves into that general ground, which I tender;—that Christianity supposes the lawful state of the world, according to the reason of civil government; and altereth no man's condition in it of itself, but maintaineth every man in that estate in which it findeth him (as St. Paul argueth at large 1 Cor. vii. 17—24), being such as Christianity alloweth. By reason whereof the avoiding of the excommunicate (easily to be visibly performed by Christians among themselves, when their conversation was among many times more men that

---

b Quoted in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 83. note r: where see its explanation.
BOOK III.

No sovereign subject to the greater excommunication.

were not Christians) becomes, without limitation, impossible to be observed of them, that live only with Christians.

§ 41. How feasible that obligation is, as the casuists now make it; I leave it to them to maintain: or how feasible it may be made. This I say, that all these reasons concur, to oblige all Christian subjects not to forbear the conversation of their sovereigns: the civil laws of every state, the advantage which the state of all subjects doth or may require from the sovereign, the inferiority wherein they are, and the necessity which all these reasons produce. For neither can Christianity pretend to dissolve the law of the land: nor can justice go forwards without conversation of the subject with the sovereign: and Christianity obligeth superiors and inferiors to maintain the relations in which it overaketh them: and, finally, the necessity of these reasons createth an exception even to the law of the Church-communion, though settled by our Lord and His apostles. And this [is] as much as to say, that the greater excommunication taketh no place against sovereigns.

§ 42. And this position is so far from being new in England, that in my nonage it was disputed at Cambridge upon an eminent occasion, at the reception of the archbishop of Spalato, by an express order of King James of excellent memory: as I conceive I am well informed; and thereby satisfied, that I maintain hereby no novelty in the Church of England.

§ 43. But those, that distinguish not this from the act of St. Ambrose in refusing the communion to the great Theodosius upon a horrible murder done by his express commandment, may do well to consider, either with what conscience they censure such a prelate in what they understand not, or why they condemn the whole Church whereof all Christians

---

[And this no novelty in the Church of England.]

But to the least.

---

* De Dominia came to England in December 1616, was installed dean of Windsor May 1618 (Le Neve); and (says Fuller, Ch. Hist., Bk. v. p. 94) "was feasted wheresoever he came; and the Universities, when he visited them, addressed themselves to him in their solemn reception as if he himself alone had been an University." But Fuller's account of him is a very bitter one.

* Bellarmine (De Rom. Pontif., lib. v. c. 8; Controv. tom. i. p. 1070. B) alleges the example of S. Ambrose, "qui ... primum excommunicavit (Theodosium), ... deinde praecipuit ut legem ferret," &c., as proving that he was "in foro externo legitimus iudex Theodosii," and that the Pope "habebat temporalem potestatem indirecte." See also Andrewes, Tortura Torti, p. 333, and Bellarmine as there quoted and answered.

** See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 82, notes n, o.
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are or ought to be members. For how can the Church refuse any Christian the communion, if it refuse not the same to all Christians, even the sovereign, in that case wherein the condition of all is one and the same? And hereby also we may see, what was the opinion of that learned prince, King James, concerning this action of St. Ambrose, whatsoever may have been said; who, had he made question of the less excommunication, consisting in excluding from the eucharist, would never have caused it to be disputed, that the greater hath no place against sovereigns.

§ 44. As concerning the jurisdiction of the Church in the causes of Christians, if the question be made, whether or not it now continue, that commonwealths profess Christianity; the argument seemeth peremptory,—that it doth not continue:—because then of necessity all civil powers should resolve into the power of the Church; because all jurisdiction, by consequence to this privilege, must needs resolve into the jurisdiction of the Church, all causes being the causes of Christians, and resorting therefore to the jurisdiction of the Church; and therefore no use of secular courts, but the power of the sword must become subordinate to execute the sentence of the Church. And, therefore, seeing that, on the other side, the reason why St. Paul forbids them to go to suit before secular courts is this,—because they were the courts of infidels, and that the scandals of Christians were by that means published before unbelievers (which it is evident was the reason, why this course was thought abominable even among the Jews);—it is manifest, that the jurisdiction of the Church in matters that arise not upon the constitution of the Church, though enforced by St. Paul and our

James himself, who was aiding the people of Rochelle against their lawful king (see Collier, Ch. Hist., Pt. ii. Bk. viii. vol. ii. pp. 724, 725). And the same question formed of course the main subject of discussion between King James and those who wrote for him, and Bellarmine and Cardinal Perron, on the oath of allegiance; in which the instance of S. Ambrose is alleged on both sides.

Corrected from MS. “the” in folio edition.

See the quotation from Selden above in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xix. § 25. note z.—One Knight in 1622 maintained certain propositions at Oxford, of which one was, that “wicked and unjust magistrates” might be “delivered to Satan” by “bishops and pastors with the consent of the Church,” out of Pareus’ Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans; and being censured for them, had the boldness to say, that one of his principal arguments in defence of them was King

Corrected from MS. “sovereign” in folio edition.

See above, § 4. note a.
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Lord, ceaseth, together with the title and cause of it, when secular powers profess Christianity.

§ 45. Which notwithstanding, it is a thing well known, that the line of Charles the Great in the west revived those privileges which Constantine had granted the Church; as his act also is repeated¹ in their Capitulars vi. 281, which Gratian also hath recorded xi. Quest. cap. Quicumque.¹ From which beginning many sorts of causes, especially such as charity seemed to have most interest in (which the clergy were thought fittest to manage), have continued to be sentenced by the ecclesiastical court in all Christian dominions; notwithstanding that they rise not upon the constitution of the Church, nor do originally belong to it to sentence. And all this, not distinguishing these several titles, hath been usually understood by the name of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or the jurisdiction of the Church. Neither is there any doubt to be made, that not only France, in their appeals from the abuse of ecclesiastical jurisdiction² (which are there warranted of course), but also all Christian states (as England in their premonaries and injunctions³), have always provided to redress the wrong that might be done by the abuse thereof.¹ Nor do I doubt, that Spain itself hath made use of such courses⁴; as may appear, not only by great volumes

¹ Misprinted "repealed" in folio edition.
³ Decret. P. ii. Causa xii. Quest. i. cc. 35—37: quoting both the Theodosian Code and the Capitulars.
⁴ See above, § 16; and the Libertes &c., there quoted, tom. ii. pp. 745 sq. ed. Maillane, for the appels comme d'abus.
³ See Bramhall, Just Vindic. of Ch. of Engl., c. iv.; Works, Pt. i. Disc. ii. vol. i. pp. 141, sq.; and Schim Guarded, sect. i. cc. 6, sq. ibid., Disc. iv. vol. ii. pp. 403, sq.
⁵ Id., ibid.
⁶ Id., Just Vindic. &c., ibid. c. vii. pp. 228, sq.
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upon that subject by Salgado de Somoza* and Jeronymo de Cevallos†, whom I have not seen, but more lively by the letters of Cardinal De Ossat‡, where there is so much mention of the differences between the see of Rome and the ministers of that crown in Italy about the jurisdiction of the Church.

§ 46. But will all this serve for an argument, that there is no such thing as a Church, no such jurisdiction as that of the Church, in the opinion of Christendom, but that which stands by the act of Christian powers; because they all pretend to limit the abuse of it? Whenas the very name of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the title of those books, and those actions, is sufficient demonstration, that they acknowledge and suppose a right to jurisdiction in the Church; which they pretend so to limit, as neither the Church nor the rest of their subjects to have cause to complain of wrong by the abuse of it: whether they attain their pretence or no, remaining to be disputed, upon the principles hitherto advanced, by any man that shall have cause to enter into any treaty of the particulars.

§ 47. Neither is the publishing of Erastus his book against excommunication at London to be drawn into the like con-

---

* Tractatus de Supplicatione ad Sanctissimum a litteris et bullia apostol. nequam et importune impetratis in perniciecius, Regni, aut Regis, aut juris tertii prejudiciun; folio Madrid 1639; by Franciscus Salgado de Somoza, juris utriusque professor.—Quoted by Seihen, De Synedr. Vet. Ebraeor., lib. i. c. 10; Op. tom. i. pp. 975, 976.

† Tractatus de Cognitione per viam violentae in causa Ecclesiasticis, et inter personas Ecclesiasticas; folio Toledo 1618; by Hieronymus de Cevallos (or Cevallos or Zevallos or Zeballos). In the first part of the book he maintains the theory—"Regis Hispaniarum nostri circa res temporales potestas manifestatur, cui accedit imperatorem in suo regno esse, nullique unquam subjectum in temporalibus:" —in the second he lays down the practice,—scil. "ad judices a Rege nostro constituatos recursus," &c.—Quoted by Seihen as in last note.

‡ Lettres de l' Illustrissime et Reverendissime Cardinal d'Ossat, Evesque de Bayeux, au Roy Henry le Grand, et a Monsieur de Villerooy, depuis l'annee MDXXIV. jusqu'a l'annee MDCCIII. last edition, folio Paris 1624.—See e.g. Lettre cccxxiv. p. 682; "Les Françoys ne tendans point a opprimer la liberté ecclesiastique, ny a asservir le saint Siege (comme font les Espagnols)."—And Avis donné au Pape &c. ibid. p. 748: "Je pourrois vous ramener le secours prestes, les estats donnez, et les renoncations faites au saint Siege par les anciens Roys de France, à commencer du Roy Pepin; et pourrois leur opposer les torts que les Espagnols ont faits et tiennent encore aujourd'hui au Saint Siege et à l'Eglise, tant au spirituel qu'au temporel."—And the complaints of the Spanish clergy to the pope respecting the ship-money levied from them by the king of Spain, Lettres lxxvi., ccxxiv., ccxvii., pp. 166, 574, 600.—Cardinal D'Ossat was ambassador at the court of Rome from Henry IV. of France.

† See the account of Selden quoted above in Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. § 28. note m: alleging the book to have been printed in London.
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sequence, that those who allowed or procured it allowed the substance of that he maintaineth; so long as a sufficient reason is to be rendered for it otherwise. For at such time as the presbyterian pretences were so hot under Queen Elizabeth; it is no marvel, if it was thought [fit] to shew England, how they prevailed at home: first, because he hath advanced such arguments, as are really effectual against them; which are not yet nor ever will be answered by them, though void of the positive truth, which ought to take place instead of their mistakes: and, besides, because, at such time as popes did what them listed in England, it would have been to the purpose to shew the English, how Macchiavell observes that they were hampered at home; and for the like reason, when the Geneva platform was cried up with such zeal here, it was not amiss to shew the world how it was esteemed under their own noses in the cantons and the Palatinate?

§ 48. And here I cannot forbear to take notice of the publishing of Grotius his book De Jure Summarum Potestatum in Sacris after his death; because that also is drawn into consequence*. For it is well enough known, that, at his being in England before the synod at Dort, he left it with two great learned prelates of the Church of England, Lancelot lord bishop of Winchester, and John lord bishop of Norwich, to peruse; and that, both of them agreeing in an 355 advice that it should not be published, he constantly observed the same till he was dead: so that, though the writing of

by the Queen's printer in 1539 by authority of Abp. Whitgift.

* See above, Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 38: and Epilogue, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 2, c. xviii. § 31; &c. And see Selden, De Synedr. &c., lib. i. c. 10; Works, vol. i. pp. 1019, 1020.

* Added from MS.

Heidelberg, Zurich, Berne, are the localities with which Erasmus was con


stituta, adæque excommunicationis forensis ac poniinentiae publicæ spectaculorum usum, neque antiquitatis foise

juri Divino attributum,” &c., “nec imperium aut jurisdictionem magis ad ecc

clesiasticos qua tales attinuisse, quam ad medicos, architectos, id genus alios.”

b “Ce livre a été composé plus de trente ans avant que d'être imprimé. M. Grotius étant en Angleterre l'an 1613, le communiqua à un des plus scévans évêques du pays, nommé Lan

celot Andrews, qui l'ayant retenu longtemps, le lui renvoya ensuite; lui conseillant, aussi bien que Jean Overall Évêque de Norwich, de le corriger en quelques endroits, qui apparaen-
it was his act, yet the publishing was not; but the act of those, that would have it appear, that his younger works do not perfectly agree with the sense of his riper years. He, that in the preface to his Annotations on the Gospels shall read him disclaiming whatsoever the consent of the Church shall be found to refuse, will never believe, that he admitted no corporation of the Church, without which no consent thereof could have been observed; and, therefore, may well allow him to change his opinion without giving the world express account of it.

§ 49. I will add hereupon one consideration out of [a] letter of [the] late learned Hales of Eton college, from the synod at Dort, to the English ambassador at the Hague. For Grotius was then, every man knows, one that adhered to the Holland Remonstrants. He speaketh of denying them the copy of a decree of the States, read them in the synod December 11. "This at the first seemed to me some-

ment touchent l'Eglise Anglicane. Depuis M. Grotius le garda toujours sans le publier. Après sa mort, Adrien Viallo, imprimeur de la Haye, en ayant recouvé une copie, apotostillée de la main de M. Blondel, il la fit imprimer à Paris. Ce que semble n'avoir pas su M. Scrivener, &c. "Le savant Gerard Vossius souhaitant dès l'an 1625 de voir ce livre imprimé, voici ce que M. Grotius lui répondit à Paris, où il eût alors, dans une lettre dont je garde l'original : "Non est e re mea ut in Galliis edatur nostra scriptio pro Summarum postatum Jure circa Sacra; quam qui dam amici edit hic velitent, deletis omnibus locis qui e scriptia Protestantium citantur; quod mihi non placet. Ce même traité a été depuis réimprimé a la Haye," &c. Colomieu, Biblioth. Choisie, pp. 32, 33. 8vo. Paris, 1731 (first publ. in 1682). Colomieu's position and friends, both in Paris and England, render his evidence on the subject of weight. — See also Selden as quoted in the last note.

The edition of 1647 appears with no other explanation than a brief note from the printer. In that of 1648, there is prefixed a statement, that the book was written before the civil wars in Belgium, and suppressed by the author; "quippe scriptus in favorem eorum partium quas ipse autor sequebatur in republica ac Ecclesia, &que

iiis inserviebat, qui ex adverso stantes prater expectationem ejus pravalue
erant; quibus cum esset insensissimus, noluit eorum causam proprio sui ius
testimonio atque hujus scripti publicatione adjuvare."

"Testor autem, si quid usquam a me scriptum est pugnans cum iis Sacrae Scripturae sensibus, quas Ecclesiæ Christianæ a prima aetate acceptos perseverante consensu tenuère, quod repertum non iuri satis confide, me id pro non scripto habere ac mutare paratis
simus." Grotius, Annot. in Evan., monitum prefixed to the work; Op. tom. ii. vol. i.

* Corrected from MS.: "the" in folio edition.

† Added from MS.

* The letters of John Hales from the synod of Dort to the Rt. Honourable Sir Dudley Carleton, then English ambassadress at the Hague, were first published after the writer's death in his Golden Remains, Lond. 1659: reprinted with additions in 1673 and 1658. Thorne may have seen them in MS. The sentence in the text was, it seems, too plain-spoken to be printed. At least it is not to be found in the two later editions, the only ones accessible to the present editor.

what hard; but when I considered, that those were the men, which heretofore in prejudice of the Church so extremely flattered the civil magistrate, I could not but think this usage a fit reward for such a service; and that, by a just judgment of God, themselves had the first experience of those inconveniences, which naturally arise out of their doctrine in this behalf."

