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EDITOR'S PREFACE.

It may be desirable to state that my only share in the preparation of this edition of 'Pearson on the Creed,' consists in two matters. I. I have carefully revised the spelling and accentuation of the Latin and Greek quotations which form a large portion of the learned author's notes, and into which many inaccuracies had found their way in the course of time. II. I have prefixed to it a plain and simple outline of the contents of the Treatise, in the shape of an 'Analysis,' which I trust may be found useful to Candidates for Holy Orders, and to Divinity Students in general.

E. W.

Hampstead, N.W., Oct. 1867.
TO THE

RIGHT WORSHIPFUL AND WELL-BELOVED

THE PARISHIONERS OF ST. CLEMENT'S,
EASTCHEAP.

Mercy unto you, and peace, and love be multiplied.

If I should be at any time unmindful of your commands, you might well esteem me unworthy of your continued favours; and there is some reason to suspect I have incurred the interpretation of forgetfulness, having been so backward in the performance of my promises. Some years have passed since I preached unto you upon such texts of scripture as were on purpose selected in relation to the Creed, and was moved by you to make those meditations public. But you were pleased then to grant what my inclinations rather led me to, that they might be turned into an Exposition of the Creed itself; which, partly by the difficulty of the work undertaken, partly by the intervention of some other employments, hath taken me up thus long, for which I desire your pardon. And yet an happy excuse may be pleaded for my delay, meeting with a very great felicity, that as faith triumpheth in good works, so my Exposition of the Creed should be contemporary with the re-edifying of your church. For though I can have little temptation to believe that my book should last so long as that fabric, yet I am exceedingly pleased that they should begin together; that the publishing of the one should so agree with the opening of the other. This, I hope, may persuade you to forget my slackness, considering ye were not ready to your own expectation; your experience tells you the excuse of
church-work will be accepted in building, I beseech you let it not be denied in printing.

That blessed saint, by whose name your parish is known, was a fellow-labourer with St. Paul, and a successor of St. Peter; he had the honour to be numbered in the scripture with them "whose names are written in the book of life;" and when he had sealed the gospel with his blood, he was one of the first whose memory was perpetuated by the building a church to bear his name. Thus was St. Clement's church famous in Rome when Rome was famous for the "faith spoken of throughout the whole world." He wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians infested with a schism, in imitation of St. Paul, which obtained so great authority in the primitive times, that it was frequently read in their public congregations; and yet had for many hundred years been lost, till it was at last set forth out of the library of the late king.

Now as, by the providence of God, the memory of that primitive saint hath been restored in our age, so my design aimeth at nothing else but that the primitive faith may be revived. And therefore in this edition of the Creed, I shall speak to you but what St. Jude hath already spoken to the whole church: "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." If it were so needful for him then to write, and for them to whom he wrote to contend for the first faith, it will appear as needful for me now to follow his writing, and for you to imitate their earnestness, because the reason which he renders, as the cause of that necessity, is now more prevalent than it was at that time, or ever since. "For," saith he, "there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." The principles of Christianity are now as freely questioned as the most doubtful and controverted points; the grounds of faith are as safely denied as the most unnecessary super-
structions; that religion hath the greatest advantage which appeareth in the newest dress, as if we looked for another faith to be delivered to the saints: whereas in Christianity there can be no concerning truth which is not ancient; and whatsoever is truly new, is certainly false. Look then for purity in the fountain, and strive to embrace the first faith, to which you cannot have a more probable guide than the Creed, received in all ages of the church; and to this I refer you, as it leads you to the scriptures, from whence it was at first deduced, that while “those which are unskilful and unstable wrest” the words of God himself “unto their own damnation,” ye may receive so much instruction as may set you beyond the imputation of unskilfulness, and so much of confirmation as may place you out of the danger of instability; which as it hath been the constant endeavour, so shall it ever be the prayer, of him who, after so many encouragements of his labours amongst you, doth still desire to be known as

Your most faithful servant in the Lord,

John Pearson.
TO THE READER.

I have in this book undertaken an Exposition of the Creed, and think it necessary in this Preface to give a brief account of the work, lest any should either expect to find that here which was never intended, or conceive that which they meet with such as they expected not.

The Creed, without controversy, is a brief comprehension of the objects of our Christian faith, and is generally taken to contain all things necessary to be believed. Now whether all things necessary be contained there, concerneth not an Expositor to dispute, who is obliged to take notice of what is in it, but not to inquire into what is not: whether all truths comprehended in the same be of equal and absolute necessity, we are no way forced to declare; it being sufficient, as to the design of an Exposition, to interpret the words, and so deliver the sense, to demonstrate the truth of the sense delivered, and to manifest the proper necessity of each truth, how far, and in what degree, and to what purposes, it is necessary.

This therefore is the method which I proposed to myself, and have prosecuted in every Article. First, to settle the words of each Article, according to their antiquity and generality of reception in the Creed. Secondly, to explicate and unfold the terms, and to endeavour a right notion and conception of them as they are to be understood in the same. Thirdly, to shew what are those truths which are naturally contained in those terms so explicated, and to make it appear that they are truths indeed, by such arguments and reasons as are respectively proper to evidence the verity of them. Fourthly to declare what is the necessity of believing those truths, what efficacy and influence they have in the soul, and upon the life of a believer. Lastly, by a collection of all, briefly to deliver the
sum of every particular faith, so that every one, when he pronounceth the Creed, may know what he ought to intend, and what he is understood to profess, when he so pronounceth it.

In the prosecution of the whole, according to this method, I have considered, that a work of so general a concernment must be exposed to two kinds of readers, which though they may agree in judgment, yet must differ much in their capacities. Some there are who understand the original languages of the holy Scripture, the discourses and tractates of the ancient Fathers, the determinations of the Councils, and history of the Church of God, the constant profession of settled truths, the rise and increase of schisms and heresies. Others there are unacquainted with such conceptions, and uncapable of such instructions; who understand the Scriptures as they are translated; who are capable of the knowledge of the truths themselves, and of the proofs drawn from thence; who can apprehend the nature of the Christian faith, with the power and efficacy of the same, when it is delivered unto them out of the Word of God, and in the language which they know. When I make this difference, and distinction of readers, I do not intend thereby, that because one of these is learned, the other is ignorant; for he which hath no skill of the learned languages, may notwithstanding be very knowing in the principles of Christian religion, and the reason and efficacy of them.

According to this distinction I have contrived my Exposition, so that the body of it containeth fully what can be delivered and made intelligible in the English tongue, without inserting the least sentence or phrase of any learned language; by which he which is not acquainted with it might be disturbed in his reading, or interrupted in his understanding. Not that I have selected only such notions as are common, easy, and familiar of themselves, but have endeavoured to deliver the most material conceptions in the most plain and perspicuous manner; as desirous to comprise the whole strength of the work, as far as it is possible, in the body of it. The other part I have placed
in the margin, (but so as oftentimes it taketh up more room, and yet is never mingled or confounded with the rest,) in which is contained whatsoever is necessary for the illustration of any part of the Creed, as to them which have any knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages, of the writings of the ancient Fathers, the doctrines of the Jews, and the history of the Church; those great advantages toward a right perception of the Christian Religion.

Now being the Creed comprehendeth the principles of our religion, it must contain those truths which belong unto it as it is a religion, and those which concern it as it is ours. As it is a religion, it delivereth such principles as are to be acknowledged in natural theology, such as no man which worshippeth a God can deny; and therefore in the proof of these, I have made use of such arguments and reasons as are most proper to oppose the Atheists, who deny there is a God to be worshipped, a religion to be professed. As it is our religion, it is Christian and Catholic. As Christian, it containeth such truths as were delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and those especially concerning Christ himself, which I have prosecuted constantly with an eye to the Jews, who obstinately deny them, expecting still another Messias to come; wherefore I shew out of the Law and the Prophets which they acknowledge, what was foretold in every particular concerning the Messias, and prove all those to be completed by that Christ in whom we believe. As our religion is Catholic, it holdeth fast that faith which was once delivered to the saints, and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities, in opposition to the heretics arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new body of divinity in opposition to the Catholic theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is, upon the Word of God delivered in the Old and New Testament, alleged according to the true sense, and applied by
right reason; not urging the authority of the Church which
they reject, but only giving in the margin the sense of the
primitive Fathers, for the satisfaction of such as have any
respect left for antiquity, and are persuaded that Christ had a
true Church on the earth before these times.