§ 50. It remains only, as concerning this point, that I give account of the article of the Church of England: which acknowledgeth the king "supreme governor in all causes and over all persons as well ecclesiastical as civil," to this effect, as having all that right in matters of religion, which the pious kings of God's ancient people, and Christian emperors and princes, have always exercised in the Church. And the account that I am to give, is, what the meaning of this collective—"which hath been exercised by the kings of Judah and Christian princes"—must be.

§ 51. For I have shewed, that it is not to be granted, that Christian princes may do that in Christianity, which the kings of Israel did under the Law; because the Law was given to one people for a condition of the land of promise, the gospel to all nations for the condition of everlasting happiness. It is therefore consequently to be said: that, in as much as the reason and ground, upon which the right [is based] which those kings are found to exercise under the Law, holds the same under the gospel, so far that power, which the Church of England ascribes to the king in Church-matters, is the same which those kings are found to exercise in the Scriptures; but wherein the reason holds not the same, in so much it is necessary to distinguish, and acknowledge a difference. It seems to me, that, when the Law refers the determination of all things questionable concerning the Law in the last resort "to the priests and Levites and to the judge that shall be in those days" at Jerusalem or "the place which God should choose" (Deut. xvii. 8—12), the reason why it speaks indefinitely of priest and judge, is, because it intended to include the sovereign: whether high

---

1 XXIX. Articles, art. 37: and xix. § 6—8, 24. Canons of 1603, can. 2.  
1 See Grot., ad Deut. xvii. 9.  
2 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c.
priest (who from after the captivity until the coming of Herod was chief of the people), or chief judge; whether those that are so called (who, as I said afore, were manifestly sovereigns), or after them the kings: so that by this law nothing could be determined without the king, either by himself or by subordinate judges. And the reason is evident. For, the penalty of transgressing this law being death, otherwise we must allow inferior judges the power of the sword without the authority of the sovereign. And therefore we see, that afterwards the good king Jehosaphat manifestly gives commission to these judges at Jerusalem as well as to their inferiors, when he restores them to the exercise of their office according to law; upon what occasion soever it may seem to have been interrupted (2 Chron. xvii. 7—9, xix. 4—9). And hereupon the psalm saith, cxxii. 5; “There is the seat of judgment, even the seat of the house of David.”

§ 52. But the Leviathan hereupon argues: that, as Solomon consecrated the temple by his own prayers, so Christian princes may in their own person consecrate churches; and not only that, but ordain, and celebrate the eucharist, and preach, and do all things themselves, which their subjects may do, who are but their ministers. The answer to which is: first, that herein he contradicts his own position, that by the Scriptures (that is, by God’s law) the right of designing persons to be ordained, and of doing other things of like nature, belongs to the people of every Church; but the office of solemnizing the ordination by imposition of hands, and in like manner of executing other acts of like nature, to the ministers of those Churches, succeeding the apostles:—secondly, that he is not able to shew a reason, why the great Turk should not by consequence be able to consecrate [the] eucharist, preach, and do any office, wherein Christianity obligeth his Christian subjects to communicate; and they accordingly stand bound to receive them at his hands: for he challenges not this right for the sovereign as Christian, but as sovereign; and therefore a Christian sovereign can no more do that, which every Christian his subject cannot do of this nature, than a sovereign that is not a Christian.

—Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiv. § 10.
—See ibid., § 9—13.
—See ibid., c. xi. § 11, note x.
—Ibid., c. xix. § 4.
lastly, that the consequence is not true nor can be proved for the reason aforesaid; which if it were not, all that he inferreth, though never so gross, would follow.

§ 53. Indeed there were, as I observed, three estates established by the Law in that people; the priests, the judges, and the prophets: and, because established by the Law, therefore successive; the priests by birth, yet a corporation by law, as by law endowed with the rights of their tribe. Therefore, when it comes to settle their courses and ministries in the temple, I have observed in my book of the Right of the Church, p. 230, that this is not done by David alone, but with the assistance of the principal of that tribe.

§ 54. For the judges: there is no reason, why we should not believe the tradition of the Jews, that they were all qualified to sit in any of their courts by imposition of the hands of some, that had received the same from Moses and his judges; though this quality made them only capable of being judges, to which they were still actually to be chosen by the king or by the court: so that, when the Talmudists relate that king David ordained thirty thousand on one day, they understand, that he did not this as king but as qualified to ordain, though as king he might actually make judges; but being zealous of the Law, as they describe him spending his time about the niceties of it, and having his guard of Cherethites and Pelethites (whom they understand to be doctors all, or scholars of the Law), they consequently make us believe, that he meant to store the nation with persons qualified to be judges.

§ 55. As for the succession of the prophets, that depended merely upon God's free grace; though a course of learning and discipline was without question founded by Moses and maintained by his successors, to make them fit by such education for the grace. And these, being the schools of the prophets in the Scriptures, when the spirit of prophecy failed, became the schools of scribes and doctors and learners of the Law, out of whom judges came.

---
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[Of the succession of the priests under the Law.]

[1 Chron. xv. 11, 12, 16, 17.]

[And of the judges.]

[2 Sam. viii. 18; 1 Kings i. 38, 44: but compare 1 Sam. xxx. 14; Ezek. xxv. 16; Zeph. ii. 8.]

[And of the prophets.]

[1 Kings xx. 35; 2 Kings ii. 5, 7, 15, iv. 1, 38; ix. 1; Amos vii. 14; &c.]
§ 56. As prophets then had their authority immediately from God, so were they the forerunners of our Saviour Christ and His apostles: as our Saviour sheweth, when He saith, Matt. xxiii. 34; "Behold I send unto you prophets and scribes and wise men, and of them ye shall kill and crucify, and of them you shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city." For, God having appointed them by the law of Deut. xviii. 18—22, to have recourse also to the prophets which He should raise, until the Messias should come, in Whom St. Stephen challengeth that law to be fulfilled Acts vii. 37; if prophets, preaching by God's commission, displeased evil rulers, they easily found pretences to quarrel the evidence of their commission, and to put them to death as false prophets: which was that, which they did to our Saviour Christ and His apostles, and those who preached Christ afterwards. These then, having commission from God alone, had in them, as I shewed afore, the qualities both of priests, in offering to God that service "in spirit and truth" which Christianity pretendeth, and of judges, in determining that which should become questionab[e] in the Church.

§ 57. And as the kings of Israel were bound by God's laws to maintain all those qualities in the execution of their office; so, the Church being founded and having subsisted three hundred years by this power of the apostles, Constantin[e] and all Christian princes after him, finding it in that estate, become obliged by God's law to maintain the Church, whereof they became members by professing Christianity, in that estate and quality wherein they become members of it. And upon these terms have the kings of England, and all other Christian princes, the same rights in Church-matters, which the godly kings of Israel and Christian emperors are found to have exercised.

§ 58. Whereof it shall be enough here to give the most eminent instance, that can be alleged; in the heresy of Arius, and all the factions that were canvassed in the Church to restore it, being once suppressed by the synod of Nicæa. Which one act of the Church, though the whole power of

* Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. c. iv. § 16, 17: and Review of it, c. iv. xv. § 13, sq.: Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., § 10.
the empire, in two emperors Constantius and Valens (though perhaps with far different intents), laboured to make void; yet they never took upon them to do it immediately of themselves, but by means of synods which they might work to their intent, or by the means of persons apposted by them to have the power of the chief Churches. And, therefore, whereas that synod, as it was an act of the empire, was easily recalled by the breath of either of those emperors; as it was an act of the Church, it prevailed over all their intentions: and by the prevailing of it we continue untainted with the heresy of Arius. The reason; because the right of the Church was so notorious to all Christians, that those emperors that did not profess Christianity, when they did not persecute it, made good the acts of it.

§ 59. As it is to be seen in that eminent example of Aurelian; which I will repeat again, because it is still alleged to argue, that Paulus Samosatenus was excommunicated by the secular power of Aurelian. But when it shall appear by Eusebius, that, the council of Antioch having created a new bishop and adjudged the possession of the bishop's palace to him, which Paulus Samosatenus defended by force, the emperor, being appealed to by the parties for execution, adjudged the possession to him whom the bishops of Rome and Italy should account lawful bishop: I suppose I shall not need many words to shew any reasonable man the very terms, which I hold, in this sentence; to wit, that the matter of it was determined by the Church, the force and execution of it came from the power of the empire.

§ 60. I had purposed here to examine some of those instances produced in the first book De Synedriis, cap. x. § 1, [and] some passages of Church-writers alleged in the Oxford doctor's Parænesis, to prove the ecclesiastical power merely the effect of the secular because limitable by it. But having debated thus far the bounds between God's law and the laws of the Church, and found the law of the Church to be no-

---

[Notes and references are included at the end of the text.]
thing but the limitation of God's law, the force whereof comes from God's general law in founding the Church; I find not the least cause to distrust him, that admitteth it, as one to be turned aside with pretences of so vast consequence upon such slight appearances. I shall therefore thus turn him loose to apply the general ground, upon which I proceed, to the particulars that may be alleged out of the ancient Church.

§ 61. Only one I must not leave behind me, the contest between the emperors and the popes about the investitures of churches; as carrying in it the means of changing the regular power of the pope, which I own, into the pretence of that infinite power which infallibility speaketh. Yet is it not my purpose to state the case in debate; because it would require the examining of many records in point of fact, not advancing the discovery of the right a whit more than supposing it stated. For supposing the investiture of a church to signify a right of contradicting an election, or to signify a right of delivering possession; no man, admitting the premisses, can deny, that all princes and states that are Christian have in them a right to do both, though the term of investiture seem properly to signify only the latter, as signifying the ceremony of investing some man in the rights of his church. For if the Church be protected in the rights of it by the laws of the land (as upon the premisses it cannot be denied, that upon the state's acknowledging the Church as founded by God it ought to be and must needs be protected); all the reason in the world will require, that the secular power be enabled to except against any man's person as prejudicial to the state, and to render no account of such exception to any man, as having no superior in that trust, to whom to render it. But if, under the title of investiture, the right of electing and consecrating, originally resident in the clergy and people of each Church and the bishops of the province, be seized into the hands of the secular power, by the force thereof constraining each party to do their own parts in admitting the nomination thereof, whether allowing it or not: whatsoever trouble any sovereign [might'] procure in such a cause, is mere wrong, and in a wrong cause;

* Added from MS.
the foundation of the Church settling the rights, that concur to the doing of it, upon the qualities which itself createth.

§ 62. But this is not therefore to say, that the pope, or all the Church, hath any right to depose such a prince or to move war against such a state, by what means soever it may be done; because that is the effect of temporal power that is sovereign, which the Church hath not in point of right, but usurpeth in point of fact by so doing. He, that can enjoin another man either to eject a prince or destroy a state, upon what terms soever he may dispose of it, when that is done; as he shall make the tenures of this world to depend upon Christianity, so he makes himself sovereign in the world, that owns him in the doing it, upon the same title of Christianity. So the popes had certainly a wrong cause in stirring war, which they had no title to do. The emperors, whether they had a right or a wrong cause (which God would punish by suffering the popes to move war without a title), the state of the case must judge; though for the most part in wars both parties are in the wrong, insisting upon that which they have no right to insist upon for the terms of peace.

§ 63. Let us consider, what brought the popes to this height of really and actually claiming temporal power over sovereignties (that is, to be sovereign over sovereigns), by moving war to destroy princes and states. I will suppose here the defection of the Italian forces from the emperor Leo Isaurus for ejecting all images out of churches; and that he, in reprisal for it, seized the possessions of the Church of Rome in his dominions, and translated the jurisdiction ecclesiastical through the same upon his Church of Constantinople. For, in reprisal for this, Pepin, whose usurpation of the crown of France pope Zachary had allowed, at the request of pope Stephen, constraining the Lombards to render or to forbear those parts of the empire which the emperors at Constantinople were not able to maintain any more against them, bestowed them upon the Church of Rome under his own protection; as the case sufficiently
shews: especially, admitting the charter of Ludovicus Pius his grandchild to be but the confirmation of his father's and grandfather's acts, saving the difference of that title under which they were done. For the charter of Ludovicus Pius (in Sigonius, De Regno Italicæ iv. m), manifestly reserving the sovereignty to himself and his successors, remits both the fruits and the administration of them to the Church, charging himself to protect it in the same. Which burden we must needs understand, that Pepin by his grant did undertake; seeing that in point of fact the Church could neither undertake to hold them against the Lombards nor against the empire (which till this act it acknowledged sovereign), whatsoever in point of right it might do. The act of Charles the Great, coming between these two, upon the ruin of the Lombards, that is, his own sovereignty, in reason must needs seem to have given the form to the act of his son. The power of this line decaying in Italy, and those who had attempted to succeed it failing, it is no marvel, if among the states of Italy, that contracted with the Germans to invest them in the same sovereignty which [was held by] Charles the Great and his line as kings of Lombardy by conquest (or as declared emperors by the city of Rome, the head whereof was then the pope, whatsoever that declaration might signify), the pope in behalf of the city and Church of Rome appeared most considerable. While the Germans, through their strength at home, were able to make good that protection which they undertook, by the loyalty of them that enjoyed it; things must by consequence continue in this estate. But when the removing of the German power from the line of Charles the


2 As in last note. And see the Libertæ de l'Eglise Gallicæ, tom. ii. Preuves, pp. 5—10.

3 See the Libertæ &c., ibid. p. 8.

4 Corrected from M.S.: "emperor" in folio edition.

THORNDIKE.
Great had done the operation of rendering them, who succeeded, obnoxious at home to them, by whose faction they obtained it; there was no great likelihood, that the obedience of strangers and Italians, accustomed to changing of masters, should continue. This was the time, that Gregory VII. pope and his successors took, when the power of the emperors in disposing the churches of Germany by the right of investiture (whatsoever in point of right it signified) must needs render their interest envious as well at home as at Rome; whatsoever occasions of discontent besides an elective crown might produce. For Charles the Great, as our William of Malmesbury notes, had heaped wealth and power upon the Churches, by which he planted Christianity in Germany; as placing a greater confidence of loyalty in them, than in any estate of his subjects besides. And the example of that credit, which the usurpation of Pepin had received by the allowance of the pope, seemed to justify any insurrection either of Italians or Germans, to which the pope was a party. For as to the issue of those wars: though the pope got no more than reducing the adverse party to composition, because he could not pretend any dominion for his Church by conquering; yet must it needs turn to the advantage of his authority, that had the greatest stroke in moving that war which others made.

§ 64. This is the story; the moral whereof became the theme for those, that undertook to preach the pope's temporal power over sovereignties. For success, to them that consult not with their Christianity, is a plausible argument of right. But, the interest of the pope in sovereignties having swelled so far beyond the whole capacity of the Church, the bad consequence of necessity follows;—that his original power in the Church must needs swell so far beyond the bounds, as, of regular, to become infinite. I will not now contend, that the subjects of the empire in Italy fell

---

*This clause is corrected in MS. into—‘When the power of Germany fell to strangers not of his line, who must get it by faction from his line.’

OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

away from it, because they thought themselves free of their allegiance by the excommunicating of the emperor Leo Isaurus*. There is reason enough to think, that the see of Rome cried up the worship of images, contrary to the moderate-ration of St. Gregory* some hundred years afore, out of hope to advance their own power by impairing the rights of their sovereign†. But I charge no more than they pretend. And there is appearance for another plea; which is, want of protection from the empire at such time as recourse was had to the protection of the French. But the vexation of the German emperors manifestly pretended the temporal effect of the pope's excommunication in dissolving the bond of allegiance, wherein the temporal power of the pope consisteth. The effect of which being such as it was, it is the less marvel, that the rest of the sovereignties of Christendom have entered into capitulations with the pope (such as the concordats which I spoke of afore with France*) whereby, to secure the government of their people in peace on that side, they make the pope's pretence of power without bounds in ecclesiastical matters [a*] law to their respective dominions and territories.

§ 65. It is strange to him, that considers without pre-judice, how they, who imagine the pope to be antichrist, could make their pretence popular that episcopacy is the support of antichrist*. For his unlimited power in Church-matters is but the regular power of all Churches united in one. It is plainly made up for the see of Rome of feathers plucked from every Church. So that, if episcopacy be the support of antichrist, then do their rights maintain his usurpation, by whom they are destroyed. Did the sovereignties of Christendom maintain the Churches of their respective dominions in that right, which the regular constitution of the Church settleth upon them (and that is it, which the protection of the Church signifieth); it would soon appear,

* See above, c. xx. § 32.
* See above, c. xxxi. § 52. notes b. c.
† See ibid., § 56.
* See above, § 35.
* Corrected from MS.: "of" in folio edition.

Chap. XXXIII. The infinite power of the pope not founded upon episcopacy.
BOOK III.

that he is antichrist, if antichrist he be, to their prejudice and disadvantage.

§ 66. The see of Rome, having got a decree at the council of Trent, scorps any terms but absolute submission to it. But the end of such an intestine war by conquest, as it would be extremely mischievous, bearing all down before the pretence of infallibility which must then prevail, so find hindrances, answerable to the advantages, which the disunion of the adverse party ministereth. The animosities of potentates that adhere to it have made it visible, that their interest consists in hindering the reunion of the Reformation to the Church of Rome. And the pretence of dissolving allegiance by the sentence of excommunication is become a way considerable by the subsistence of them who regard it not. Nor is the advantage, which the favour thereof lends the arms of those princes who tie themselves the most strictly to the interests of it, any more considerable. Whether or no it be time for them to bethink themselves, that it were better for them to enjoy the unquestionable title of a true Church, and of the chief Church of Christendom, which it is absolutely necessary for all Churches to hold communion with, the common Christianity being secured; than, catching at the disposing of all men's Christianity without rendering any account to the Church,—(which how dangerous for their own salvation is it?)—to hang the unity of the Church merely upon the interest of the world,—(which how prejudicial is it to the salvation of God's people?)—not upon the interest of Christianity: themselves must judge.

§ 67. This I am sure; if Christian powers maintain their due right and title of protectors of God's Church, it is the regular constitution thereof which they must maintain. The exemption of monastical orders and universities from the jurisdiction of their ordinaries, under whom they stand, and the synods to which they resort; the reservation of cases, dispensations in canons, provisions of churches; and the rest of those channels, by which power as well as wealth is drained from all Churches to Rome?: must needs be stopped up, at least for the greatest part, if Christian sovereigns did pro-

7 See Bramhall, Schism Guarded, sect. i. cc. 4—8; Works, Pt. i. Disc. iv. vol. ii. pp. 396, sq.
tect the Church of their dominions in the right of ending causes, that concern not the whole Church, at home.

§ 68. This were such a ground of confidence between sovereigns and the clergy of their dominions, that it would be very hard to imagine any interest considerable to engage against that interest, by the prejudicing whereof neither of them could expect any advantage: and this confidence, the means to restore and to maintain that intercourse and correspondence between the Churches of several sovereignties; by which, when all Churches (at least as many as easily outweighed the rest) were under the Roman empire, the unity of the Church was maintained without that recourse to temporal power which made it infinite.

§ 69. Nor would there remain any just ground of jealousy between the pope and the council. The calling of a general council I yielded to the empire during the time that it contained the whole Church*. Now that it is broken into several sovereignties, and the pope and Church of Rome subject to none of them, but sovereign of considerable dominions; how should it not depend on him, with the consent of the sovereignties whereof Christendom consisteth? how should not the consent of their Churches be involved in the same? Indeed, if by that original intercourse the Churches understood one another, there could arise no cause to complain, that any vote should be unduly obtained; when it should be known afore, that it could have no further effect than the voluntary consent of those who receive it, which the free carriage of the debate must produce. What prejudice the see of Rome could imagine to any regular preeminence, that it may challenge, by such proceeding as this; it would be difficult to evidence.

§ 70. As for the prejudice that matters in difference may create to the common Christianity, which are at present the pretences, why this moderation cannot seem rightful and necessary; when the parties are sufficiently wearied with prosecuting the extremities which they pretend, then will it appear, though too late for the preserving of the common Christianity, that the preservation of the common Chris-

* Above, § 21. note i.
Of the Laws of the Church.

Book III. Christianity doth indeed consist in abating the extreme pretences on both sides. I have shewed my opinion, at least in gross, how and to what point they ought to be abated; and I shall impute it to the common Christianity, whatsoever offence I procure myself by shewing it.

The End of the Third Book.

Laus Deo.
A CONCLUSION

TO ALL

CHRISTIAN READERS.

By the premisses, though I must not take upon me to determine that which the whole Church never did, nor never will, undertake to declare;—what is necessary to be believed for the salvation of all Christians, as the means without which it is not to be had; what is necessary to the salvation only of those, who become obliged by their particular estate:—yet I conceive myself enabled to maintain, that only those things which concern a Christian as a Christian are necessary to be known for the salvation of all Christians; those things which concern a Christian as a member of a Church, becoming necessary to that salvation of every member of the Church, according as the obligation, which the communion of the Church createth, taketh place by virtue of his particular estate in the Church. For it is not the same obligation that takes hold on the young and the old, on the ignorant and the wise, on those that have liberal education and those that live by their hands, on superiors and inferiors, on the clergy and the people. But the profession of that Christianity, which our Lord Christ delivered to His apostles to preach when He gave them authority to found His Church, being the condition, without undergoing whereof no man was to be admitted a member of the Church by being baptized a Christian; as it is supposed to the being of the Church, so must it of necessity contain whatsoever the salvation of all Christians requireth. What a man's particular estate will require him to know, that by his knowledge he
may be enabled to discharge the obligation of it, becomes
necessary to his salvation by virtue of that particular estate.
But whatsoever obligation the acts and decrees of the Church
can create, is necessarily of this nature; taking hold upon
every estate, as it stands bound to be satisfied, that they en-
join nothing to be believed or done, that is not necessarily
either dependent upon, or consistent with, that which the
necessity of salvation requireth all to profess.

§ 2. It is therefore necessary for the salvation of all Chris-
tians to believe, that there is one true God, Who made all
things, with all mankind, having immortal souls, and all
angels, to endure for everlasting: that, governing all things
by His perfect providence (which supposes the maintenance
of them in acting according to their several natures), He
shall at the end of the world, which He hath determined,
bring the actions of all men and angels to judgment, and
assign them their respective estate for everlasting, as it shall
appear their actions have deserved according to His law.
For all this it was necessary to the salvation of all those that
were saved under the Law to believe; and, therefore, it is all
presupposed to that, wherein Christianity properly consisteth.
The people of God therefore held it, when our Lord came:
neither had He any thing to reform them in; saving that
pernicious opinion, which the Pharisees had perverted it with,
—that the Law of Moses, whether civil or ceremonial, was
the law by which that people was to be saved or damned:—
the incongruity whereof was so gross, that the Sadducees,
on the contrary side, took advantage thereupon to deny the
world to come. The corruptions, therefore, which these sects
had brought in, being cleared; the faith of God's ancient
people remains, thus far, the faith of His Church. If any
question may remain concerning the end of the world,
whether or no necessary then expressly to be believed; it is
not considerable here. But, further, in regard the coming
of Christ, which brought Christianity, must be maintained
necessary to the salvation of all: it is necessary to salvation
to believe, that, our first parents being seduced from the
obedience of God by apostate angels, neither themselves nor
their posterity would have been able of themselves to recover
that amity with God here, which might bring them to hap-


piness in the world to come: that therefore God, by His
word, diversely ministered before and under the Law, en-
deavoured to reconcile mankind to Himself again; but with
so little success (the greatest part thereof being swallowed up
in idolatry, and of His own people the greater part being
carried away with the hope of salvation by outwardly keeping
Moses' law), that at length it appeared requisite, that the
Word of God should become incarnate by the Holy Ghost
of the virgin Mary; and by His obedience to God in preach-
ing the terms of reconcilement with God to His people, and
suffering death at their hands for so doing, should void the
interest which God had allowed the apostate angels in man-
kind, whom they had cast down; and by rising again, and
going up to the right hand of God, should give the Holy
Ghost (the fulness whereof dwell in His manhood, as planted
in the Word incarnate), both to reduce them to Christian-
ity, and to enable them to persevere in it; undertaking to
give whomsoever shall profess Christianity by being bap-
tized into the Church, and live according to it, remission of
sins here, and everlasting life in the world to come, in con-
sideration of the obedience of Christ, provided by Him for
that purpose. For by His second coming, raising all from
death to life, He, That was judged here afore, shall then
judge the world; and, rendering them that have disobeyed
God everlasting punishment, shall render everlasting hap-
piness to them, whose bodies the Holy Ghost That dwelt in
them here raiseth.

§ 3. This is that precious pearl, and that hid treasure;
this is that grain of mustard seed, that leaven; which being
purchased at the price of all we have, and sowed in the heart,
and laid up in the past of our thoughts, makes all our actions
fruitful to the riches of everlasting happiness. This is that
little spot of truth, for the maintaining whereof so many
bloody fields of controversies in religion are and have been
fought, by souls, that perish by maintaining division in the
Church, to the prejudice, if not the loss, of that truth for
which they fight; as the country always suffers by the war
that is made for it.

§ 4. All this while it is to be remembered, that baptism
[The pre-
ciousness of
this faith.]
[Matt. xiii.
31, 33, 44,
48.]
tieth, not only to profess this faith unto death, but to live
[Baptism
tieth to
live as well]
THE CONCLUSION.

according to Christianity. Whether it be by virtue of Moses' law, cleared by our Lord of the false glosses of the Scribes and Pharisees, or by the new law of Christ, clearing the
spiritual intent of the old: it is not necessary to salvation for a Christian to know. For Irenæus, briefly distinguishing
matter of faith from matter of knowledge in the Scriptures,
i. 2—4, makes all that, which concerns the reason of the
difference in God's proceeding under the Law and the gospel,
to be matter of abundant knowledge, not of necessary faith.
But it is necessary for the salvation of a Christian to know,
that by being a Christian he undertakes to suppress, mortify,
and prevent, as far as in him lies, even the first motions
of concupiscence, whether in the lusts of the flesh or the lust
of the eyes or the pride of life; as our Lord in the gospel
hath clearly laid forth, howsoever the Law have expressed or
intimated the same. And this is that war with the devil, the
world, and the flesh, for the keeping of God's commandments;
which our baptism undertaketh. For there is no difference
in things to be done, concerning a private Christian as a
private Christian, that seems to be any considerable ground
of division in the Church. The substance of our common
Christianity in that part seems to remain without dispute.
In things that are to be believed, it were well if it could be
said so truly, that there is no part of the rule of faith in dis-
pute. In the mean time, the substance of Christianity, con-
taining whatsoever it is necessary for the salvation of all
Christians to know, whether in matter of faith or of man-
ners (whereof, to speak properly, the rule of faith signifieth
only the first part), consisteth only in that, which concerns
a particular Christian, as such, whether to be believed or
to be done.

* Having laid down in lib. i. c. 2, the fundamentals of the Creed, and in
  c. 3, that "μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως οὐσίας, οὔτε ὁ πολύν περὶ αὐτῆς διδασμοῖς
eἰστὶν ἐκπλήσσας, οὔτε ὁ τῷ δόλῳ, ἡλικτόνησας." Irenæus continues in c. 4.
  (p. 47)—"Τὸ δὲ πλείως η ἐλαττον κατὰ σύνεσιν εἰδεῖν τινά, οὐκ ἐν τῇ
  τῆς ὀβείλεσθαι αὐτήν ἀλλὰ ἀλλήλοις γίνεται," k. t. l. "καὶ διὰ τι διαδοθὲν
  καὶ πλείους γεγόναι τῇ ἀποφθέγματι, μηνίν ἄρα τίς ἐκάθετος ὁ χαρακτῆρ, διδαχεῖν" k. t. l.

5 "Obj. Worship of saints and angels are things to be done. R. I speak
of things concerning a private man, not as member of a Church, as these." Added in margin in MS.
§ 5. But what then shall the belief of "one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," in our creed, signify? Only, that there are Christians in the world? Shall a Christian be saved by believing that, which all Christians see,—that there is a company of men that call themselves Christians? Or shall it therefore be necessary to the salvation of all Christians, to know, that God hath founded the whole body of the Church, consisting of all Churches, for a society and corporation subsisting by His law? Shall it concern the salvation of simple Christians to understand the nature of corporations, and to know how visible communion in Christian offices makes the Church such a one; believing that this comes by God's appointment? I do not imagine any such thing. Indeed, whosoever allows no ground of difference between true Christians on the one side, and heretics and schismatics on the other side, cannot admit the belief of one Catholic Church for an article of his creed. For had there never been heresy or schism, the communion of all Christians with all Christians going forwards without interruption; the Church had been no less Catholic, than now, that it is called Catholic, to distinguish it from heresies and schisms; which prevailed sometimes in some places, but never spread nor lasted with the Church. But had there been no profession qualifying for communion with the Church; had there been no power in the Church to limit the order and circumstance of communion in the offices of Christianity: it could never have been visible, whom a Christian was to communicate with, professing himself bound by believing one Catholic Church to communicate with it. Because by this means it was visible; and because, being visible, an obligation was acknowledged of communicating with it: the profession of this obligation was to be part of the common Christianity, which the creed was to signify. But when it is no more visible whom a Christian is to communicate with, by reason of division in the Church; what is it then, that resolves, whom a Christian is to communicate with?

§ 6. That is, indeed, the question, which this whole business intends to resolve. For, the Reformation having occa-
sioned division in the Church, the parties are both visible; but which is the true Church, remains invisible, so long as it remains in dispute. For though it be not invisible to that reason, which proceeds aight upon due principles; yet that is not required of all Christians that would be saved: and, therefore, if it be not visible to the common reason of all men, it is invisible. This I allege to no further purpose than to shew, how much all parties stand obliged to procure the reunion of the Church; as answerable for the souls, that may miscarry by choosing amiss in that, which God’s ordinance makes visible, but men’s disorder invisible, to common sense. For the more difficult the way of salvation proves by this means, the more shall all estates stand obliged to clear it.

§ 7. Let us then see, wherein the difficulty of the choice consisteth; let us see, what satisfaction the parties tender common sense, that salvation is to be had by [cleaving to⁴] them. The word and the sacraments are the marks of the true Church. So say the doctors of the Reformation; so say, perhaps, their confessions of faith⁵. It were too long to dispute that. But how are these marks distinctive? For I suppose they pretend not to make known the reformed Churches to constitute the true Church, in opposition to the Church of Rome, by marks common to both. And will any common sense allow, that the Church of Rome will grant, that they have not the word of God or the sacraments? which they allow the Reformed to have? If you add the pure preaching of the word, and the pure ministering of the sacraments⁶; you advance not a foot. For is common sense able to judge,


⁵ i.e. if the following are definitions, and not merely descriptions.—“Est autem Ecclesia congregatio sanctorum in qua evangelium recte docetur et recte administratur sacramenta. Et ad veram unitatem Ecclesiae satis est consentire de doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramentorum.”—Conf. Aug. art. vii. De Ecclesia.—“The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.” XXXIX. Art., art.19.—“The true Church... hath always these notes or marks, whereby it is known; pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.”—Homily for Whitaunday, Pt. ii.—See also Field, Of the Church, Bk. ii. at length.