In that part, which, after the demonstration of each truth,
teacheth the necessity of the believing it, and the peculiar
efficacy which it hath upon the life of a Christian, I have not
thought fit to expatiate or enlarge myself, but only to mention
such effects as flow naturally and immediately from the doctrine;
especially such as are delivered in the Scriptures; which I have
endeavoured to set forth with all possible plainness and per-
spicuity. And indeed in the whole work, as I have laid the
foundation upon the written word of God, so I have with much
diligence collected such places of Scripture as are pertinent to
each doctrine, and with great faithfulness delivered them as
they lie in the writings of those holy penmen; not referring
the reader to places named in the margin, (which too often I
find in many books multiplied to little purpose,) but producing
and interweaving the sentences of Scripture into the body of
my Exposition, so that the reader may understand the strength
of all my reason, without any further inquiry or consultation.
For if those words which I have produced prove not what I
have intended, I desire not any to think there is more in the
places named to maintain it.

At the conclusion of every distinct and several notion, I have
recollected briefly and plainly the sum of what hath been de-
ivered in the explication of it, and put it, as it were, into the
mouth of every Christian, thereby to express more fully his
faith, and to declare his profession. So that if the reader please
to put those collections together, he may at once see and per-
ceive what he is in the whole obliged to believe, and what he
is by the Church of God understood to profess, when he maketh
this public, ancient, and orthodox Confession of Faith.

I have nothing more to add; but only to pray, that the Lord
would give you and me a good understanding in all things.
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ANALYSIS

OF

PEARSON ON THE CREED.

ARTICLE I. Chapter 1. I BELIEVE.

1. The Creed, so called from "credo," I believe; which words must be understood not only before each article which the Creed contains, but before every single truth laid down in each article.

2. What, then, do we mean when we say, "I believe?" This to be considered,
   (1) As to faith; (2) as to the confession of faith; (3) as to the obligation of such belief and confession.

3. Belief defined to be an assent to that which is credible, as credible. This assent is primarily an act of the understanding.

4. But what do we mean by credible? The term excludes all self-evident truths (whether known directly by our reason or our senses) and matters capable of being scientifically proved either from their cause or their effect; for such things are called "self-evident" or "scientific," not "credible;" and on the other hand there are matters which, though apparently true, still leave room for doubt, and these are called "probable."

5. But where a thing propounded to us is neither self-evident, nor evident to our senses, nor scientifically certain, and yet rises above probability, not by a manifestation, but by attestation of the truth, this is said to be credible, and assent to this is "belief," or "faith."

6. What, then, is Christian faith? It will differ from ordinary faith according as the matter with which it is conversant differs from ordinary matters.

7. Now the credibility of objects differs according to the authority of the testimony on which it depends; and this, again, must depend on the authority of the testifier: and his authority must depend on (1) his knowledge, (2) his goodness.

8. Where the testifier is God, the acceptance of this testimony is said to be Divine faith; but where it is man, it is called human faith.

9. Now we are always proceeding in human affairs on this principle of faith, at all events where we think our informant to be well-informed and honest.

10. But when we have put before us for our acceptance the testimony of God, our assent to it is the highest kind of faith; for God is (1) infinitely wise and (2) infinitely good. He cannot be deceived, and he cannot deceive us.

11. But how is this testimony conveyed to us? By revelation; and this is either (1) immediate or (2) mediate.
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12. God revealed himself immediately to Adam, to Noah, to Abraham, to Moses, to Samuel; but he revealed himself to the Israelites mediately.  for,

13. These and the other prophets were but inspired instruments in the hand of God.

14. So also under the Gospel, God revealed himself immediately to the Apostles;

15. But the believers to whom the Apostles preached had these same truths revealed to them mediately.

16. The faith of the Israelites was an assent to the truths of the old law as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered to them in the writings of Moses and the prophets.

17. So also the faith of Christians is an assent to the truths of the Gospel as credible upon the testimony of the writings of the Apostles and prophets.

18. To "believe," at the head of the Creed, means to assent to the whole and every part of what has been so delivered to us; and to say "I believe," is to make a confession or outward expression of such faith.

19. Faith being invisible, needs some outward expression, for Christ established a visible body, the Church.

20. An outward profession of faith was required of all candidates for baptism; and this outward profession took the form of a Creed.

21. It is necessary to make some such a profession; for

(1) Truth loves the light.
(2) God has commanded it, and has promised to reward it.
(3) It adds mutual strength to Christians as a body.
(4) It tends to God's glory, as the concealment of it tends to his dishonour.

22. This Creed was therefore publicly professed at baptism, and at the celebration of the eucharist.

23. And the Creed is expressed in the singular number, not "we," but "I" believe; in order to bring home the necessity of a practical faith personally to each individual.

24. Summary of the meaning of the words "I believe."

**ARTICLE I. Chapter 2. I BELIEVE IN GOD.**

1. What, then, is the object of our faith? God: the first point of Christian belief is that God is.

2. This includes (1) the notion or name of God; (2) His existence; (3) His unity.

3. God is essentially God; and if other gods are spoken of, it is only metaphorically and accidentally. The idea of God includes (1) His self-existence; (2) the dependence of all other things on Him.

4. Some persons think that the idea of a God is innate in us; others are not of the same opinion.

5. But at any rate, when we see his creatures, we must acknowledge that there is a Creator.

6. The existence of God proved by reason. Whatever is made cannot have made itself; we are therefore driven to believe in something which never was made—a great First Cause.

7. The operations of nature, too, as we call them, are all directed to some common end, and are conducted by more than human foresight; and as the artist is towards works of art, such is God to the phenomena of the natural world,
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8. This is the concordant testimony of all nations, that there is a God.
9. And God himself has confirmed this belief by revealing himself, (1) by prophecy; (2) by miracles; (3) by conscience.
10. But why is it necessary to believe in God? Because all faith is vain, and all worship superfluous, without such a belief.
11. As a matter of fact, men in general are more prone to idolatry than to atheism; but our profession, "I believe in God," is a protest against both polytheistic and atheistic opinions; as
12. Is further explained in the corresponding clause of the Nicene Creed.
13. The unity of God is confirmed by reason. There can be only one First Cause; and if there were more Gods than one, then all perfections could not be in one; and the power of one God would clash with that of another.
14. God, therefore, is not only actually but essentially one.
15. Why it is necessary to be assured of the unity of the Godhead;
   (1) In order to concentrate our affections.
   (2) In order to give God the honour due to him.
16. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe in God."

Article I. Chapter 3. I Believe in God the Father.

1. But this one God is also a Father; so called even by the heathen.
2. He is a Father, and we are his sons, in many senses:—
   a. By our creation, in common with matter.
   b. In a higher sense as being created after his image.
   c. By our redemption.
   d. By our regeneration, which admits us to (1) grace here, and (2) to glory hereafter.
   e. By our adoption.
3. Faith in God is correspondingly necessary, as
   (1) The ground of filial duty.
   (2) The real spur to devotion.
   (3) Our solace in afflictions.
   (4) A motive to imitate him.
4. But there is a higher sense in which God is a Father; viz., the Father of Jesus Christ, who is his own Son by eternal generation (idios uios).
5. And this is the true and proper meaning of God's paternity, as shown by the apostolic commission (Matt. xxviii. 18, 19), and the Baptismal Creed, (Acts viii. 36, 37), which becomes to Christians the rule of faith in brief.
6. This interpretation is confirmed by the teaching of the early fathers.
7. But in what sense is God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ?
   (1) As he was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary (Luke i. 35).
   (2) As he was sent by the Father to be the King of Israel (John x. 35, 36).
   (3) As he was raised by him from the dead, and made heir of all things (Acts iii. 32, 33).
   (4) By eternal generation (Ps. cx. 4; John i. 1).
8. The excellency of this relation shown to consist (a) in the idea of priority; (b) in the fact that what the Father hath in himself, the Son hath by communication from him; for
9. The name of Son implies a derived essence.
10. We read of the Son and of the Spirit being "sent," but not so of the Father.
11. Where the three Persons of the Trinity are mentioned, the name of the Father usually is placed first; whence the ancient doctors of the Church call the Father, the origin, cause, author, root, and fountain of divinity.

12. This pre-eminence is expressed thus in terms; the Father, of whom are all things; the Son, by whom are all things.

13. The proper notion of the Father is that of an eternal, self-existing essence; that of the Son is of an eternal, but communicated essence.

14. Thus in the Bible the terms “God” and “Father” are often used for each other.

15. It is necessary to believe in God the Father,
   (1) In order to prevent polytheism.
   (2) Because salvation is promised only by access through Christ to the Father.

16. Summary of the meaning of the words “I believe in God the Father.”

ARTICLE I. Chapter 4. I BELIEVE IN GOD, THE FATHER ALMIGHTY.