⁶ Bellarmine himself (De Eccles. Militante, lib. iii. c. 2. Controv. tom. i. p. 1228. C) lays down, that “Ecclesiam... unam et veram esse omnium ejusdem Christianae fidei professione et orundem sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum,” but adding, “ac præcipue unius Christi in terris vicarii Romani pontificis.”

⁷ See last note.
that the Reformed way is pure, that of the Church of Rome impure? It judgeth, that they who call it so think so; whether it be so or not, it must come under dispute. And, appealing to the Scriptures, it appeareth, that common sense is not judge in the meaning and consequence of them, upon which the resolution depends. It is therefore manifest, that the preaching of the word and the ministering of the sacraments is no mark of the Church; unless you say something more, to limit the ground upon which they may be no less.

§ 8. What limitation I would add, is plain by the premises. The preaching of that word, and that ministering of the sacraments, which the tradition of the whole Church confineth the sense of the Scriptures to intend; is the only mark of the Church, that can be visible. For I suppose preaching twice a Sunday is not; if a man be left free to preach what he will, only professing to believe the Bible—which what heresy disowneth?—and to make what he thinks good of it. And yet how is the generality of people provided for otherwise; unless it be, because they have preachers, that are counted godly men by those, whom what warrants to be godly men themselves?

§ 9. In the mean time is it not evident, that preachers and people are overspread with a damnable heresy of Antinomians and Enthusiasts, formerly (when puritans were not divided from the Church of England) called Etonists and Grindeltons, according to several countries? These believe so to be saved by the free grace of God, by which our Lord died for the elect, that by the revelation thereof, which is justifying faith, all their sins, past, present, and to come, are remitted; so that to repent of sin or to contend against it is the renouncing of God’s free grace and saving faith. How much might be alleged to shew, how all is now overspread with it.

8 See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxv. § 9, c. xxxii. § 50; and in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vi., xxi.
1 The Etonists were so called from one John Eaton, for whom see the notes to the passage referred to in note k above. For the Grindletonians, see Pagitt’s Heresiography, p. 99, under the title Familiasts.
2 See above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. i. § 11. notes k—d.
3 See Edwards’ Gangrena and Pagitt’s Heresiography, and Gataker, Rutherford, &c., with the other Pres-
§ 10. The book called Animadversions upon a Petition out of Wales shall serve to speak the sense of them, who call themselves "the godly party;" as speaking to them a body. Thus it speaks, p. 36:—"Look through your veil of duties, profession, and ordinances; and try your heart, with what spirit of love, obedience, and truth you are in your work: and whether will you stand to this judgment? Or, rather, that God should judge you according to grace, to the name and nature of Christ written upon you and in you? Sure, the great Judge will thus judge us at last by His great judgment or last judgment; not by the outward conversation, nor inward intention, but finally by His eternal election, according to the Book of Life." This just afore he calleth "the seed of Christ and His righteousness in" a Christian. And p. 38:—"When we are inangered, we let fly at men's principles, being not satisfied to rebuke men's actions, opinions, and works, but would be avenged of their principles too; as if we would kill them at very heart, pull them up by the roots, and leave them in an uncurable condition, rotten in their principles: ... but principles lie deeper than the heart, and are indeed Christ; Who is the principle and beginning of all things; Who, though heart fail, and flesh fail, yet He abides the root of all." Shall he pretend to be a Christian, that professes this? Shall any pretend to be a Church, that spue it not out? Let heaven

byterian writers quoted in the passage referred to before in note k, and above all the Acts of Parliament of May 2, 1648, and August 9, 1650 (in Scoebell, Pt. i. pp. 149, 150, Pt. ii. pp. 124—126), "against blasphemies and heresies;" for ample proof of this.

"Animadversions upon a Letter and Paper enclosed, sent to His Highness" (Cromwell) "from some Gentlemen and others in Wales:" with, prefixed to it, the letter and paper themselves, which are the subject of the Animadversions, being "a Word for God or a Testimony on Truth's behalf, from several Churches and divers hundreds of Christians in Wales (and some few adjacent) against wickedness in High Places, with a letter to the Lord General Cromwell, both, first presented to his own hands, and now published for further information:" Atto. pp. 104: published apparently about 1657.

The petition and letter in question are a vehement remonstrance on the part of the Fanatical party in Wales, among whom one Varson Powell an Anabaptist was a leader, against the Acts of Parliament establishing Presbyterianism according to the platform of the Westminster Assembly, and against Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate, &c. The Animadversions are the defence of Cromwell's side. A similar attack of the Anabaptists upon Cromwell in 1648 is printed in the supplement to Trelmin's edition of Neal, vol. v. pp. 152—155. Lond. 1822. And the fierce paper to the same effect, addressed by them at a later period (in 1657-8) to Charles II. (in Clareond, Hist of Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 359. fol. 1719), is well known. These Animadversions then profess to issue from the more moderate, and to be addressed to the more frantic, of the Independent party.

"Animadversions &c., p. 36.

"Ibid. pp. 35, 36.

"Ibid. p. 38."
and earth judge, whether poor souls are otherwise to be secured of the word, than by two sermons a Sunday; when the sense of "the godly" is claimed to consist in a position so peremptorily destructive to salvation as this.

§ 11. It will be said, perhaps, that now the ministers of the Congregations have subscribed the Confession of the Assembly¹. But alas! the covering is too short. When a bishop in the Catholic Church subscribed a council, there was just presumption, that no man under his authority could be seduced from the faith subscribed; because no man communi-
cated with the Catholic Church but by communicating with him that had subscribed it. Who shall warrant, that "the godly," who have this sense, not liable to any authority in the Church, shall stand to the subscriptions of those ministers? or to the authority of the Assembly, pretended by the Presbyteries? If they would declare themselves tied so to do, who shall warrant, that there is not a salvo for it in the confession which they subscribe? If there were not, why should any difficulty be made to spue out that position, which is the seed of it;—that justifying faith consistseth in believing that a man is of the number of the elect, for whom Christ died, excluding others?—why that, which is the fruit of it;—that they, who transgress the covenant of baptism, come not under the state of sin and damnation, come not from under the state of grace²?—Why, but because a back door must be left for them, that draw the true conclusion from their own premises; reserving themselves the liberty to deny the conclusion, admitting the pre-
misses. It is not then a confession of faith, that will make

¹ The Independents in the Savoy Confession of Oct. 1658, expressly consent to the Westminster Confession of Faith "for the substance of it," and adopt "in most places its very words;" insomuch that the modern Independents have "in a manner laid aside the use of it" (the Savoy confession) "in their families, and agreed with the Presbytere-
ians in the use of the Assembly's Cate-
chism." So Neal; and see the Con-
fession itself, entitled A Declaration of the Faith and Order owned and practi-
cised in the Congregational Churches in England: agreed upon &c. at the Savoy Octob. 12. 1658, Preface, sign. B. 2, 4to. Lond. 1659.—The West-
minster Confession of Faith was adopted
with some considerable exceptions by
the Parliament, June 20, 1648 (Neal,
vol. iii. pp. 320, 321). But Neal's edi-
tor, Toulmin, boasts (ibid. p. 329. note), that it "was not made the legal
standard of orthodoxy;" that "it was
not subscribed by any member of" the
Westminster "Assembly, except by the
prolocutor, assessors, and clerks; nor
till forty years after was a subscription
or assent to it required of any layman
or minister as a term of Christian com-
munion."

² See above Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. vii. xxxi. &c.: and Bk. 111. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxv. § 10.
the word that is preached a mark of the Church, without
some mark visible to common sense warranting that con-
fession of faith.

§ 12. As for the sacraments, no Church no sacraments. If
they suppose that ground upon which, that intent to which,
the whole Church hath used them; there is no further case
of division in the Church: for that secures the rule of faith.
If not, they are no sacraments, but by equivocation of words:
they are sacrileges, in profaning God's ordinances.

§ 13. The sacrament of baptism, because the necessary
means of salvation, is admitted for good, when ministered by
those who are not of the Church; but always void of the
effect of grace: to which it reviveth, so soon as the true faith
is professed in the unity of the Church. If a sacrament be
a visible sign of invisible grace, that baptism is no baptism,
which signifieth the grace it should effect but indeed effecteth
not. Such is that baptism, which is used to seal a covenant
of grace without the condition of Christianity; a covenant,
that is not the covenant of two parties, but the promise of
one. Whence comes the humour of rebaptizing, but to be
discharged of that Christianity, which the baptism of the
Church of England exacteth? Why do they refuse baptism
in New England to all, that refuse to enter into the covenant
of Congregations? How comes it more necessary to sal-

* See Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. ix. § 28, c. x. § 31.
7 Compare above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iii. § 6, 7; c. vii. § 4.
* There was an ordinance of Parliament in May 1648, that “whoso-
ever shall say that the baptism of in-
fants is unlawful,” &c., “and in pursuance thereof shall baptize any
person formerly baptized,” &c., “shall renounce his error,” or “be com-
mitted to prison till he find sureties that he shall not publish or main-
tain” it “any more” (Neal, vol. v. pp. 151, 152. ed. Toulmin). But the ordinance it ap-
ppears was not enforced.
* In the answers of the elders &c. at Boston in 1662, to the questions pro-
pounded to them (Mather, Eccles. Hist. of New Eng., Bk V. p. 64), it
is laid down, that the “proper subjects of baptism” are “the members of
the visible Church,” and that these “are confederate visible believers in particular
churches, and their infant seed.”—

See also Increase Mather’s Discourse concerning the subject of Baptism, to
Cambridge (in America), 1676: which is especially concerned with the con-
troversey in New England respecting the persons who have a right to bap-
tism, defines them to be those who are “according to Scripture rule become
members of the visible Church,” and quotes the Savoy meeting of 1638 and
Dr. Owen in support of the doctrine—
“All men are bound, say they” (of New England), “to become settled
members of such a particular Church as is before described. And whosoever
do not, remains for the time without the visible Church of Christ, and is
in that estate incapable of any Church ordinance or privilege, though he be
not only baptized but also truly con-
vated.” &c. Narrative of some Church
Courses in New England, &c. by W.R.,
c. vii. p. 29. Lond. 1644: from the au-
thority of Robinson, Mather, &c.
vation to be of a Congregation, than to be baptized and made a Christian? Is it not, because it is thought, that salvation is to be had without that profession of Christianity which the sacrament of baptism sealeth? that it is not to be had without renouncing it? Upon these terms, those, that are denied baptism by the Congregations because they are not of the Congregations, are denied salvation as much as in them lies, but not in deed and in truth. For, the necessity of baptism supposing a profession of the Catholic Church, they perish not by refusing it, who will not have it by renouncing the Catholic Church; that is, by covenancing themselves into Congregations. They that are so affected must know, that they have authority of themselves to baptize to effect; which no Congregation in New England is able to do.

§ 14. If the sacrament of the eucharist seal that covenant of grace, which conditioneth not for Christianity; it is no sacrament but by equivocation of words. Where that conditional is doubtful or void, there is no security for poor souls, that they receive the sacrament of the eucharist. They, who depart from the Church, that they may minister the sacraments on such grounds and to such effects as the Church allows not, incur the nullities and sacrileges, which departing from the Church inferreth.

§ 15. But if, beside the faith of the Church, the authority of the Church be supposed to the effect of the sacraments; how shall the sacraments be sacraments, though ministered upon profession of the true faith, where no authority of the Church can be pretended for the ministering of them? or where it can only be pretended, but is indeed usurped and void? Posterity will never forget, that there are in a land, inhabited by Christians, called England, country parishes, in which the sacraments have not been ministered for so many years, as the order of the Church of England hath been superseded by the late war. If the word and sacraments be the marks of the Church; what pretence for a Church,

---

b "As not to leave the Catholic Church nor covenant themselves into Congregations." Added in margin in M.S.

c See above, Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxx. § 11—18.

d Written A.D. 1659; and the Common Prayer was forbidden by law, and the Directory enforced in its stead, March, A.D. 1641 (Scobell, Pt. I. pp. 75, sq.)
where there is indeed a pretense of the word (though no presumption that it is God's), but of sacraments not so much as a pretense? What hath the rest of England deserved of the Congregations, or of the Presbyteries; that they should be left destitute of the means of salvation, because they cannot see reason to be of Congregations, or Presbyteries?

§ 16. Laymen preach; and laymen go to church to hear them preach, because they cannot preach themselves at home to their families*. The horror of profaning the sacraments of the Church by sacrilege is yet alive, to make them tremble still at usurping to celebrate the sacrament of the eucharist. But will those laymen, that preach, answer for the laymen's souls to whom they preach, that they have sufficient means of salvation by hearing them preach, being of no Church; that might answer, that it is God's word which they preach, ministering no sacraments for a mark of the Church? Is it possible a Christian should hold himself able to preach, who holds not himself able to baptize? Or is it the appetite of devouring consecrated goods, that ensnares men to preach; who, when it comes to baptizing, had rather let innocent souls perish than own the authority of the Church (which enables every Christian to baptize in case of necessity*), because they know

---

* See Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. xi. § 5—9; and Review of it, c. xi.
† See Due Way of Composing Differences, &c., § 19—Compare the history of the Wesleyans: who only gradually became bold enough to administer sacraments. In the Plan of General Pacification (an ominous title), dated Aug. 6, 1798, it is enacted, that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper shall not be administered in any Chapel, except a majority of the trustees of that Chapel on the one hand, and the majority of the stewards and leaders belonging to that Chapel... on the other hand, allow it," and then only with consent of the Conference, and under several limitations. See S. Warren's Chronicles of Methodism, pp. 223, 224, 8vo. Lond. 1827. The above qualified permission was the result of a vehement division between those who adhered (with their founder Wesley himself) to the Church, and those who were pushed by their position into schism.
‡ See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 23: Epilogue, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xix. § 12; and Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. viii. § 11.—That laymen might not baptize, even in case of necessity, appears to have been held by the New England Congregationalists, who solemnly enact in their Confession of Faith, A.D. 1680, c. xxviii.: that "neither" baptism nor the Lord's Supper "may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word lawfully called" (Mather's Eccles. Hist. of New Eng., Bk. v. p. 17, fol. Lond. 1792): and enforce it at length ibid. p. 56.—And Cartwright had laid down, that "only a minister of the word, that is, a preacher," may "minister the sacraments" (in his Directory of Ch. Gov., § Of Sacraments, in Appendix to Neal, vol. v. pp. xvii., xviii.). And see Hooker, E. P., V. Ixi. 4.—However the Anabaptist Confession of Faith A.D. 1646, § xli. (Append. to Crosby, Hist. of Baptists, vol. i. num. ii. p. 21), expressly declares, that "the person designed by Christ to dispense baptism, the Scripture holds forth to be a disciple, it being no where tied to a particular Church officer or person extraordinarily sent," &c.
they usurp the office of preaching without authority from the Church. It is I that have said, that a layman may be authorized to preach by the Church. And I believe still, I said true in it. But shall I therefore answer for him that preacheth without authority from the Church? Should he preach by authority from the Church, there were presumption for his hearers, that it is the word of God, which the Church authorizeth. When he preacheth without authority from the Church, shall he not answer for the souls, whom he warrants salvation by his preaching without Church or word or sacraments?