1. Next in order to God's paternity, follows the idea of his omnipotence.
2. The term Almighty is (a) authoritative; implying universal dominion; (b) executive; implying ability to do all things.
3. (a) Under the former we include, (1) the right of making things as he wills, (2) the right of having and possessing them, (3) the right of using them.
4. Each of these three branches of the idea further considered.
5. A belief in this his almighty power and authority is needful,
   (1) To inspire us with reverence.
   (2) To prevent us from repining at misfortunes.
   (3) To make us esteem our blessings aright.
6. His almighty power is not only authoritative, but executive; and this latter quality flows from the former.
7. But its consideration is more conveniently deferred to the 6th article. (See below.)
8. Other significations attributed to the term considered.
9. Summary of the meaning of the words, “I believe in God, the Father Almighty.”

ARTICLE I. Chapter 5. MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH.

1. The omnipotence of God especially shown in the work of creation. What do we mean by “heaven and earth?” what by “creation?” to what Person do we ascribe that act?
2. By “heaven and earth” we mean all things.
3. This is proved in detail from the Scriptures.
4. All things, except himself, were made by God.
5. The world, then, is not self-existent, but was made.
6. Everything is either made or not made; the latter is God and God alone.
7. All things made contain, and, indeed, imply, some imperfection, for they admit of degrees.
8. Even the angels are created beings; and if so, much more are things visibly created also.
9. Though some philosophers held that the world is self-created and self-existent, yet their arguments are easily proved to be fallacious, being based on arguments and principles which human experience cannot verify or establish.
10. How the world was made, as to (1) its object or effect, (2) its cause or agent, (3) its time.

11. The word which we translate "created" does not necessarily mean "made out of nothing," although we must infer this fact from reason, and from God's word.

12. The idea of anything existing before God made it contradicts our idea of God's independence and all-sufficiency; and therefore wisely is the word "Almighty" placed before "Maker of heaven and earth."

13. The philosophic rule, "Ex nihilo nihil," is indeed the result of observation of the phenomena of the world; but we cannot argue, without a fallacy from things human to things divine; nor from the common law of generation to that which brought that generation about.

14. Things were created either (a) immediately or (b) medially. All things immaterial were made in the former, and things material in the latter way.

15. Next as to the Agent. He was moved (yet so as not to cease to be free), and he created all things.

16. He was moved, not by any outward impulse, but by his own intrinsic goodness; so that the world is not a necessary, but a voluntary emanation from him.

17. But with him to will was to perform.

18. Answer to the objection that the creature might have been produced from all eternity by the free determination of God's will.

19. Contradictions and other difficulties in the antiquity ascribed to the world by the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Assyrians.

20. We must therefore acknowledge a creation in time; probably nearly 6,000 years ago.

21. It follows that he who made all things is God the Father.

22. [This position excludes and refutes the supposition of there being two Gods, one the creator of goodness and light, the other of evil and darkness.]

23. It is necessary to profess our faith in this truth, as tending more especially,

(1) To promote God's glory.
(2) To lower the pride of man.
(3) To encourage us to cheerful and willing obedience.
(4) To console us under troubles.

24. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth."

Article II. I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.

Chapter 1. I believe in Jesus.

1. We believe not only in "the Father," but in "the Son."

2. Our Lord represented under a threefold description:—First as "Jesus Christ; secondly as "God's only Son;" and thirdly as "our Lord."

3. Meaning of the word, Jesus.
   a. It is a personal name, while the word Christ refers to his office.
   b. It is given to individuals in Holy Scripture.
   c. Those who bore it were types of our Lord, especially Joshua.

4. How Christ is a Saviour.
   a. Because he has revealed the way of salvation to man.
   b. Because he has procured the way of salvation for man.
   c. Because he has conferred salvation on man.
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5. Moses and Joshua types respectively of the Law and of the Gospel.
6. The two compared and contrasted.
7. A belief in a Saviour is necessary,
   a. From the nature of the thing.
   b. That we may rejoice in the name of Jesus.
   c. To kindle our love towards him.
   d. To strengthen us in our obedience to him.
8. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe in Jesus."

**ARTICLE II. Chapter 2. And in Jesus Christ.**

1. We believe that he who is Jesus by name is also Christ by office.
2. The meaning of the term "Christ" (ὁ Χριστός) = Messias = the Anointed.
3. Uses of anointing under the Law.
4. The Christ was expected by the Jews of old;
5. And foretold by Moses.
6. The time of his promised appearance was coincident with the birth of Jesus; this shown by (a) the prediction of Jacob; (b) the prophet Malachi.
7. Proof that Jesus was this Christ.
   a. He was born in Judæa at the time of the expected Messiah.
   b. Other prophecies were fulfilled in him and him alone.
   c. Such as the place, the family, the manner of his birth.
   d. His acts corresponded with the acts of the expected Messiah, his teaching, his miracles.
   e. His sufferings corresponded with the sufferings of the expected Messiah; (a) in his life, (b) in his death.
8. This proof corroborated by the fact that all nations came in and served him, as was foretold.
9. The general reception of the Gospel confirms the proof of the Messiahship of Jesus; for,
   a. In itself his doctrine was not likely to command success.
   b. In themselves his Apostles were not likely to command success.
   c. Their manner and address were not likely to command success.
10. All these things together prove Jesus to have been the Messias or Christ.
11. What was the end, and what the manner, of his anointing?
12. Under the old law (a) kings and (b) priests and (c) prophets were anointed.
13. The end of his anointing was the redemption or salvation of man.
14. Jesus was anointed to be a prophet, in the full sense of the term.
15. He was also anointed to the priestly office, which he exercised on earth, and now exercises in heaven.
16. He was also anointed to be a king.
17. And his regal power is shown (a) in the ruling of his people, (b) in the destruction of his enemies.
18. The manner of his anointing considered.
19. He was anointed, not with the customary oil; but
20. With the Holy Ghost, which that oil typified.
21. The meaning and uses of consecrating oil.
22. The conclusion drawn that "Jesus" and "the Christ" are one and the same person.
23. The necessity of believing this article shown more precisely.
24. The practical importance of this article on our Christian conduct.
25. The necessity of this belief shown in respect of his threefold office.
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26. The same further enforced by a consideration of the derivation of the word "Christian."
27. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe in Jesus Christ."

ARTICLE II. Chapter 3. His Only Son.

1. With the name of Christ that of the Son of God is inseparably connected.
2. "Only" means "only-begotten" (μονογενής).
3. Jesus Christ is the Son of God,
   a. As born of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary.
   b. As designed by God's special will to his high office.
   c. As raised by God from the dead.
   d. As appointed heir of all things.
4. But there is a higher sense in which he is a Son, a sense in which Adam was especially a type of him in respect of his creation or birth.
5. In order to prove this, we must establish several points.
6. Firstly, that he had an existence prior to his human birth, and distinct from it.
7. This proved negatively. The contrary supposition involves an absurdity.
8. And it is contrary to God's own word;
9. As, for instance, to the assertion that he came down from heaven.
10. Further, not only had the Son a priority of existence, but also a priority of long duration.
11. "Before Abraham was, I am!" the meaning of these words.
12. The Socinian interpretation of these words refuted.
13. But he "was" even before the Flood, and before Adam.
14. It was he "by" whom the Father created the world.
15. This asserted by St. Paul in his Epistles to the Hebrews and the Colossians.
16. And not only did he create the world, but he also preserves it.
17. Another creation, viz., a metaphorical one, is ascribed to Jesus Christ.
18. And this is our regeneration or new creation.
19. He created also the angels; but he has never created them anew.
20. This same doctrine asserted in the first Chapter of St. John's Gospel.
21. How the "Word" differs from Jesus and Christ.
22. The meaning of this term was known to the Jews.
23. The whole doctrine summed up briefly.
24. In his existence, prior to his being born of the Virgin Mary, he was truly God.
25. This asserted by St. Paul in Phil. ii. 6, 7. Already subsisting in the form of God, and being God, he emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, when he was born of the Virgin Mary.
26. The reality of his divine and of his human nature asserted.
27. This implied by the words, "I am Alpha and Omega," &c. (Rev. i. 11).
28. And by the words of Isaiah when he saw Christ's glory (Isa. vi. 1-3 and John xii, 41).
29. In the Scriptures Christ is frequently called God in a different sense from that in which the term is metaphorically used of men (Ps. lxxxii. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6).
30. The argument against Christ's divinity drawn from the Greek article refuted.
31. The divinity of Christ asserted by St. Paul in speaking of "the mystery of godliness" (1 Tim. iii, 16).
32. And in his address to the elders of the church at Ephesus (Acts xx. 28) (καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος).
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33. The meaning of the term Emmanuel.
34. The divinity of our Lord asserted by St. Thomas (John xx. 28).
35. Our Lord is also termed the true God (1 John v. 20).
36. He is called in Scripture by such other terms as are predicible only of God.
37. This divine essence Jesus Christ had by communication from the Father.
38. And as the divine essence is one and indivisible, he is of one substance (άυτούς) with the Father.
39. This communication of the divine essence is the same thing as the generation of the Son.
40. And consequently Christ is the Son of God.
41. And his is the most perfect kind of generation, seeing that the identity of nature in both is perfect.
42. Jesus Christ, therefore, is the only-begotten Son of God.
43. Refutation of heretical interpretations of this doctrine.
44. We are called sons of God in a different and lower sense: we receive the grace of God, he received the divine essence.
45. And though the essence which the Son received from the Father is the same as that which the Holy Ghost received, yet there is a difference in the mode of communication: the former was "begotten," the latter "proceedeth" from the Father.
46. The necessity of believing this doctrine shown, as
   a. Being the foundation of our faith in our redemption.
   b. Teaching us to honour Christ aright.
   c. Tending to confirm and increase our gratitude to God.
47. Brief summary of the meaning of the words "I believe in Christ, the only Son of God."

ARTICLE II. Chapter 4. OUR LORD.

1. His domination, or character as "our Lord," consequent on his sonship.
2. What is the meaning of the word, "Lord"? The title of "the Lord" given to Christ absolutely.
3. It signifies, as applied to Christ, more than human dominion.
4. In the Old Testament it is used as equivalent to Jehovah.
5. But used in this sense, is it applicable to Christ?
6. The Jews certainly deemed that Jehovah and the Messiah were one. This proved from Holy Scripture.
7. As "Jehovah" was applied to Christ in the Old Testament, so the title of "the Lord" is applied to Christ by the Apostles in the New Testament.
8. Markedly so by David, by Joel, and John the Baptist.
9. How is Christ "the Lord"? (a) As God, (b) as man.
10. As God, he created the world (John i. 1-3; Heb. i. 2).
11. As man, all things are made subject unto him (John v. 27, &c.); e. g. all judgment, power to forgive sins, power to change the Jewish law.
12. This power not fully given to him till he rose from the dead.
13. Of this power, part is temporary, part eternal.
14. His triumph over his enemies is of the former kind (1 Cor. xv. 24).
15. His sovereignty and rule are eternal (Luke i. 23; Dan. vii. 13, 14).
16. But whose Lord is Jesus Christ? He is "our" Lord: Lord of all persons (even of the angels) and of all things, except God.
17. But he is the Lord of us men in several ways:—
   (a) By creation; (b) by redemption; (c) by headship of the Christian family; (d) by virtue of the surrender of ourselves to him at our baptism.
18. The necessity of this belief on several grounds:—
   a. To discover to us our real condition as "not our own" (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20).
   b. To enforce upon us the duty of obedience.
   c. As a pattern for kings and rulers.
   d. For our comfort and assurance.
9. Summary of the meaning of the words "I believe in Christ our Lord."

ARTICLE III. WHICH WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY GHOST, BORN OF
THE VIRGIN MARY.

Chapter 1. WHICH WAS CONCEIVED.

1. The conception of Jesus Christ and his nativity two distinct things.
2. We must consider (a) him who was conceived and born; (b) him by whose
   operation he was conceived; (c) her who conceived and bore him.
3. He who was thus conceived and born was the Eternal Son of God, and this
   article teaches us the doctrine of the Incarnation.
4. It was "the Word" who "was made flesh;" God joined in His own
   person the human nature with the divine. The connection of this article
   with the following articles.
5. He who was made flesh was none other than "the Word."
6. He assumed a human nature at his conception,
7. Proofs of the reality of his human nature,
8. He took a human soul as well as a human body;
9. And in fact he took our whole perfect and complete nature; so that two whole
   and perfect natures exist distinct in him.
10. These natures cannot have been confused in Christ; else he would then have
    been neither God nor man.
11. Nor could these natures have been changed; neither (a) the divine into the
    human—for the nature of man is made, but that of God cannot be made—
    nor (b) the human into the divine, for that which had no being could not
    be changed into anything else.
12. The true doctrine formally stated.
13. Nor is this doctrine a mere scholastic speculation: we must acknowledge the
diversity of the natures in Christ, as also the unity of his person, against
the Nestorians.

ARTICLE III. Chapter 2. WHICH WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY
GHOST.

1. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost.
2. That is, by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary.
3. Christ, like Melchisedek, had no earthly father, but was only the reputed son
   of Joseph.
4. Nor was he conceived by Mary without the operation of God.
5. We cannot explain how he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and how by the
   Blessed Virgin.
6. But we know that he was made man of the substance of his mother, and of no
   other.
7. Through whom he was descended from David and Abraham.
8. We must believe this doctrine in order to believe in the perfect sinlessness o
him who was "the Lamb of God," the Redeemer of the World, the second Adam.

9. This manner of Christ's conception proves the universality of man's redemption and God's grace.

10. And teaches us the true source whence all holiness is derived.

11. Summary of the meaning of the words "I believe in Jesus Christ . . . . which was conceived by the Holy Ghost."

**ARTICLE III. Chapter 3. Born of the Virgin Mary.**

1. The Virgin Mary considered as to her (a) name, (b) condition, (c) action.

2. Her name "Mary" common to many women in Holy Scripture; identica. with "Miriam" (Miriam a type of Mary).

3. Besides her name little is said of her in Scripture, or known of her, except by a tradition, not traceable beyond the fourth century.

4. This Mary distinguished from other Maries by the affix of "the Virgin."

5. We must show that the Messias was to be born of a virgin.

6. This shown from Gen. iii. 15. "The seed of the woman."

7. Confirmed by the prophecy of Jeremiah xxxi. 22, "A woman shall compass a man."

8. And by that of Isaiah vii. 14, "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel."

9. Next we must show that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was a virgin when she bore him.

10. This shown by Holy Scripture (Matt. i.; Luke i.).

11. She also remained a virgin afterwards; this shown (a) by Scripture (b) from tradition.

12. Answer to objections to this doctrine based on Matt. i. 25.

13. Answer to objections based on John ii. 12; Matt. xii. 46; xiii. 55; xxvii. 56, &c.

14. But how was this virgin the mother of Christ?

15. This implies a real, true, and proper conception; a real growth in her womb, and a real birth for her body, so that she was truly the mother of God.

16. The necessity of this belief shown in respect of the Blessed Virgin, in order to give to her her proper dignity.

17. The necessity of this belief in respect of Christ, in order that we may believe him to have been truly—
   a. Born of a woman;
   b. Born of a pure virgin;
   c. Born of that virgin who was of the lineage of David, and espoused to Joseph.

18. Summary of the meaning of the words "I believe in Jesus Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary."

**ARTICLE IV. He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.**

**Chapter 1. He suffered.**

1. Distinction between the words "suffered" and "was crucified."

2. Christ's sufferings or "Passion" considered in a threefold way; First, *was suffered*; secondly, *how he suffered*; thirdly, *what he suffered.*
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3. Who it was that suffered, considered in his office and person.
4. As to his Office, it was the promised Messias that was to suffer: this proved from the Old and New Testaments in detail.
5. Absurdity of the supposition of the Jews of a twofold Messias, the one a suffering, and the other a triumphant Messias; for—
6. No Messias of the tribe of Ephraim is mentioned in Scripture.
7. And their supposition, if weighed carefully, really makes for us.
8. It is acknowledged on all hands, Christians, Jews, and Gentiles, that Jesus suffered.
9. The Messias actually suffered for us in virtue of an agreement between himself and the Father.
10. And this agreement really amounted to a covenant.
11. The terms of this covenant were revealed by the Spirit of God to the prophets, and by them delivered to the church.
12. And all the sufferings thus agreed upon as belonging to the Messias were undergone by Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ.
13. We now consider him in his Person.
14. It was the very and eternal Son of God, and God himself, that "suffered."
15. But how did he suffer? we ask.
16. He suffered in his humanity, in his soul and in his body.
17. For God cannot suffer or die,
18. The hypostatic union, as it is called, the perfect and complete union of two whole and perfect natures in the person of Jesus Christ, underlies this apparent paradox; and
19. The essential properties of the one nature, in virtue of this union, are really imparted to the other nature; so that "God the Son," being not only God but also man, suffered, though not in his Deity, (by reason of which he is truly God) yet in his humanity, by reason of which he who is truly God is also truly man.
20. But what did the Son of God suffer?
21. He suffered in body by taking on him our frail and sickly flesh, by submitting to be circumcised, scourged, and crucified.
22. He suffered in soul also; as, for instance, from the apprehension of evil.
23. And all this to a very high degree indeed.
24. The same was the case with what he suffered in the way of grief for the sins of all mankind.
25. The necessity of this belief enforced for five reasons:—
a. To assure us of his real human nature.
b. To redeem man and to reconcile him to God.
c. To purchase heaven for the members of his body, the church.
d. To assure us of his sympathy.
e. To teach us that we are to suffer, and how.
26. Summary of the meaning of the words "He suffered."