§ 17. But these are not "the godly." Those, that know themselves such, are thereby authorized to retire themselves into Congregations, that they may enjoy the purity of the ordinances. It is then men's godliness, that enables them to forsake the Church, and betake themselves into Congregations. And indeed I know an Oxford doctor; who, to prove himself no schismatic for it, hath alleged, that he can be no schismatic, because he knows himself to be godly and to have God's Spirit. I deny not, that he hath alleged other reasons why he is no schismatic; the ground whereof I considered afore. But what Quaker could not have alleged the Spirit of God as well as he? And did not he, who pretends himself Christ, allege reasons for it as well as pretend the Spirit?

§ 18. A nice mistake it is to imagine, that a Christian is to accept the Scriptures for the word of God, because the Spirit of God assures him that so they are. For of a truth, until the Spirit of God move him to be a Christian, he ac-

---

1 Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. ix. § 4; Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. xi. § 4; Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 22; and Review of it, c. iii. § 20. The Church of Christ "is a company of visible saints, called and separated from the world by the word and Spirit of God, to the visible profession of the faith of the gospel, being baptized into that faith, and joined to the Lord, and each to other, by mutual agreement in the practical enjoyment of the ordinances commanded by Christ their Head and King." Anabaptist Confession of 1646, § xxxii.: as just quoted pp. 18, 19.

2 Viz. Dr. Owen.—"How some men may prevail against us, before whom we must stand or fall according to their corrupt notion of schism, we know not: the rule of our consciences, in this as in all other things, is eternal and unchangeable. Whilst I have an uncontrollable faithfull witness, that I transgress no limits prescribed to me in the word, that I do not willingly break or dissolve any unity of the institution of Jesus Christ, my minde as to this thing is filled with perfect peace," &c. &c. "And let men say...what they please or can to the contrary, I am no schismatick." John Owen, Of Schismes, c. viii. § 66. pp. 276, 277. Oxf. 1657.

3 See above in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxv. § 17.

---

4 N. 2
cepteth them not for such. When It doth, he is moved so to accept them by the Spirit of God, as by the effective cause; but for reasons, which though contained in the Scriptures, yet, were they not visibly true before a man can accept the Scriptures for the word of God, he could never so accept them by God's Spirit: unless we can imagine the virtue of God's Spirit not to depend upon the preaching of His gospel; which I suppose only Enthusiasts do imagine. Nor doth the Spirit of God distinguish to any Christian the Apocrypha from canonical Scripture, but by such means as may make the difference visible. No more doth It assure him that he is a good Christian, but upon the knowledge of such resolutions and actions wherein Christianity consisteth. If it be requisite to make a man no schismatic, that it be not his own fault, that he is not of the Catholic Church; if he persuade himself upon insufficient reasons, that there is no such thing by God's law as the visible body of a Catholic Church: just it is with God to leave such a one to think it God's Spirit, That assures him a godly man, being a schismatic. It is not therefore supposition of invisible godliness, that can privilege men to withdraw themselves from the Church into Congregations; supposing such a thing as a Catholic Church. The purity being invisible, but the bar to it, separation from God's Church, visible; the ordinances, for which they separate, will remain their own ordinances, not God's.

§ 19. The Presbyterians sometimes plead their ordination in the Church of England for the authority, by which they ordain others against the Church of England, to do that, which they received authority from the Church of England to do, provided that according to the order of it: a thing so ridiculously senseless, that common reason refuseth it. Can any state, any society, do an act, by virtue whereof there shall be right and authority to destroy it? Can the ordina-

* See Thorndike's Letter concerning the Present State of Religion among us.—In the Form of Presbytery Ordination set forth by the Westminster Assembly (Appendix to Neal's Hist. of Puritans, ed. Toulmin, num. ix.), it is enacted among other things, that "if a minister be designed to a congregation who hath been formerly ordained presbyter according to the form of ordination which hath been in the Church of England, which we hold for substance valid, . . . let him be admitted without any new ordination."—And so also the Act of Parliament establishing "Church-government," Aug. 1648 (Scobell, Pt. i. p. 173).
tion of the Church of England, proceeding upon supposition of a solemn promise before God and His Church to execute the ministry a man receiveth according to the order of it, enable him to do that, which he was never ordained to do? Shall he by failing of his promise, by the act of that power which supposed his promise, receive authority to destroy it? Then let a man obtain the kingdom of heaven by transgressing that Christianity, by the undertaking whereof he obtained right to it.

§ 20. They are therefore mere congregations, voluntarily constituted by the will of those, all whose acts, even in the sphere of their ministry once received, are become void by their failing of that promise, in consideration whereof they were promoted to it: void, I say, not of the crime of sacrilege towards God, which the usurpation of Core constituteth, but of the effect of grace towards His people. For the like voluntary combining of them into presbyteries and synods createth but the same equivocation of words; when they are called Churches, to signify that which is visible by their usurpation in point of fact, not that which is invisible by their authority in point of right

§ 21. For want of this authority, whatsoever is done by virtue of that usurpation being void before God; I will not examine, whether the form, wherein they execute the offices of the Church which they think fit to exercise, agree with the ground and intent of the Church or not: only, I charge a peculiar nullity in their consecrating the eucharist, by neglecting the prayer for making the elements the Body and Blood of Christ; without which the Church never thought it could consecrate the eucharist. Whether, having departed from the Church, Presbyteries and Congregations scorn to learn any part of their duty from the Church, lest that might

---

* See Thorndike's Letter concerning the Present State of Religion among us.

† See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. iv. § 7, sq.: and for the Puritans, Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x. § 6.—The Directory orders the minister first to read "the words of institution," and then to use a "prayer, thanksgiving, or blessing, of the bread and wine to this effect:" proceeding to give a form, which contains this passage: —" Earnestly to pray to God... to vouchsafe His gracious presence and the effectual working of His Spirit in us, and so to sanctify these elements both of bread and wine, and to bless His ordinance, that we may receive by faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us, and so to feed upon Him that He may be one with us and we with Him," &c.:— and going on to speak of "the elements being now sanctified by the word and prayer."
seem to weaken the ground of their departure; or whether they intend, that the elements remain mere signs, to strengthen men's faith that they are of the number of the elect; which they are, before they be consecrated, as much as afterwards: the want of consecration rendering it no sacrament that is ministered, the ministering of it upon a ground destructive to Christianity renders it [none] much more.

§ 22. On the other side, the succession of pastors from the apostles, or those who received their authority from the apostles, is taken for a sufficient presumption, on behalf of the Church of Rome, that it is Catholic. But I have shewed, that the tradition of faith, and the authority of the Scriptures which contain it, is more ancient than the being of the Church; and presupposed to the same, as a condition upon which it standeth: that the authority of the apostles, and the powers left by them in and with the Church, the one is originally the effective cause, the other immediately the law by which it subsisteth, and in which the government thereof consisteth: that the Church hath power in laws of less consequence, though given the Church by the apostles, though recorded by the Scriptures; where that change, which succeeds in the state of Christendom, renders them useless to preserve the unity of the Church, presupposing the faith, in order to the public service of God. But neither can the Church have power in the faith, to add, to take away, to change any thing in that profession of Christianity, wherein the salvation of all Christians consisteth, and which the being of the Church presupposeth; nor [to nullify] that act of the

---

4 See Just Weights and Measures, c. xxi. § 8.—How far the Presbyterians as a body were clear in the matter, may be judged from the Directory, which lays down, that by this Sacrament "Christ and all His benefits are applied and sealed up unto us," and from the Westminster Confession of Faith, c. xxvii. § 3, affirming, that "the grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them," but depends "upon the work of the Spirit and the word of institution:" and c. xxviii. § 1, that baptism is "ordained . . . not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in newness of life:" and c. xxix. that in the Lord's Supper, "worthy receivers . . . do inwardly by faith really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified and all benefits of His death," &c.

5 Added from MS.

6 See e.g. Field, Of the Church, Bk. ii. c. 6, from Stapleton and Bellarmine.

7 Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. iv., xxi., xxviii., &c.

8 Corrected from MS.; "in" in folio edition.
THE CONCLUSION.

apostles' authority, whereby the unity of the Church was founded and settled; nor [to nullify*] that service of God, for which it was provided.

§ 23. There is therefore something else requisite to evidence the Church of Rome to be the true Church, exclusive to the Reformation, than the visible succession of pastors; though that, by the premisses, be one of the laws, that concur to make every Church a Catholic Church. The faith upon which, the powers constituted by the apostles in which, the form of government by which, the service of God for which, it subsisteth: if these be not maintained according to the Scriptures interpreted by the original and Catholic tradition of the Church, it is in vain to allege the personal succession of pastors (though that be one ingredient in the government of it, without which neither could the faith be preserved nor the service of God maintained, though with it they might possibly fail of being preserved and maintained) for a mark of the true Church. The preaching of that word, and that ministering of the sacraments (understanding by that particular all the offices of God's public service in the Church), which the tradition of the whole limiteth the Scriptures interpreted thereby to teach, is the only mark, as afore⁷, to make the Church visible.

§ 24. To come then to our case; is it therefore become warrantable to communicate with the Church of Rome, because it is become unwarrantable to communicate with Presbyteries or Congregations? This, is, indeed, the rest of the difficulty, which it is the whole business of this book to resolve. To which I must answer, that absolutely the case is as it was, though comparatively much otherwise. For if the state of religion be the same at Rome, but in England far worse than it was: the condition, upon which communion with the Church of Rome is obtained, is never a whit more agreeable to Christianity than afore; but it is become more pardonable for him, that sees what he ought to avoid, not to see what he ought to follow.

§ 25. He, that is admitted to communion with the Church of Rome by the bull of profession of faith enacted by Pius IV.

---

* Corrected from MS.; "in" in folio edition.

⁷ Above, § 8.
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pope (not by the council of Trent), besides many particulars there added to the creed (which whether true or false, according to the premisses, he swears to as much as to his creed), at length professes to "admit without doubting, whatsoever else the sacred canons and general councils, especially the synod of Trent, hath delivered, decreed, and declared: damning and rejecting as anathema, whatsoever the Church damneth and rejecteth for heresy under anathema;" but whether the whole Church or the present Church, the oath limiteth not.

Here is no formal and express profession, that a man believes the present Church to be infallible. And therefore it was justly alleged in the first Book, that the Church hath never enjoined the professing of it. But here is a just ground for a reasonable construction, that it is hereby intended to be exacted; because a man swears to admit the acts of councils, as he does to admit his creed and the Holy Scriptures.

§ 26. Nor can there be a more effectual challenge of that privilege, than the use of it in the decree of the council, that the Scriptures, which we call Apocrypha, be admitted with

---


"The Council of Trent imposed acceptance of its decrees upon all cathedral dignitaries and all who had cure of souls: the bull imposes the oath upon all belonging to monasteries or any religious order (Preamble of the bull as quoted in note 2). And another bull (Bullar. Rom., ibid., pp. 291-204) imposes it upon all who take degrees or hold offices at Universities or public "gymnasia."

"Ego N. firma fide credo et profiteor omnia et singula quae continguntur in symboio fidei quo sancta Romana Ecclesia utitur: videlicet Credo in unum Deum, &c. (reciting the Nicene Creed, and then continuing)—" Apostolicas et ecclesiasicas traditiones religiosae ejusdem ecclesiae observationes et constitutions firmas simo admitto et amplector. Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia" &c. "admitto, nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimum consensum patrum accepiam et interpretabor. Profiteor quoque septem esse vere et proprie sacramenta novae legis" &c.—(going on to profess and accept, the sacrifice of the mass, transubstantiation, concomitance, purgatory, invocation and veneration of saints, adoration of relics and images, indulgences, supremacy of the pope, etc.). "Cetera item omnia a sacra canonibus et ecclesiae concilii, ac praecepice a sacrosancta Tridentina synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitante recipio atque profiteor; similique contraria omnia atque hæreses quacumque ab ecclesiis damnatas, rejectas, et anathematizatas, ego pariter damno, rejicio, et anathematizo: hanc veram Catholicae fidem .. integram et inviolabilem usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum constantissime (Deo adjuvante) retineere et conservare, atque mea subditis, vel illis quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri, et prædicare, quantum in me erit, curatum, ego idem S. sponeo, voveo, ac juro; sic me Deus adjuvet et haec sancta Dei evangelia." Forma juram. Prof. Fidei, ap. Bull. Pii IV. as quoted in note 2.

"c. iv. § 21, c. xxxi. § 51."
the like reverence as the unquestionable canonical Scriptures, being all enjoined to be received as all of one rank; which, before the decree, had never been enjoined to be received but with that difference, which had always been acknowledged in the Church. For this act, giving them the authority of prophetic Scripture inspired by God which they had not afore,—though it involve a nullity (because that which was not inspired by God to him that writ it, when he writ it, can never have the authority of [Scripture] inspired by God, because it can never become inspired by God; nor can become known that it was indeed inspired by God, not having been so received from the beginning, without revelation anew to that purpose),—yet usurpeth infallibility, because it enjoineth that, which no authority but that which immediate revelation createth can enjoin.

§ 27. Further, the decree of the council concerning justification involving a mistake in the term, and understanding by it the infusion of grace, whereby the righteousness that dwelleth in a Christian is formally and properly that which settles him in the state of righteous before God; not fundamentally and metonymically that which is required in him that is estated in the same by God in consideration of our Lord Christ: though I maintain, that this decree prejudgeth not the substance of Christianity; yet must it not be allowed to express the true reason, by which it takes place. The council then transgresseth the power of the Church, in erecting a position of the School (and that, in the proper sense of the terms, not true) into an article of the faith; but the bull much more, in requiring to swear it. And whether or no the decree of the council concern the salvation of a single Christian, being under it: the swearing to it, which the bull enjoineth, necessarily concerns the salvation of him, who, if he understood the business, knows it not to be true; if he understand it not, cannot swear it.

§ 28. But that the satisfaction of penance is not to abolish the guilt of eternal death, by changing the love of this world into
into the love of God above all things; but to redeem the
debt of temporal punishment, remaining when the sin is re-
mitt ed by the sacrament (or, when it can be had, by the mere
desire of it): as it is decreed Sess. vi. cap. xiv.\textsuperscript{k}: this is
necessarily prejudicial to the Christianity of those, who must
needs be induced by it to think themselves restored to God's
grace without the means which His gospel requireth\textsuperscript{1}. For
be penance never so much a sacrament; if the Church sup-
pose the gospel, the applying of the keys thereof cannot
abate that condition which the gospel requireth, but is em-
ployed to effect it. Therefore absolution proceeds not but
upon supposition, that the change of a man's disposition is
visible by the performing of his penance\textsuperscript{m}. If the case of
necessity create an exception, which the Church presumeth
that God dispenseth in, and therefore reconcileth all in the
point of death by giving them the eucharist\textsuperscript{n}; it is not, be-
cause there is ground of pardon in their being reconciled,
but in the procuring of their being qualified for it, which
must not have been presumed upon otherwise. For the pre-
sumption of pardon not lying in the act of reconcilement by
the power of the keys, but in the ground of it; upon the cor-
rupt custom of absolving first and imposing penance to be
performed afterwards, to decree this construction, that it is
not imposed for remission of sin (as conditionally depending
on it) but to pay the temporal punishment remaining when
it is remitted\textsuperscript{o}; was to heap abuses upon abuses. For hence
is come the change of attrition into contrition by the sen-
tence of absolution\textsuperscript{p} in him, in whom all the penance that is
enjoined pretends nothing else than to effect it. So that,
pardon being held forth upon undue grounds, the corruption
of our nature must needs presume upon it, when it is not
effected. How then shall a man swear to admit this, without
consenting and concurring to the entangling of simple souls
in the snares of their sins? And this is therefore a point,
wherein the Christianity which the decree constituteth is
necessarily defective: as not providing for that, which the

\textsuperscript{k} See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xi. § 3, note q.
\textsuperscript{1} See ibid., § 5, 6.
\textsuperscript{m} See ibid., c. ix. § 5—11, 27, 28, &c.
\textsuperscript{n} See ibid., c. x. § 10—12; and Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxiii. § 9.
\textsuperscript{o} See Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xi. § 1, sq., § 21, &c.
\textsuperscript{p} See ibid., § 4.
Gospel maketh requisite to the remission of sin; but teaching to expect it from the act of declaring it by the Church, without supposing the ground, upon which the gospel tendereth it.