ARTICLE IV. Chapter 2. UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

1. Next follows the circumstance of time, in accordance with the custom of historical records.
2. Who was Pontius Pilate, by person and by office?
3. He was by birth a Roman, who, after the overthrow of the Jewish polity, was appointed by the victorious Romans Procurator of Judæa.
4. This office did not exist till after the banishment of Herod Archelaus, some years after our Saviour's birth.
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5. Though primarily this office concerned only the collection of tribute, yet owing to the constant rebellions of the Jews, the Procurator of Judæa was invested with the power of life and death.

6. And so the Christ, who was to die, and in a manner not prescribed in the law of Moses, was delivered by the Jews into the hands of their enemies to be put to death; the Jews thereby confessing that they had lost their independence as a nation.

7. But how was Pilate persuaded, in spite of his belief in the innocence of Christ, to deliver him up to death?

8. Because he was cruel, avaricious, and tyrannical, and therefore a coward.

9. Why was it necessary to add to the Creed the words, "Under Pontius Pilate"?

(1) In order to assure us of the very time when he suffered.
(2) In order to furnish us with an external testimony to the death of Christ.
(3) In order to confirm prophecy, and that, too, from a most unsuspected source.

10. Summary of the meaning of the words, "Suffered under Pontius Pilate."

ARTICLE IV. Chapter 3. Was crucified.

1. This section concludes the passion and introduces the death of Jesus Christ.
2. That the Messias was to suffer is shown by (a) types, (b) prophecies.
3. As to Types: He is prefigured in Isaac offered up by Abraham, by the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and by the paschal lamb.
4. As to Prophecy: We have the words of Zechariah (xii. 10) and of David (Psalm xxii. 16).
5. It is a certain historical fact, fully recorded by the four evangelists, that Christ was actually crucified.
6. But what was the nature of the punishment of crucifixion? It was essentially a heathen, not a Jewish punishment.
7. The punishment and the form of punishment described.
8. The propriety of this mode of punishment as the penalty of sedition.
9. Crucifixion was (a) the most painful, (b) the most disgraceful of deaths.
10. It is necessary to profess our belief in Christ crucified for several reasons.
11. First, that we may be assured that he has undergone for us the curse of the Law.
12. To assure us that in him the curse of the Law is abolished.
13. To lead us to crucify our affections and lusts.
14. To teach us to meditate on his cup of suffering.
15. To teach us humility; for he died the death of a slave.
16. To assure us of the reality of his death.
17. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe in Christ crucified."

ARTICLE IV. Chapter 4. Dead.

1. Not only was he crucified, but he also died.
2. We must show (a) that the Messias was to die, (b) that our Jesus did truly die, and (c) in what this his death did consist.
3. The death of the Messias was foretold both in prophecy and in type; and, (as shown above) there was only one Messias.
4. The actual death of Jesus of Nazareth on the cross was witnessed even by the Jews.
5. His soul was actually severed from his body.
6. This we know from his own words, and from the pains of the cross.
7. And from his actual assumption of man’s nature.
8. Jesus Christ died by a voluntary though a wonderful death.
9. St. Peter expressly declares that his crucifixion was the cause of his death.
10. We must therefore conclude that he died an actual death.
11. But let us examine the nature of the union of the soul and body in Jesus Christ.
12. That union was of two kinds: 1, of parts, 2, of nature; and at his death the former was destroyed, the latter remained.
13. And this is what we assert in the Creed.
14. And it is in perfect harmony with Scripture, which states that “God redeemed us by his own (ςιας) blood.” (Acts xx. 28.)
15. The nature of Christ’s death was such that a link still subsisted; his body and soul were severed, but no disunion took place between his human soul and body and his divinity.
16. The doctrine of Jesus Christ’s death is the foundation of his mediatorship,
17. As our prophet,
18. As our priest,
19. As our king.
20. Summary of the meaning of the words “He was crucified, dead.”

ARTICLE IV. Chapter 5. AND BURIED.

1. Not only did he die, by the separation of his soul from his body, but his body was buried in the grave.
2. The Messias was to be buried, for it was the custom of the Jews to bury their dead, and his burial was foretold by prophecy and type.
3. Jesus was buried, though burial was usually denied to those who were crucified,
4. And this, too, at the request of the Jews.
5. And, as Isaiah had prophesied, he was “buried with the rich.”
6. The process of his burial described more minutely.
7. The importance of the doctrine of Christ's burial to give us a proof of his actual death.
8. To work in us a corresponding change in our hearts and lives.
9. To teach us what respect should be paid to the Christian dead.
10. Summary of the meaning of the words, “I believe that Jesus Christ was buried.”

ARTICLE V. HE DESCENDED INTO HELL; THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD.

Chapter 1. He descended into hell.

1. This clause is of less antiquity than the rest of the Creed, dating from about A.D. 400.
2. Originally expressed, “Descendit in inferna,” the word bearing the double meaning either of “hell” (Acts ii. 27), or “the lower parts of the earth” (Eph. iv. 9).
3. By his descent into hell, however, is meant something more than that his body went down into the grave.
4. The clause “He descended into hell,” though not stated in Holy Scripture totidem verbis, is yet virtually contained there.
Analysis of Pearson on the Creed.

5. As shown by a comparison of several passages: Eph. iv. 9; John iii. 13, viii. 23; Ps. cxxxix. 15, xiii. 9; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Acts ii. 25-31.

6. Various interpretations of this clause considered.
7. That of Durandus, as supplying a virtual but not actual motion of Christ's soul to the place of departed souls.
8. This interpretation rejected as not satisfactory.
9. A later interpretation that his soul went down among the damned.
10. This interpretation also rejected, whether understood as referring to a physical or metaphorical hell.
11. A third interpretation propounded that Christ's body was laid in the grave.
12. This fully considered and rejected on several grounds.
13. Another interpretation, signifying that the soul of Christ, while his body lay in the grave, went into the place of departed spirits.
14. This interpretation further considered on the grounds of reason.
15. And supported by the general, but not universal, opinion of the fathers of the Church.
16. Several fanciful meanings held by individual writers discussed seriatim, and the difficulties which they respectively involve displayed.
17. The interpretation which is nearest to Holy Scripture, and least open to objection suggested, viz., that the soul of Christ, really separated from his body by death, truly passed unto the places below, where are the souls of the departed, to the end that he might undergo the condition of a dead man as well as that of a living man.
18. And his soul went down into the place of the departed, in order to save our souls from going into the place of torments.
19. Summary of the meaning of the words, "He descended into hell."

ARTICLE V. Chapter 2. THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD.

1. In this clause we must consider Christ's resurrection: (a) as to the action (b) as to the reality of it, (c) as to the time of it.
2. The Messias was to rise again from the dead.
3. This proved by prophecy and type.
4. Jesus Christ did rise again from the dead, as testified by the pious women, the apostles, the five hundred brethren (1 Cor. xv. 6), and also by his enemies, the Roman guard and the Jewish chief priests.
5. And also by higher witnesses, as by angels, and by the Holy Spirit.
6. As to the reality of his resurrection, it was the reunion of his body and soul into the same person which he was before his death.
7. Such a resurrection is true of Jesus Christ: this proved by the evidence of the senses of the apostles.
8. By actual proof of the activity of his body, soul, and spirit after he had risen.
9. The meritorious cause of Christ's resurrection was his own obedience in life and death.
10. The efficient cause was, principally, God the Father.
11. And, instrumentally, God the Son. God the Father raised the Son, but the Son also raised himself.
12. He rose on the third day after his death.
13. In accordance with types and prophecies.
14. Why there was no longer or briefer interval than three days between his death and his resurrection.
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15. How the interval of one day and two nights was counted as three days and three nights.
16. The character of the day on which he died; the preparation or eve of the Sabbath.
17. The character of the day during which he rested in the grave, the Sabbath.
18. The character of the day on which he rose again; the Lord's Day, the beginning of the new creation.
19. The Lord's Day, or Sunday, distinguished in detail from the Sabbath.
20. Importance of the doctrine of our Lord's resurrection, as comprising our faith in him as the Son of God (Acts xiii. 33; Rom. i. 4).
21. As assuring to us our acceptance with God.
22. As strengthening our hope of our own resurrection.
23. As calculated to stimulate us to a new life of holiness.
24. Summary of the meaning of the clause, "The third day he rose again from the dead."

Article VI. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

Chapter 1. He ascended into heaven.

1. This article states two things: (1) Christ's ascension, (2) his session.
2. As to his ascension, we must consider (a) who it was that ascended, (b) how he ascended, and (c) whither he ascended.
3. The Messias was to ascend into heaven. This is shown by type.
4. And by prophecy also.
5. What was thus foretold of the Messias was true of Jesus Christ.
6. His ascension was not figurative or metaphorical.
7. But took place in the presence of the apostles.
8. And of angels.
9. And his ascension was actually and truly into heaven.
10. And this local ascension is not true of his divinity (for as God he was in heaven always), but of his human nature.
11. The necessity of a believing in Christ's ascension, in order to confirm our faith. We see him rewarded and invested with power.
12. It is necessary to strengthen our hope.
13. It is necessary in order to exalt our affections.
14. His ascension, too, was a necessary and antecedent condition of the sending down of the Holy Spirit and the foundation of the Church by the apostles.
15. Summary of the meaning of the words, "He ascended into heaven."

Article VI. Chapter 2. And sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

1. This clause contains two assertions: (a) that Jesus Christ is seated at God's right hand, and (b) that this God is the Father Almighty.
2. It is needful to show (a) that the Messias was to sit at the right hand of God, (b) that this is true of Jesus Christ, and (c) what this session implies.
3. This session was foreshadowed by types.
4. And foreshown by prophecy, especially by David.
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5. Jesus Christ, as the Holy Scriptures assure us, on being taken up to heaven, did sit down at the right hand of God.

3. And this honour was never given to any but to him.

7. But what is it to sit at God's right hand?

8. Although in a certain sense metaphorical, it implies that he is seated in possession of all power, honour, and happiness.

9. By session is not meant any particular bodily position.

10. But it means that he abides there, and implies the possession of rest, peace, continuance, majesty, and sovereignty.

11. And, further, it implies the right of judgment.

12. The session of Jesus Christ at God's right hand thus marks our Mediator's entry upon his kingly office.

13. According to promises expressly made to David.

14. The effects of this his session are the subduing of his enemies, both temporal and spiritual.

15. Not that this subduing is at present complete or final.

16. For still power is left to Satan over the wicked.

17. Ultimately this session at God's right hand will destroy even death itself.

18. His kingly power will last until all his enemies are destroyed.

19. And will then be swallowed up in the Beatitude Vision.

20. Though in one sense Christ will remain a king for ever; whence the Nicene Creed adds, "Whose kingdom shall have no end."

21. A belief in Christ's session at God's right hand is needful to teach us our duty as his subjects.

22. And to assure us of his protection.

23. And to give us faith in his intercession.

24. But it is at the right hand of "God the Father Almighty" that he is seated.

25. The word "almighty" is used here in a different sense from the first Article.

26. For there authority is meant; here power of operation is intended.

27. The term "almighty," or "omnipotent," more fully explained. First it implies that he is the source of all power.

28. Secondly, it implies that none can resist his will.

29. Thirdly, it implies that his power extends over all things.

30. The only limitation to his almighty power is that he cannot do things repugnant to each other, or to his own essential attributes.

31. And this omnipotence is predicatable of each of the three persons in the Trinity.

32. It is needful to believe in God's omnipotence in order to engender fear and reverence.

33. In order to supply a foundation for our faith.

34. In order to breed in us reliance and trust.

35. In order to quicken our devotion.

36. Summary of the meaning of the words "I believe in Jesus Christ, who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty."

Article VII. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

1. We must consider four things: (a) who shall come again, (b) whence he shall come, (c) for what end he shall come, (d) the persons who are the objects of his coming.

2. We must first show that the Messias was to come again, and that Jesus Christ did assure us that he would come again.
3. It was prophesied that the Messias should come once in humility, and a second time in power and glory.
4. It was declared by the angels that Jesus Christ should come again in power and glory.
5. That he shall come again from heaven is clear from the New Testament, and from the previous chapter.
6. We next consider the end for which he shall come.
7. It is evident, from reason and conscience, that there will be a judgment.
8. The same is evident even to the heathen, from God's attribute of justice.
9. And this is confirmed by revelation, both in the Old and New Testaments.
10. And he who shall judge the world is the triune God.
11. And this judgment will be carried out by the instrumentality of God the Son.
12. Because he is not only God, but also man.
13. And it is just and fitting that he who was judged here should hereafter become judge.
14. This dignity of the Son of man frequently portrayed in Holy Scripture.
15. And the nature of his judgment fully explained in Holy Scripture.
16. And he will judge all men, whether living or dead, at his coming.
17. A certain curious question as to the living, or "quick," stated.
18. It is necessary to believe a future universal judgment, in order to vindicate the justice of God's dealings with man.
19. In order to urge us to repent of our sins.
20. In order to strengthen our hope of eternal life.
21. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe that he shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

**ARTICLE VIII. I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST.**

1. The words "I believe" repeated at the commencement of this third part of the Creed: for the meaning of the words the reader is referred to Article I.
2. What do we believe concerning the Holy Ghost? (a) as to his nature, (b) as to his office?
3. As to his nature, the Spirit is "holy" in two senses: (1) passive, (2) active.
4. The Holy Ghost is a person, not a mere energy or quality.
5. In Holy Scripture things are attributed to the Holy Ghost which imply personality.
6. The Holy Ghost is opposed in the Old Testament to evil spirits, which certainly had a personal being.
8. The Socinian solution of these texts stated.
9. And shown at length to be unsatisfactory, and to involve contradictions.
10. The Holy Ghost, too, is not only a person, but a divine and an exalted person.
11. The sin against the Holy Ghost, being unpardonable, is consistent with no other supposition except that of his being God.
12. In the kingdom of Christ all things are done by the power of the Spirit of God.
13. He by whose operation Jesus Christ was conceived in the womb of Mary was truly God.
14. Moreover, we are baptized into the name of the Holy Spirit as well as of the Father and the Son.
15. When mentioned in the Greek Testament the Holy Spirit has always the definite article prefixed, and this implies a person.

16. And “lying unto the Holy Ghost” is said in the Acts of the Apostles to be “lying unto God.”

17. The Holy Ghost is said to “dwell” in the bodies of Christians.

18. And yet this divine person is not the Father nor yet the Son: for

19. He proceedeth from the Father:

20. And he receiveth of that which is the Son’s:

21. And furthermore, he is joined together in the work of our salvation with the Father and the Son; e.g., “through the Son we have access by one Spirit unto the Father” (Eph. ii. 18).

22. Proof that the Holy Ghost is the third person in the blessed Trinity.

23. And he “proceeds” from the Father and the Son.

24. Though the mode of his procession is rather inferred from Holy Scripture than expressly stated in it.

25. Variety of expression but substantial harmony of teaching on this doctrine between the eastern and western churches.

26. And now what is the office of the Holy Spirit? It is our sanctification.

27. And this includes all means to that end; as, for instance, the illumination of man’s soul.

28. And also his regeneration and renewal.

29. And his spiritual guidance.

30. And the effecting and maintaining his union with Christ.

31. And the creating in him a sense of his filial adoption by God.

32. And the setting apart a standing ministry.

33. (The necessity of this article of belief shown from the very nature of a creed.)

34. And to make us desire union with God.

35. And to work out our own sanctification.

36. And to strengthen and comfort us in our trials.

37. And to maintain the organization of the Christian church to the end of the world.

38. Summary of the meaning of the words, “I believe in the Holy Ghost.”

**ARTICLE IX. THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.**

**Chapter 1. THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.**

1. This article in some creeds stands last of all, and the word “catholic” is a later addition.

2. We must show how the Church is (a) holy, (b) catholic.

3. “Church,” or “kirk,” derived from the word Κυκλησία. The Greek word, ἐκκλησία, signifies “a calling forth.” Neither term alone adequate to express the nature of the church as propounded here for our belief.

4. The word “Church” sometimes used as inclusive, and sometimes as exclusive of the angels; sometimes as including and sometimes as excluding the Jewish polity.

5. We, however, restrict it here to that body which our Lord promised to Peter that he would build (Matt. xvi. 18), and which was afterwards built (Acts ii. 41) on his preaching.