§ 29. If the decree of transubstantiation⁹ could possibly be expounded to signify only the sacramental presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, which I maintain the consecration effecteth⁷; what would that serve the turn, when it is further required, that we hold him anathema, that believes the substance of the elements to remain⁴? Which being so manifestly justified by the Scriptures, neither any tradition of the Church, nor any reason, rendering the bodily presence of them inconsistent with the sacramental presence of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, excludefth⁴.

§ 30. Nor is it enough, that Christian people frequent themselves, and admit in others, the use and effect of those offices, which the council of Florence first decreed to make up the seven sacraments⁸; unless they swear to hold them for sacraments without distinguishing, either in that grace which the ceremony signifieth, or in the force whereby they concur to the obtaining of it⁵. Whereas the difference between our common Christianity, and that which the Church is able to contribute towards the effect of it by any office which it is enabled to celebrate, ought to distinguish the grace of the Holy Ghost, which baptism and the eucharist immediately bestow by virtue of the covenant of grace which they enact and establish, from that, which any office of the Church by God’s promise to hear the prayers thereof is able to bring to pass.

§ 31. Further, seeing that, by the Scriptures expounded according to the original tradition of the Church, the souls of those that depart in grace are in an imperfect state of happiness till the general judgment, according to the state in which they depart⁴: neither can any prayers be made to redeem souls out of purgatory-pains to the sight of God Church.

---

⁹ See ibid., c. i. § 3, note e.
⁷ See ibid., c. ii. § 8, sq.; c. iii. § 2; c. iv. § 10, sq.
⁸ Conc. Trid., Sess. xiii. can. 2; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 808. D.
⁴ See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. ii.—v.
* Corrected from MS.: “these” in folio edition.
⁵ See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxx. § 35. note e.
⁶ See ibid.
⁸ See ibid., c. xxvii. § 4, sq.; c. xxix. § 30, sq.
(which the decree of the council of Florence supposeth*) upon those terms; nor any assurance be had, that the prayers which are made to the saints do come to their knowledge. And how then shall a good Christian swear to believe, that souls are helped out of purgatory by the prayers of the living; or that he is to pray to saints, of whom he can by no means be assured that they hear his prayers?

§ 32. Surely it cannot be imagined, that the communion of the eucharist in one kind,—the making of these prayers to saints, which distinguish them not from God (desiring of them those things which only God can give),—the setting up of their images in churches, to be worshipped and prayed to in the house of God’s service,—the worshipping of images, as the objects of that worship in respect of their principals, which is not the worship of their principals,—the serving of God in an unknown language,—the barring of Christian people from the Scriptures,—the maintaining of masses where nobody communicates, scarce anybody assisteth,—the opinion of applying the virtue of Christ’s death by them to those, who neither communicate nor assist them with their devotions, by virtue of the sacrifice,—the tendering of pardon for sin by indulgences, whereof there can be no effect but the releasing of penance enjoined;—these and other customs of that Church, which have the force and effect of law (which written laws many times never attain), are so far from being reasonable means to advance the service of God, that to live under them and to yield conformity to them is a burden unsufferable for a Christian to undergo; to approve them by being reconciled to the Church that maintains them, a scandal incurable and irreparable.

§ 33. But to swear, further, and to profess firmly to admit and embrace them as contained within the title of constitutions and observations of that Church; is a thing, which to me it seems strange that it should ever be required of a Christian. The effect of this bull is of so high a nature, in regard of those whom it concerns; that never any general council pretended to produce the like. That every man

---

* See ibid., c. xxviii. § 34. note 1.
* See ibid., c. xxix. § 34, sq.
* See, for all these subjects, ibid., cc. v. § 25, 26; cc. xi.; xxiv.—xxix.; &c.—The whole paragraph stands in the folio edition as above printed. Thorndike had evidently forgotten the beginning of it before writing the end.
should own the laws of the society wherein he lives, so far as
to live in conformity with them, is a thing necessary to the
subsistence of all communities. Nor is a private person
chargeable with the faults of the laws, under which he lives;
until it appear, that by the means of those faults he must
fail of the end for which the community subsisteth: that is,
of salvation, by communicating with the Church of Rome.
But to make a private Christian a party to the decrees and
customs of the Church (by swearing to admit and embrace
them all), because he communicateth with it; is to make
him answerable for that, which he doeth not. He, that
would swear no more than he believes, nor believe more than
he can see cause to believe (being a private Christian, and
uncapable to comprehend what laws and customs are fit for
so great a body as the Church), must not swear to the laws
of the Church as good or fit (were there no charge against
them), because past his understanding; but rest content, by
conforming to them, to hold communion with the Church.
But instead of mending the least of those horrible abuses,
which the complaints of all parts of Christendom evidence to
be visible, to exclude all that will not swear to them; is to
bid them redeem the communion of the Church by trans-
gressing that Christianity, which it ought to presuppose.
Woll may that power be called infinite, that undertakes to
such things as this. But how should the means of sala-
tion be thought to consist in obeying it?

§ 34. Here is then a peremptory bar to communion with [And is
the Church of Rome; only occasioned by the Reformation,
but fixed by the Church of Rome. That order, which several
parts of Christendom had provided for themselves under the
title of Reformation, might have been but provisional, till a
better understanding between the parties might have pro-
duced a tolerable agreement (in order whereunto a distance
for a time had been the less mischievous); had not this pro-
ceeding cut off all hope of peace but by conquest, that is, by
yielding all this. And therefore, this act being that which
formed the schism, the crime thereof is chiefly imputable
to it.

§ 35. As therefore I said afore, that the sacrament of [As the
baptism of

\* Above in § 13.
baptism, though the necessary means of salvation, becomes a necessary bar to salvation, when it enacteth a profession of renouncing either any part of the faith or the unity of the Church; so here I say, that the communion of the eucharist, obtained by making a profession which the common Christianity alloweth not a good Christian to make, is no more the means of salvation to him who obtaineth it upon such terms, how much soever a Christian may stand obliged to hold communion with the Church. And this is the reason, that makes the communion of the Church of Rome, absolutely, no more warrantable than afore; now that it is become unwarrantable to communicate with Presbyteries and Congregations.

§ 36. But, comparatively, an extremity in respect to the contrary extremity holds the place of a mean⁸; nor did I ever imagine, that the humour of reforming the Church without ground or measure may not proceed to that extremity, that it had been better to have left it unreformed, than to have neglected those bounds, which the pretence of reformation requireth. I say not, that this is now come to pass, comparisons being odious: but this I say;—that he, who goes to reform the Church upon supposition that the pope is antichrist and the papists therefore idolaters⁹, is much to take heed, that he misken not the ground for that measure, by which he is to reform; and, taking that for reformation which is the furthest distant from the Church of Rome that is possible, imagine, that the pope may be antichrist, and the papists idolaters, for that which the Catholic faith and Church alloweth.

§ 37. It is a marvel to see, how much the zeal to have the pope antichrist surpasses the evidence of the reasons which it is proved with. For otherwise it would easily appear, that, as an antipope is nothing but a pretended pope, so antichrist is nothing else but a pretended Messiah; he, who pretends to be that which Christ is indeed, and to give salvation to God's people. Our Lord foretells of "false Christs and false prophets," Matt. xxiv. 24, Mark xiii. 22; and those

---

* Corrected from MS. "means" in folio edition.—Compare Aristotle, Eth. Nic., II. viii. §, &c.—Πρὸς μὴν τὸ μὲν τὸν εἶναι καὶ πάντα Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τις φα-
are the preachers of new sects, which pretended to be Christ, and which pretended not to be Christ.

§ 38. Simon Magus and Menander, we know by Irenæus\(^\text{a}\); Dositheus, by Origen upon Matthew\(^\text{b}\); pretended all of them to be the Messiah to the Samaritans; who, as schismatical Jews, expected the Messiah as well as the Jews. Saturninus and Basilides were false prophets, but not antichrists\(^\text{k}\); because not pretending that themselves were the Messias, but pretending some of those, whereof they made that fulness of the Godhead which they preached to consist, to be the Messias. Among the Jews, all, that ever took upon them to be the Messias, besides our Lord Jesus, are properly antichrists; among whom Barcochab under Adrian was eminent\(^\text{1}\).

§ 39. But there is reason enough to reckon Manicheus and Mahomet both of that rank: as undertaking to be that to their followers, which the Jews expected of the Messias; to save them from their enemies, and to give them the world to come. For Manichæus seems indeed to have given himself the name of Menahem, signifying in the Hebrew the same as Paracletus in Greek; because he pretended to be assumed by the Holy Ghost\(^\text{m}\); as not he but Christians\(^\text{n}\) believe, that the Word of God assumed the Manhood of

\(^{\text{a}}\) Quoted above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xii. § 2. note b, and § 16, 17.

\(^{\text{b}}\) Quoted ibid., § 2. note c.


\(^{\text{k}}\) See above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xii. § 19, 20.


\(^{\text{m}}\) "Quapropter quoniam sive missionis sive respecti a Paracletos se Manicheus vester affirmat," &c. S. Aug., Cont. Epist. Manichei quam vocant Fundamenti, c. vii. § 8; Op. tom. viii. p. 155. G.—"Superbia... impulit hominem, ut non missum se a Paracletos vellet videri, sed suae speciem ut ipse Paracletos diceretur. Sic..." &c. "Matus Chatus homo non a Dei Filio, id est Virtute et Sapientia Dei, per quam facta sunt omnia, missum est; sed sua susceptum secundum Catholicam..." incipit ut Ipse esset Dei Filius:... sic se ille voluit a Spiritu Sancto... videri esse susceputum, ut jam cum audimus Manicheum Spiritum Sanctum, intellegamus apostolum Jesum Christum," &c. Id., ibid., c. vi. § 7. p. 155. B. C.

"Manes was called by his followers Manicheus, "deviantes nomen in sansem," according to S. Augustin, De Haer., c. xlii. Op. tom. viii. p. 13. F. And his more learned followers, "eminenita a lettera, Manicheum vocant, quasi manna fundentem" (Id., ibid.). דפיט is the Hebrew for "consolator."

\(^{\text{n}}\) "A Manichee not reputed a Christian." Added in margin in MS.
Christ. But when he writ himself "apostle of Jesus Christ" in the head of his epistle called "The Foundation," which St. Augustin writes against: it was not with an intent to acknowledge our Lord the true Christ, Whose coming he made imaginary and only in appearance; but to seduce Christians (with a colourful pretence of the name of Christ, and some ends of the Gospels, as you heard Epiphanius say) to take himself for that, which Christ is indeed to Christians. St. Augustin, Contra Epist. Fund. cap. vi[II]., suspecteth, that he intended to foist in himself to be worshipped instead of Christ by those, whom he seduced from Christ; and shews you his reason for it there. But whether worshipped or not (for it cannot be said, that Mahomet pretended to be worshipped for God by his followers): though he could not be that, which our Lord Christ is to Christians, unless he were worshipped for God; yet he might be that, which the Messias was expected to be to the Jews, in saving them through this world unto the world to come.

§ 40. Whether Christians are to expect a greater antichrist than any of these towards the end of the world, or not, is a thing no way clear by the Scriptures; and the authority of the fathers is no evidence in a matter, which evidently belongs not to the rule of faith. It is not enough, that St. John saith, "Ye know that the antichrist is coming"—"ο ἀντίχριστος" (1 John ii. 18): for how many thousand articles are there, that signify no such eminence; and, therefore, how shall it appear to signify here any more than him that


† "Nec fuisse (Christum) in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem verum etiam resurrectionem simili sermenti retur." 8c. Aug., De Haer., c. xlvii. Manichaei; Op. tom. viii. p. 16. F.


§ "Quid ergo aliud suspicis nescio, nisi quia istic Manichaeus, qui per Christi nomen ad imperitiorum animos aditum querit, pro Christo Ipso se coli voluit?" S. Aug., as in note m above, c. viii. § 8. p. 156. B.

† Id., ibid.

‡ "Inter eos autem unus futurus erat cæteris eminentior, ad quem pro prolocus ille Joh. v. 43. pertinent." Grotius, ad 1 Joh. ii. 18: interpreting it however of Barcochab.
pretends to be the Christ? For it is evident, that St. John, 
both there and 1 John iv. 3, speaks of his own time. 

§ 41. As for the Revelation: neither is it any where said, 
that it prophesieth any thing of antichrist; nor will it be 
proved, that it saith any thing of the pope. Much of it, 
being a prophecy, hath been expounded to [an\textsuperscript{z}] appearance 
of something like the pope, though with violence enough; 
all of it, without prophesying what shall come to pass, could 
ever be expounded to that purpose. And is it\textsuperscript{y} not strange, 
that so great a foundation should be laid upon the event of 
an obscure scripture (such as all prophecies are), to be con-
jectured by that which we think we see come to pass? For 
I refer to judgment, how much more appearance there is, 
that it intendeth the vengeance of God upon the pagan em-
pire of Rome for persecuting Christianity\textsuperscript{y}; both in the text 
and composure of the prophecy, and in the pretence of ten-
dering and addressing it.

§ 42. Nor is there any thing more effectual to prove the 
[The idolat-
ries it speaks of, 
heathen; 
not such as may be found in the Church 
of Rome.] 
the same than the idolatries, which it specifies that the Chris-
tians chose rather to lay down their lives than commit\textsuperscript{a}. 
True it is, no man can warrant, that by praying to saints for 
the same things that we pray to God for, and by the worship 
of images, idolatry may not come in at the back door to the 
Church of Rome\textsuperscript{b}; which Christianity shuts out at the great 
gate. But if it do, the difference will be visible between that 
and the idolatry of pagans, that profess variety of imaginary 
deities, by those circumstances, which in the Apocalypse 
expressly describe the idolatries of the heathen empire of 
Rome\textsuperscript{c}.

§ 43. And therefore I am forced utterly to discharge the 
[The pope 
cannot be antichrist.] 
Church of Rome of this imputation; and to resolve, that the 
pope can no more be antichrist, than he, that holds by pro-
fessing our Lord to be the Christ, and to honour Him for

* See Grot. ad loc.
* Corrected from MS.: "all" in folio edition.
* Corrected from MS.: "it is" in folio edition.
* See above, Review of Rt. of Ch. in 
Chr. St., cc. i. § 16, v. § 31—53; and 
Epilogue, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. 
Tr., c. xxiii. § 18, sq.: and com-
pare Bossuet's interpretation, quoted in 
Wordsworth's Apocalypse, Appendix 
F., p. 146.
* See the passages referred to in last 
note.
* See above, Bk. III. Of the Laws 
of the Ch., c. xxxi.
* See the references in note z.
God as the Christ is honoured by Christians, can himself pretend to be the Christ.