6. The foundation of this Church and its early growth described.

7. Various senses of the term Ἐκκλησία.

8. Local churches so called as geographical portions of the one Church.
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9. The unity of the Church consists in its origin and creed.
10. In its faith.
11. In its sacraments.
12. In its hope.
13. In its charity.
15. And our belief is in a Church which not only has been and is, but which shall continue.
16. Individual Churches may perish, but the universal Church is indestructible.
17. The Church is "holy" in its vocation, in its offices and powers, in its obligations to a holy life, and in its perpetuation of holiness.
18. Although, as a matter of fact, at present it contains both bad and good persons.
19. Yet hereafter it shall be perfect, and without blemish or spot in its members.
20. This Church is also "catholic," or universal.
21. Various senses of the word ἱερός.
22. Individual and local Churches can only be called catholic by their conformity with the universal Church.
23. The term "catholic" denotes the diffusiveness of the Church, in virtue of Christ's commission, "Go, teach all nations" (Matt. xxviii. 19).
24. It denotes also the fact that it teaches all necessary doctrine.
25. Also that it teaches universal obedience to God's commands.
26. And that in it are bestowed all spiritual gifts and graces.
27. We must believe in the Holy Catholic Church because Christ has appointed it as the only way to eternal life.
28. Also in order that we may keep within it, and avoid the sin of schism.
29. Also in order that we may seek to be holy in its fold.
30. Also because if we are not in the Catholic Church we are in no Church at all.
31. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church."

Article IX. Chapter 2. The Communion of Saints.

1. These words of later date than the rest of the article, yet equally important.
2. At the first foundation of the Church its leading feature was its κοινωνία, or unity shown in action. Its members had all things in common.
3. This form of κοινωνία not of lasting obligation.
4. The communion of saints may be regarded as (a) between themselves and others, or (b) as between themselves.
5. The saints here denote members of the Church.
6. All members of the Church are saints by outward calling.
7. But there is a higher saintship, an inward holiness, and to these the doctrine refers specially.
8. These saints have communion with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.
9. Also with the angels.
10. And also with other saints.
11. Whether the latter be alive,
12. Or dead.
13. Practical effect of this doctrine. (The silence of Scripture as to the condition of the saints in heaven shows the practice of the Roman Church in respect of the departed saints to be as unwarrantable as it is novel.)
14. This doctrine necessary in order to encourage us to a holy life.
15. To produce in us gratitude to God.
16. To make us love our fellow-saints, whether living or departed.
17. To inspire us with love of all mankind.
18. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe in . . . . the communior of saints."

**Analysis of Pearson on the Creed.**

ARTICLE X. THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

1. The position of this article implies that we believe that forgiveness of sins is to be obtained in the Church of Christ.
2. What is the nature of sin? It is defined as the transgression of God's law.
3. The guilt of sin makes us indebted to eternal punishment.
4. But this guilt may be remitted or forgiven by him against whom it was committed.
5. And this forgiveness contains two ideas,—reconciliation to an offended God, and satisfaction to a just God.
6. This reconciliation and satisfaction are wrought by Jesus Christ's death.
7. This position stated more fully and precisely.
8. But how is this connected with the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church?
9. The preaching of this remission of sins was entrusted to the Church at its foundation.
10. The first remission of sins takes place at baptism, and sins committed after baptism are remissible on true repentance.
11. This doctrine necessary, because we have all sinned and come short of God's glory.
12. Also in order to esteem God's goodness and our happiness aright.
13. Also to influence us with a love of God, who has remitted to us such a debt.
14. To teach us how much we owe to Jesus Christ.
15. To remind us of our part in the covenant between us and God.
16. Summary of the meaning of the words, "I believe the forgiveness of sins."

ARTICLE XI. THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

1. This article variously expressed in the Creed of the Church of Aquileia.
2. The resurrection in general sufficiently explained above (Art. V., ch. 2), so we confine ourselves here to the resurrection still to come.
3. It is to be believed that the bodies of all men will be regathered and reunited with their own several souls.
4. The ancient philosophers, who believed in a future life, did not believe, or even imagine, that man's body should rise again.
5. The alleged impossibility of such a resurrection considered.
6. It is not impossible to God from want of either knowledge or power.
7. Nor is it impossible with respect to man, as shown by the creation of man.
8. But the resurrection is not only not impossible, but even, a priori, probable or physical grounds.
9. And also on moral grounds.
10. And also from the analogy of nature.
11. But we have as a basis for this doctrine the higher ground of revelation.
13. And the doctrine is more fully taught in the New Testament.
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ARTICLE XII. AND THE LIFE EVERLASTING.

1. This article not to be found in all Creeds.
2. There will be a resurrection of all men, both good and bad.
3. For the wicked a resurrection unto condemnation.
4. The punishment of the wicked will be eternal.
5. Origen the first who doubted this doctrine.
6. The good shall rise unto a happy and glorious eternity of life.
7. A belief in this doctrine needful, in order to keep us from sin and to urge us to repentance.
8. And in order to make us fear God duly.
9. And to teach us the value of Christ's Blood.
10. And to stir us up to desire heaven.
11. And to wean us from the pleasures of this life.
12. And to support us in our trials.
13. Summary of the meaning of the words "I believe in the Life Everlasting"
AN EXPOSITION OF THE CREED.

ARTICLE I.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.

1.*—As the first word Credo, I believe, giveth a denomination to the whole confession of faith, from thence commonly called the Creed; so is the same word to be imagined not to stand only where it is expressed, but to be carried through the whole body of the confession. For although it be but twice actually rehearsed, yet must we conceive it virtually prefixed to the head of every article: that as we say, I believe in God the Father Almighty, so we are also understood to say, I believe in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord; as, I believe in the Holy Ghost, so also, I believe in the Catholic Church. Neither is it to be joined with every complete article only; but where any article is not a single verity, but comprehensive, there it is to be looked upon as affixed to every part, or single truth, contained in that article: as, for example, in the first, I believe in God, I believe that God to be the Father, I believe that Father to be Almighty, I believe that Father Almighty to be the Maker of Heaven and Earth. So that this Credo, I believe, rightly considered, multiplieth itself to no less than a double number of the articles, and will be found at least twenty-four times contained in the Creed. Wherefore, being a word so pregnant and diffusive, so necessary and essential to every part of our confession of faith, that without it we can neither have Creed nor confession, it will require a more exact consideration, and more ample explication, and that in such a notion as is properly applicable to so many and so various truths.

2.—Now by this previous expression, I believe, thus considered, every particular Christian is first taught, and then imagined, to make confession of his faith: and consequently this word, so used, admits a threefold consideration. First, as it supposeth

* Note.—The numerals prefixed to the paragraphs refer the reader to the corresponding cards of the Analysis prefixed to this edition.
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ART. I.

belief, or faith, which is confessed. Secondly, as it is a confession, or external expression of that faith so supposed. Thirdly, as both the faith and confession are of necessary and particular obligation. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered, First, what is the true nature and notion of belief; Secondly, what the duty of confessing of our faith; Thirdly, what obligation lies upon every particular person to believe and confess; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the first word of the Creed, then may every one understand what it is he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, I believe.

For the right understanding of the true nature of Christian faith, it will be no less than necessary to begin with the general notion of belief; which being first truly stated and defined, then by degrees deduced into its several kinds, will at last make the nature of Christian faith intelligible: a design, if I mistake not, not so ordinary and usual, as useful and necessary.