§ 44. Nay, though I sincerely blame the imposing of new articles upon the faith of Christians; and that, of positions which I maintain not to be true: yet I must and do freely profess, that I find no position necessary to salvation prohibited, none destructive to salvation enjoined to be believed, by it. And, therefore, must I necessarily accept it for a true Church; as in the Church of England I have always known it accepted: seeing there can no question be made, that it continueth the same visible body by the succession of pastors and laws (the present customs in force being visibly the corruption of those which the Church had from the beginning), that first was founded by the apostles.

§ 45. For the idolatries,—which I grant to be possible, though not necessary, to be found in it, by the ignorance and carnal affections of particulars, not by command of the Church or the laws of it,—I do not admit to destroy the salvation of those, who, living in the communion thereof, are not guilty of the like.

§ 46. There remains, therefore, in the present Church of Rome the profession of all that truth, which it is necessary to the salvation of all Christians to believe either in point of faith or manners: very much darkened, indeed, by enhancing of positions, either of a doubtful sense, or absolutely false, to the rank and degree of matters of faith; but much more overwhelmed and choked with a deal of rubbish, opinions, traditions, customs, and ceremonies (allowed indeed but no way enjoined), which make that noise in the public profession and create so much business in the practice of religion among them, that it is a thing very difficult for simple Christians to discern the pearl, the seed, and the leaven of the gospel (buried in the earth and the dough of popular doctrines and observations), so as to embrace it with that affection of faith and love, which the price of it requires. But if it be true, as I said afore, that no man is obliged to commit those idola-

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{d}}\text{ See Just Weights and Measures, c. i. : and Bramhall, Just Vindic., c. vi. ; &c.: and Works Pt. i. Disc. ii. vol. i. pp. 197, 198: and elsewhere.---And see ample references in Browne's Exposition of XXXIX. Articles, Art. xix. sect. 1. in fin.}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{e}}\text{ See Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxxi. § 42—50.}\]
tries, that are possible to be committed in that communion; it will not be impossible for a discerning Christian to pass through that multitude of doctrines and observations (the business whereof, being merely circumstantial to Christianity, allows not that zeal and affection to be exercised upon the principal as is spent upon the accessory) without superstition and will-worship, in placing the service of God in the husk and not in the kernel, or promising himself the favour of God upon considerations impertinent to Christianity.

§ 47. As for the half-sacrament, the service in an unknown language, the barring the people from the Scriptures, and other laws manifestly intercepting the means of salvation, which God hath allowed His people by the Church: it seems very reasonable to say, that the fault is not the fault of particular Christians; who may and perhaps do many times wish, that the matter were otherwise; but that, the Church being a society concluding all by the act of those who conclude it, there is no cause to imagine, that God will impute to the guilt and damnation of those who could not help it, that which they are sufferers in, and not actors.

§ 48. Nay, 'tis much to be feared, that the authors themselves of such hard laws, and those who maintain them, will have a strong plea for themselves at the day of judgment, in the unreasonableness of their adversaries:—that it is true all reason required, that the means of salvation provided by God should be ministered by the Church; but, finding the pretence of reformation without other ground than that sense of the Scriptures which every man may imagine, and therefore without other bounds and measure than that which imagination (for which there are no bounds) fixeth, they thought it necessary so to carry matters, as never to acknowledge that the Church ever erred in any decree or law that it hath made; lest the same error might be thought to take place in the substance of Christianity, and the reformation of the Church to consist in the renouncing of it (which we see come to pass in the heresy of Socinus): and that, finding the unity of the Church which they were trusted with absolutely necessary to the maintenance of the common Christianity, whereby salvation is possible to be had (though
more difficult, by denying those helps to salvation which such laws intercept), they thought themselves tied for the good of the whole not to give way to laws, tending so apparently to the salvation of particular Christians.

§ 49. On the other side, supposing the premisses, there remains no pretence, that either Congregations or Presbyteries can be Churches: as founded merely upon human usurpation, which is schism; not upon Divine institution, which ordereth all Churches to be fit to constitute one Church, which is the whole. I need not say, that there can be no pretence for any authority visibly conveyed to them by those which set them up, having it in themselves before.

§ 50. I do not deny, that a Christian may attain to a kind of moral assurance concerning the sincerity of another Christian, that he is in the state of grace and endowed with God’s Spirit: not by any immediate dictate of the Holy Ghost to his own heart, which is not promised to that purpose; not by any vehemence or suddenness in the change which made him so, enabling him to design the time and place and means by which it came to pass, that it may appear the work of God’s Spirit, preventing and swallowing up all concurrence of his own free choice; for this the change of the end and design of a man’s whole life and the course of it admits not: but by force of those arguments and effects of it, visible in his conversation, which the prudence of a sincere Christian can impute to nothing else. But I deny, therefore, that every true Christian can, by the ordinary means which God allows, be so assured of the sincerity of other true Christians, as thereby to be privileged to forsake the Church of God in which they live, as consisting of others as well as of such; to retire themselves into Congregations, in which they may serve God in that order, which the sincerity of their Christianity assureth them to contain the purity of God’s ordinances. For it is manifest, that the gift of God’s Spirit, requisite to the salvation of all Christians, is not promised to this effect, as to give them that discretion, which enables to value the consequence of such appearances. And if it were; and if all true Christians could attain assurance of all Christians of whom the question may be made, whether true Christians or not: yet hath not God provided, that the
truest and sincerest Christians retire themselves from communion with those, of whom there is no reasonable presumption that they are such, but are only qualified members of the Church by such laws, as may comprise all the world, professing Christianity, in the communion of the Church.

§ 51. For whatsoever our Lord hath foretold of the Church in the Gospel, as of a net that catcheth both good and bad fish, as of a floor containing chaff as well as grain, as of a flock containing goats as well as sheep (as the ark contained as well unclean beasts as clean); necessarily falls upon the visible Church (and hath been so accepted by the Church in the case of the Donatists): to assure us, that the good are not defiled by communion with the bad, but obliged to live in it for the exercise of their charity and patience in seeking their amendment. For separation upon pretence of satisfaction in the Christianity of some, to them who profess not to have it of others; as it carrieth in it a necessary appearance of spiritual pride in overseeing all those that concur not in it, so it sets up a banner to the imposture of hypocrites, and turns the pretence of sincere Christianity to the justifying of whatsoever it is that a faction so constituted shall take for it: not measuring men's persons by the common Christianity, but the common Christianity by that which appears in the persons of those, who without due grounds are supposed true Christians exclusively to others.

§ 52. The ground of Congregations being thus void, the constitution of them must needs involve the sacrilege of schism in the work; and therefore a nullity in the effects of it: the baptism which they give, void of the effect of grace; the eucharist, though consecrated in the form of the Church, (which it is not to be doubted, that the Novatians, Meletians, and Donatists held), because they are not blamed in it; nor do I doubt that Tertullian's Montanists did the like, whatsoever abuse might come in among them afterwards by being separated from the Church), void of the thing signified by it;

---


That all these sects were in the first instance schisms, without the addition of heretical tenets, see bk. 111.

Of the Laws of the Ch., c. x. § 5: and Just Weights and Measures, c. ii. § 9, c. xxv. § 4.

See ibid.—Nothing appears to be laid to their charge on the subject, in Tillemont, Méin. Eccl., tom. ii. art. Montanistes.
the prayers of the Church void of that effect which the promise of hearing the prayers thereof importeth, whatsoever offices the Church exerciseth and solemnizeth therewith.

§ 53. How much more the constitution of Presbyteries, which, pretending no such thing as separating the clean from the unclean, admits to the communion upon no further pretence of reformation, than answering the Assembly’s Catechism at the demand of triers; constituted by those, who contrary to that solemn promise upon supposition whereof they were advanced to orders in the Church of England, usurp the power (not of their bishops but) of the whole Church, in prescribing an order of ecclesiastical communion in all offices of the Church without warrant from it; ordaining those, who undertake to warrant the salvation of souls (as sufficiently provided for thereby) by becoming their ministers, to be their ministers. For what pretence can colour this usurpation, can obscure the sacrilege of schism in the act, the nullity of God’s promises in the effect of it when the difference consists in renouncing that authority, which themselves deny not to have been in possession according to God’s law, pretending further so strongly as they know by virtue of it; in disclaiming single heads of Churches, and the clergy that think themselves bound to do nothing without them, though limited both by the law of the Church and the law of the land; and in setting up themselves in their stead to manage that authority, without the exercise whereof themselves believe Christianity cannot subsist, by presbyteries and synods. As if the tyranny of an oligarchy were not more insufferable than the tyranny of a monarch. Or as if there were not presumption of tyrannizing in those, who find themselves free from the bond of these laws, which fall to the ground with the authority that used them, to use the authority they usurp at their own discretion; which is necessarily the law of all government, that is not limited by laws which it acknowledgeth.

§ 54. For if they allege, that they provide us a confession of faith (which is a strange allegation, not alleging either [Still more so the Presbyteries.]

k See Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. viii. § 16. notes c, f: and above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xi. § 25. note m, and c. xvi.

1 See above, § 19.

= See above, § 11.
what we wanted before or what we get by it); I shall quickly bring them to the trial, by demanding of them to spue out that damnable heresy of Antinomians and Enthusiasts, in turning the covenant of baptism into an absolute promise of life everlasting to them for whom Christ died, without conditioning that they believe and live like Christians\(^a\): which they can never do without contradicting themselves, until they make that faith which only justifieth to consist in that loyalty, wherewith a man undertakes his baptism, out of a choice, the freedom whereof excludes all predetermination of the will, though by that grace which effectually brings it to pass. For this condition, making all assurance of salvation the fruit of justifying faith, not the act of it (as if one could be assured of it by believing that he is sure of it), obligeth a man to his Christianity for that very reason, which first moves all men to be Christians; to obtain the promise which depends upon the performing of it.

§ 55. The substance therefore of Christianity consisting in it, that baptism which enacteth it not, that eucharist which restoreth and establisheth it not, is not baptism or the eucharist, but by equivocation of words\(^a\); which so long as we are not secured of, how should the word and sacraments, which such establishments hold forth, be that word and those sacraments, which are the marks of God's Church?

§ 56. And are they not revenged of the seven sacraments in the Church of Rome beyond the measure of moderate defence, who, to renounce them for sacraments, suppress the offices which by them are solemnized? If they allow the baptism of infants and the covenant of baptism, what reason can they have to abolish the solemn profession of it at years of discretion, with the blessing of the Church, for the performance of that to which their profession obliges\(^?\)? What account will they give, either for not blessing marriages\(^?\), leaving private Christians to contract without the authority of the Church; or for blessing them, without being warranted by the law of the Church that they are such as Christianity omissions Confirmation altogether.

\(^a\) See above, § 11.
\(^b\) See above, § 12—15.
\(^c\) See Just Weights and Measures, c. xxi. § 11.—It is almost needless to say that the Westminster Directory omits Confirmation altogether.
\(^d\) See Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. viii. § 12; and above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxx. § 20.
alloweth? Are they not most Christianly revenged of extreme unction by providing no visitation for the sick of auricular confession, by confining the keys of the Church to the taking away, not of sin from before God, but of scandal from before the Church? Ordinations, I marvel not, that all are forced to maintain; for how should altar be set up against altar, not providing who should minister at it?

§ 57. As for the ceremonies and circumstances of God's service, doth not superstitious strictness in abolishing them oblige reasonable men to think, that they imagine themselves no less acceptable to God for neglecting them, that the papists for multiplying them beyond that which the order of them to their end can require? That the memories of the saints should be fit occasions of serving God (which the Christianity of the ancient Church made one of the most powerful means to extinguish heathenism), is now so abhorred, as if we had found out some other Christianity than that which it served to introduce. That there should be times of fasting, is so far from the care of reformers, as if there were no such office of Christianity to be exercised by God's Church. In fine, what is become of the substance, while we talk of ceremony and circumstance? Whether churches were provided, revenues founded, persons consecrated, to the intent, that the service of God might daily and hourly sound in them, by the psalms of His praises, by the instruction of His word, by the prayers of His people, by the continual celebration of the eucharist: or that there should be two sermons a Sunday, with a prayer at the discretion of
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* See Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. viii. § 14, for the extent to which this holds of the Presbyterian Directory. And for Thornhicle's meaning, see Just Weights and Measures, c. xxi. § 11; and c. xvi. § 6.
* See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. ix. § 2, note u, and references there.
* "Presbyterians and Independents. —Anabaptists also ordain, when they come to make congregations. Those, who slight it, cannot pretend to be of any Church." Added in margin in MS.—The Anabaptist Confession of Faith, A.D. 1646. § xxxvi., xxxvi. (Append. to Crosby’s Hist. of Baptists, vol. i. num. ii. p. 20), and the Confession of Faith of Several Congregations in the county of Somerset &c. in 1656, § xxxi. (ibid. num. iii. p. 52), both recognize ordination.—And even Quakers have a ceremony in some sense answering to ordination, i.e., a separation between those who minister and those who do not.
* See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxxi. § 57.
* See ibid. § 15; and c. xxii. § 28, 54; and Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. viii. § 2, 3.
* See above in Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. xxii. § 35, sq.; and Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. viii. § 5, 29—33.
him that preaches before and after it; provided nothing be done to signify that humility of mind, that reverence of heart, that devotion of spirit, which the awful majesty of God is to be served with: I report myself to the piety of Christendom from sun to sun. This I see,—woe worth my sins, that have made me live to see it!—an effectual course is taken, that the Church doors be always shut; and no serving God there, unless somebody preach.

§ 58. This is the sum of that, which the premisses enable me to allege, why I can have no part in the present reformation, so called. Besides the utter want of all pretence for authority: the whole title and pretence upon which, and the end to which, an equitable mind might question, whether ordinary authority though of God’s institution and appointment may be superseded in a case of extraordinary necessity, to restore the true faith and service of God (which all authority of the Church presupposeth for the ground, and proposeth for the end, of all communion with it), is found utterly wanting, upon the best enquiry that I have been able to make. I am to seek for a point, any one point, wherein I can justly grant that the change is not for the worse. Even that frequency of preaching, which was the outside of the business; even granting it to be by the rule of true faith, yet hath the performance of it been so visibly, so pitifully defective, that he must have a hard heart for our common Christianity, who can think, that there is wherewith to defend it from the scorn of unbelievers, had they nothing to do but to mind it.

§ 59. I confess, as afore I allowed the Church of Rome some excuse from the unreasonableness of their adversaries, so here, considering the horrible scandals given by that communion in standing so rigorously upon laws so visibly ruinous to the service of God and the advancement of Christianity, and the difficulty of finding that mean in which the truth stands between the extremes (as our Lord Christ between the thieves, saith Tertullian), I do not proceed to give the

Yet excuse to be found for Presbyterians in the horrible scandals given by the Church of Rome.


a "Revera quasi inter duos latrones crucifigitur Dominus, quomodo aliquando excitius idiotarum istorum ex utroque latere sacrilega convivia." Novatus, De
salvation of poor souls for lost, that are carried away with the pretence of reformation, in the change that is made, even to hate and persecute by word or by deed those who cannot allow it.

§ 60. For as for the appearance of heresy: though the mistake be dangerous to the soul, because if followed it becomes the principle of those actions, which "whoso doeth shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" yet it may be so tenderly held, as not to extinguish other points of Christianity, which necessarily contradict it. For though indeed they do not stand with it, yet it is possible, that those, who through the difficulty of finding the truth have swallowed a mistake, may not proceed to act according to the consequence of it; but of the rest of that Christianity, which they retain, and contradicteth it.

§ 61. For as for the authority of the Church (the neglect whereof creates that obstinacy, in consideration whereof heresy is held heretically): the rigorousness of the Church of Rome extending it beyond all bounds that our common Christianity can allow, and necessitating well-disposed Christians to wave it; what marvel, if, the due bounds becoming invisible to common sense, by communion with the Church, the misprison of heresy possess them with the esteem of Christianity? and the difficulty of avoiding the temptation create an excuse to God for them, whose intentions are single?

§ 62. As for the crime of schism, justly sticking to them, who [presume\(^d\)] upon their understanding in the Scriptures by the Scriptures alone, which God hath nowhere promised to assist without using the helps which He hath provided by His Church: though the sacrilege thereof justly render void of effect the ordinances of God, which are ministered by virtue of that usurpation which it involveth; yet, there being abundance of souls that may live and die without knowing any better, much less that can ever be able to judge the best upon true principles,—why should I not hope,

that God, passing by the nullities which it createth, will make good the effect of His grace to those, who with singleness of heart seek it in a wrong way, when by His law He cannot be tied to concur to the means?

§ 63. But this resolution, being the result of the premisses, demonstrateth, how much reason the parties (that is, those who create the parties by heading the division) have to look about them; lest they become guilty of the greatest part of souls, which in reason must needs perish by the extremities in which it consisteth. And the representing of the grounds thereof unto the parties, though it may seem an office unnecessary for a private Christian to undertake, yet seemeth to me so free from all imputation of offence, in discharging of our common Christianity and the obligation of it; that I am no less willing to undergo any offence which it may bring upon me, than I am to want the advantages, which allowing the present Reformation might give me.

§ 64. In the mean time, I remain obliged not to repent me of the resolution of my nonage, to remain in the communion of the Church of England. There I find an authority visibly derived from the act of the apostles by means of their successors. Nor ought it to be of force to question the validity thereof, that the Church of Rome and the communion thereof acknowledgeth not the ordinances and other acts which are done by virtue of it, as done without the consent of the whole Church; which it is true did visibly concur to the authorizing of all acts done by the clergy, as constituted by virtue of those laws which all did acknowledge, and under the profession of executing the offices of their several orders according to the same.

§ 65. For the issue of that dispute will be triable by the cause of limiting the exercise of them to those terms, which the reformation thereof containeth: which if they prove such, as the common Christianity, expressed in the Scriptures expounded by the original practice of the whole Church, renderers necessary to be maintained, notwithstanding the rest of the Church agree not in them; the blame of separation, that

---

"Th. Gospel, His law now in force." Added in margin in MS.

* See Bramhall, Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated, c. viii.; Works Pt. i. Disc. v. vol. iii. p. 115.

† See note g. Oxf. 1844.
hath ensued thereupon, will not be chargeable upon them that retire themselves to them for the salvation of Christian souls, but on them who refuse all reasonable compliance in concurring to that which may seem any way tolerable. But towards that trial, that which hath been said must suffice.

§ 66. The substance of that Christianity which all must be saved by, when all disputes and decrees and contradictions are at an end, is more properly maintained in that simplicity, which all that are concerned are capable of, by the terms of that baptism which it ministereth (requiring the profession of them from all that are confirmed at years of discretion); than all the disputes on both sides, than all decrees on the one side, all confessions of faith on the other side, have been able to deliver it. And I conceive I have some ground to say so great a word; having been able, by limiting the term of justifying faith in the writings of the apostles, according to the same, to resolve upon what terms both sides are to agree, if they will not set up the rest of their division upon something which the truth of Christianity justifieth not, on either side. For by admitting Christianity (that is, the sincere profession thereof) to be the faith which only justifieth, in the writings of the apostles; whatsoever is in difference as concerning the covenant of grace, is resolved, without prejudicing either the necessity of grace to the undertaking, the performing, the accepting of it, for the reward; or the necessity of good works in consideration for the same.

§ 67. The substance of Christianity (about which there is any difference) being thus secured; there remains no question concerning baptism and the eucharist, to the effect for which they are instituted, being ministered upon this ground, and the profession of it, with the form which the Catholic Church requireth to the consecration of the eucharist. Nor doth the Church of England either make sacraments of the rest of the seven; or abolish the offices, because the Church of Rome makes them sacraments. Nor wanteth it an order for the daily morning and evening service of God, for the celebration of festivals, and times of fasting, for the observa-

* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. vii. § 1, sq.
tion of ceremonies, fit to create that devotion and reverence which they signify to vulgar understandings in the service of God. But praying to saints, and worshipping of images, or of the eucharist, prayers for the delivery of the dead out of purgatory, the communion in one kind, masses without communions, being additions to or detractions from that simplicity of God's service, which the original order of the Church delivereth, visible to common reason, comparing the present order of the Church of Rome with the Scriptures and primitive records of the Church; there is no cause to think, that the Catholic Church is disowned by laying them aside.

§ 68. It is true, it was an extraordinary act of secular power in Church-matters to enforce the change without any consent from the greater part of the Church. But if the matter of the change be the restoring of laws, which our common Christianity as well as the primitive orders of the Church (of both which Christian powers are born protectors) make requisite; the secular power acteth within the sphere of it, and the division is not imputable to them that make the change, but to them that refuse their concurrence to it.

§ 69. Well had it been, had that most pious and necessary desire thereof to restore public penance, been seconded by the zeal and compliance of all estates; and not stifled by the tares of puritanism, growing up with the reformation of it. For as there can be no just pretence of reformation, when the effect of it is not the frequentation of God's public service in that form which it restoreth, but the suppressing of it in that form which it rejecteth; so, the communion of the eucharist being the chief office in which it consisteth, the abolishing of private masses is an insufficient pretence for reformation, where that provision for the frequenting of the communion is not made, which the restoring of the order in force before private masses came in requireth. Nor can any mean be imagined to maintain continual communion with that purity of conscience which the holiness of Christianity requireth, but the restoring of penance.

§ 70. In fine, if any thing may have been defective or...
amiss in that order which the Church of England establisheth, it is but justice to compare it in gross with both extremes which it avoideth: and, considering that it is not any private man to make the body of the Church such as they could wish to serve God with, to rest content, in the he is not obliged to become a party to those things which he approves not; conforming himself to the order in force in hope of that grace, which communion with the Church the offices of God’s service promiseth.

§ 71. For consider again, what means of salvation Christians have by communion with the Church of Rome. All are bound to be at mass on every festival day, but to say only so many Paters and so many Aves as belong to the hour; not to assist with their devotions that which they understand not, much less to communicate. All are bound to communicate once a year at Easter: and, before they do it, to say they are sorry for the sins they confess; undertaking the penance which is enjoined, not for cleansing the sin, but to remain for purgatory, if they do it not here. The like at the point of death, with extreme unction over and above. Within the compass of this law, Christians may fall into the hands of conscientious curates and confessors, that shall not fail to instruct them, wherein their Christianity and salvation consists, and how they are to serve God “in spirit and in truth;” preferring the principal before the accessory. Rubbish of ceremonies and observations, indifferent of themselves, but which spend the strength of the seed and root of Christianity in leaves and chaff without fruit. But they may also fall under such, as shall direct them to look upon the virtue of the sacrifice, that is repeated in the mass, and promise themselves the benefit thereof by “the work done” without their assistance; to look upon their penance only

1 See Van Espen, Jus Eccles., P. II. Sect. ii. tit. ii. c. 2. § 11, sq., stating the ancient discipline, and adding (§ 15) that “ex hac disciplina in pluribus ecclesiis parochialis... remanit usus horarum canonizarum saltem pro maior parte diebus dominicis et festis de-cantandarum; ut nimimum populus his diebus ad ecclesiam istis horis conveniret.” The council of Trent (Sess. xxiii. Decret. de Observandis et Evitandis in Celebratione Missae, ap. Labb. Conc. tom. xiv. p. 857. C) bids the priests “moneant eundem populum, ut frequentem ad suas parochias, saltem diebus dominicis et majoribus festis, sequantur.”—See also above in Bk. III. of the Laws of the Ch., c. v. § 24, 26

2 See Epilogue, ibid. c. x. § 24, note s, c. xi. § 16.

3 Misprinted 421 in folio edition.
as that, which must be paid for in purgatory if not done here; to do as the Church does, and to believe as it believes, promising themselves salvation by being of communion there-with, though it import no more than I have said: nay, though they be directed such devotions as are common to God with His creature, as spend the seed of Christianity in the chaff of observations, impertinent to the end of it

§ 72. On the other side, departing thence to Congregations and Presbyteries, what means of salvation shall a Christian have? Two sermons a Sunday, and a prayer before and after each; but whether it be the word of God or his that preaches, whether Christianity allow to pray as he prays or not, no rule to secure; and whether Christian liberty allow, that men be tied to serve God from Sunday to Sunday or not, until God's Spirit indite what every man shall say to God, no way resolved. A man may possibly light upon him, that does not take justifying faith to consist in believing that a man is of the elect for whom alone Christ died; or that, believing it, presses the consequences, which contradict his own premisses, as if he did not. But how easy is it to light upon him, that draws the true conclusion from the premisses which he professeth, and maketh mere popery of the whole duty of a Christian? Certainly the Church of Rome holdeth no error in the faith any thing near so pernicious as this. That of transubstantiation is but a flea-bite in comparison of it. He, who by reason of his education is afraid to think that the elements remain; is he therefore become incapable of the Spirit of God conveyed by the Body and Blood of our Lord in the sacrament? And certainly that is the prime interest of our Christianity in it; though the bodily presence of the elements is no way prejudicial to the same. But whoso believeth he hath God's word for his salvation, not supposing any condition requisite, may think himself tied to live like a Christian, but by no means but by holding contradictions at once: which though all men by consequence do, because all err; yet, in matters of so high consequence, to do it cannot be without prejudice to the work of Christianity, and

1 See above, Bk. III. Of the Laws of the Ch., c. v. § 24, sq.; c. xxxvi. § 27, sq.; and Just Weights and Measures, c. xxi. § 13.
2 See ibid. c. xxv. § 1, sq.
3 See ibid. § 9—12.
dangerous to the salvation it promiseth. Nor can baptism or the eucharist be baptism or the eucharist but equivocally, to them that allow the true consequence of this.

§ 73. And shall any man persuade me, that, unless a man will swear that which no man is able to shew that a Christian may swear, he perishes without help for want of this communion so obtained? Or, on the other side, that his salvation can be secured, who, to obtain that means of salvation which Congregations or Presbyteries tender, concur[s] to the open act of schism which they do? So necessary is it for me to continue in the resolution of my nonage; as being convinced, upon a new inquiry, that the means of salvation are more sufficient, more agreeable for substance to the Scriptures expounded by the original practice of the whole Church (though perhaps not for form), in that mean than in either extreme.

§ 74. This resolution then being thus grounded, what alteration can the present calamity of the Church of England make in it, to persuade a man to believe those articles which the bull of Pius IV. addeth to the common faith; to maintain whatsoever is once grown a custom in the Church of Rome, as for that service of God, which it destroyeth? Or, on the other side, to become a party to that express act of schism, with misprision of heresy involved in it, which the erecting of Congregations and Presbyteries importeth? Epiphanius mentioneth one Zacchæus in Syria, that retired himself from communion with the Church to serve God alone. If the force of the sword destroy the opportunities and means of yielding God that service, which a man's Christianity professed upon mature choice requireth; shall it be imputable to him, that, desiring to serve God with his Church, he is excluded by them, who ground their commu-

---

* See above, § 25.
* See above, § 54.
+ See Thorndike's Letter on the Present State of Religion among us. The text was written A.D. 1659.
  "Ἤλλων ἑγών ἀδελφῶν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ ἐπάθω ἰκανών καθεμισῶν," κ.τ.λ.
  "Ἀτέρων δὲ, ἐπὶ προείσθω, οὐκ ἄρκας, ἄλλα κατὰ τῆν πράξειν νῦν, τυπικῶς παρὰ τὴν ἀληθείαν νευειομένων.

nion upon conditions which the common Christianity allow-eth not? Or to them, by whom he is so excluded?

§ 75. I can only say to the scattered remains of the Church of England,—whose communion I cherish, because it standeth upon those terms, which give me sufficient ground for the hope of salvation, which I have cherished from my cradle;—that the ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England, being no longer in force by the power of this world, are by consequence no longer a sufficient rule for the order of their communion in the offices of God's service; in which order the visibility of every Church consisteth. Not as if the nature of good and bad, in the matter of them, had suffered any change: but because, being the mean to preserve unity in the service of God upon those terms which the law of the land enforced, they are no sufficient mean to preserve it upon those terms, which only our Christianity requireth; to wit, that it be distinct from Congregations and Presbyteries, as well as from the Church of Rome. Which, in my opinion—making it necessary to the salvation of every Christian to communicate with the Catholic Church (that is, with a Church which ought to be a member of the whole Church),—is of great consequence. For neither is it actually and properly a Church, the order whereof in the service of God is not visible; nor is there sufficient means in that case for the effect of a Church, and of that visible order in which the being of a Church consisteth, towards the salvation of those who are of it or might be of it. And this is that, which must justify that which I have done in speaking out so far, what I conceive the rule of faith, what the laws of the Catholic Church, require to be provided for in every Church and every estate. For if they be not wanting to themselves, to their title, to the salvation of God's people; they have enough in the Scriptures, interpreted by the original tradition and practice of the whole Church, both to condemn the errors, which the ground of their communion obliges them to disown, and to give such a rule to the order of their communion in the offices of God's service, as the present state thereof, compared with the primitive state of those Christians who first succeeded the apostles, shall seem to require.

THORNDIKE.
§ 76. It is indeed a very great ease to me, that, having declared against untrue and unsufficient causes for dividing the Church (for which there can be no cause sufficient), I have owned the cause which I think sufficient for a particular Church to provide for itself without the consent of the whole. For by this means I secure myself from being accessory to schism, and the innumerable mischiefs which it produceth. But I confess this declaration makes me liable to a consequence of very great importance;—that there is no true mean, no just way to reconcile any difference in the Church, but upon those grounds and those terms which I propose. For supposing the society of the Church by God's law; upon what terms the least sucking heresy amongst us is reconcilable to the party from which it broke last (supposing it reconcilable upon the grounds and terms of our common Christianity), upon the same terms is the Reformation reconcileable to the Church of Rome, the Greek Church to the Latin, all parts to the whole, the Congregations and Presbyteries to the Church of England. Whereas, not proceeding upon those grounds, not standing on those terms, all pretence of reconciling even the Reformed among themselves will prove [but*] a mere pretence.

* Added from MS.

LAUS DEO.

FINIS.
ERRATA.

p. 484. note e. col. 1. l. 24, for § 20. read § 10.
— 504. — t, after Assembl. insert c. viii.
— 653. l. 11, for prosopopaea read prosopopæa.
— 690. - 22, — àdβao — àdβao.
— 714. note r, dele Ψ.

CORRIGENDUM.

p. 473. note u, and margin, p. 474. notes z, a, p. 475. notes f, k, p. 476. notes s, x; for Twysden read Selden. The Hist. Angl. Scriptt. X. was edited by Twysden, but the Preface was written by Selden.