3.—Belief in general I define to be an assent to that which is credible, as credible. By the word assent is expressed that act or habit of the understanding, by which it receiveth, acknowledgeth and embraceth anything as a truth; it being the nature of the soul so to embrace whatsoever appeareth true unto it, and so far as it so appeareth. Now this assent, or judgment of anything to be true, being a general act of the understanding, and so applicable to other habits thereof as well as to faith, must be

1 Πίστις δὲ πρὸς λόγον ἐκουσίως ἔστιν, θεοσεβέσις συγκαταθέσις.—S. Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. lib. ii. Πίστις μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ συγκαταθέσις ἀδίκαιτος τῶν ἀκούσαντων ἐν πληροφορίᾳ τῆς ἁλληθείας τῶν κηρυχθέντων θεοῦ χάριτι. —S. Basilius, Ascet. de Fide. The Basildians: Ὅριζον- τα γοῦν οἱ Ἀπὸ Βασιλείου τὴν πίστιν, ψυχῆς συγκαταθέσιν πρὸς τί τῶν μη κυνότιναι αἰσθήσεων διὰ τὸ μὴ παρεῖναι.—S. Clem. Alexan. Strom. lib. ii. Κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἡμέραν λόγον, πίστις ἐστὶν ἑκουσίως τῆς ψυχῆς συγκαταθέσις.—Thessolus, Thesp. sertm. ii. And yet he also afterwards acknowledgeth they had that definition from the Greeks: Τὴν μὲν γὰρ πίστιν καὶ οἱ ὑμετέροι φιλοσοφὸς ὁρώσαντο εἰναὶ εὐθελούσιν τῆς ψυχῆς συγκαταθέσις. "Credere est cum assensu cogitare."—S. Augustinus. Et De Spiritu et Lili. Lib. : "Quid est credere, nisi consentire verum esse quod dictur?" So I take the συγκαταθέσις used by the Greek Fathers to signify assensus or assensionem, as A. Gallius translateth the Stoic, συγκατάθεται, sive assensione approbat, lib. xix. 1. And before him Cicero: "Nunc de assensione atque approbatione, quam Gredi συγκατάθησιν vocant pauca dicamus."—In Lucullo. Σοι ἀποτίς καὶ συγκαταθέντες are opposed by the Greeks. As Sextus Empiricus, speaking of Alcmeus seeing Alcides brought back by Heracles from Hades: Ἐπεὶ, μεντόν οτι δὲ ταῦτα περισσότερον ἢ διάνοιαν ἀπὸ τῆς συγκαταθέσεως, καὶ πρὸς ἀπιστίαν ἐκλινε.—Pyth. Hyl. lib. i. 33.

2 Ψυλλαλήθης ἡ ψυχή, οὐδέποτε κατὰ τὸ πνεύμα ἀνέγκομαι διαπίθεται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ φανερὰ ἀληθὸς πάντως καὶ εὐθύς.—Simplicius, in 3 Aristotelis De Anima.—Καὶ τῆς ταλήνθης σκοπηθείς, εὑρίσκει τὸν ἀνθρώπον φιλος διαβεβλημένον μὲν πρὸς τὸν τοῦ πνεύματος συγκατάθησιν, ἠχοῦται δὲ αἰσθημάς πρὸς πίστιν ταλήθους.—S. Clem. Alexan. Strom. lib. ii. 

3 As συγκαταθέσις, the Greek word used for this assent, is applied to other acts of the understanding as well as to faith, so Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of the definition of faith: Ἀλλοὶ δὲ ἀδάνακτος πράγματος ἐνωτικῆς συγκαταθέσις ἀπέδωκαν εἶναι τὴν πίστιν, ὡσπερ ἀμέλει τὴν ἀπὸδεικνύον, ἀγνοο- μένου πράγματος φανερὰ συγκαταθεμένην.—Strom. lib. ii.—And again: Πᾶσα σῦν δέξατε καὶ κρίνετε καὶ ἑπιλύοντες καὶ καθαρίζετε ὡς ζαμών καὶ συνεστίνει αἰεὶ τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώ- πων, συγκαταθέσις ἐστιν ἡ δὲ οὐδὲν ἀλλὰ ση πίστις εἰν αὖ ἡ τε απιστία, ἀποσύνθεται ὃς οὔσα τῆς πίστεως, δυνατήν δείκνυται τὴν συγκαταθεμένην τή καὶ πίστιν.
specified by its proper object, and so limited and determined to its proper act, which is the other part left to complete the definition.

This object of faith is first expressed by that which is credible; for every one who believeth any thing, doth thereby without question assent unto it as to that which is credible, and therefore all belief whatsoever is such a kind of assent. But though all belief be an assent to that which is credible, yet every such assent may not be properly faith; and therefore those words make not the definition complete. For he which sees an action done, knows it to be done, and therefore assents unto the truth of the performance of it because he sees it: but another person to whom he relates it, may assent unto the performance of the same action, not because himself sees it, but because the other relates it; in which case that which is credible is the object of faith in one, of evident knowledge in the other. To make the definition therefore full, besides the material object, or thing believed, we have added the formal object, or that whereby it is properly believed, expressed in the last term, as credible; which being taken in, it then appears that, First, whosoever believeth any thing, assenteth to something which is to him credible, and that, as it is credible and again, whosoever assenteth to any thing which is credible, as it is credible, believeth something by so assenting: which is sufficient to show the definition complete.

But for the explication of the same, farther observations will be necessary. For if that which we believe be something which is credible, and the notion under which we believe be the credibility of it, then must we first declare what it is to be credible, and in what credibility doth consist, before we can understand what is the nature of belief.

4.—Now that is properly credible which is not apparent of itself, nor certainly to be collected, either antecedently by its cause, or reversely by its effect, and yet, though by none of these ways, hath the attestation of a truth. For those things which are apparent of themselves, are either so in respect of our sense, as that snow is white, and fire is hot; or in respect of our understanding, as that the whole of any thing is greater than any one part of the whole, that every thing imaginable either is, or is not. The first kind of which being propounded to our sense, one to the sight, the other to the touch, appear of themselves immediately true, and therefore are not termed credible, but evident to sense; as the latter kind, propounded to the understanding, are immediately embraced and acknowledged as truths apparent in themselves, and therefore are not called credible, but
evident to the understanding. And so those things which are apparent, are not said properly to be believed, but to be known.

Again, other things, though not immediately apparent in themselves, may yet appear most certain and evidently true, by an immediate and necessary connexion with something formerly known. For being every natural cause actually applied both necessarily produce its own natural effect, and every natural effect wholly dependeth upon, and absolutely pre-supposeth, its own proper cause; therefore there must be an immediate connexion between the cause and its effect. From whence it follows that, if the connexion be once clearly perceived, the effect will be known in the cause, and the cause by the effect. And by these ways, proceeding from principles evidently known by consequences certainly concluding, we come to the knowledge of propositions in mathematics, and conclusions in other sciences: which propositions and conclusions are not said to be credible, but scientifical; and the comprehension of them is not faith, but science.

Besides, some things there are which, though not evident of themselves, nor seen by any necessary connexion to their causes or effects, notwithstanding appear to most as true by some external relations to other truths; but yet so as the appearing truth still leaves a possibility of falsehood with it, and therefore doth but incline to an assent. In which cause whatsoever is thus apprehended, if it depend upon real arguments, is not yet called credible, but probable: and an assent to such a truth is not properly faith, but opinion.

5.—But when any thing propounded to us is neither apparent to our sense, nor evident to our understanding, in and of itself, neither certainly to be collected from any clear and necessary connexion with the cause from which it proceedeth, or the effects which it naturally produceth, nor is taken up upon any real arguments or reference to other acknowledged truths, and yet notwithstanding appeareth to us true, not by a manifestation, but attestation of the truth, and so moveth us to assent not of itself, but by virtue of the testimony given to it; this is said properly to be credible; and an assent unto this, upon such credibility, is, in the proper notion, faith or belief.

6.—Having thus defined and illustrated the nature of faith in general, so far as it agreeth to all kinds of belief whatsoever, our method will lead us on to descend by way of division to the

1 "Apparentia non habent fidem, sed sagnostionem."—Gregorius, 4 Dial. cap. 5.

2 Ai dia τῶν μαρτύρων ἡδέοι πιστεῖς.—Aristot. Prob. xviii. 3.
several kinds thereof, till at last we come to the proper notion of faith in the Christian's confession, the design of our present disquisition. And being we have placed the formality of the object of all belief in credibility, it will clearly follow, that diversity of credibility in the object will proportionably cause a distinction of assent in the understanding, and consequently a several kind of faith, which we have supposed to be nothing else but such an assent.

7.—Now the credibility of objects, by which they appear fit to be believed, is distinguishable according to the diversities of its foundation, that is, according to the different authority of the testimony on which it depends. For we having no other certain means of assuring ourselves of the truth, and consequently no other motives of our assent in matters of mere belief, than the testimony upon which we believe; if there be any fundamental distinction in the authority of the testimony, it will cause the like difference in the assent, which must needs bear a proportion to the authority of the testimony, as being originally and essentially founded upon it. It is therefore necessary next to consider in what the authority of a testimony consisteth, and so to descend to the several kinds of testimonies founded upon several authorities.

The strength and validity of every testimony must bear proportion with the authority of the testifier; ¹ and the authority of the testifier is founded upon his ability and integrity: his ability in the knowledge of that which he delivereth and asserteth, his integrity in delivering and asserting according to his knowledge. For two several ways he which relateth or testifieth any thing may deceive us; one, by being ignorant of the truth, and so upon that ignorance mistaking, he may think that to be true which is not so, and consequently deliver that for truth which in itself is false, and so deceive himself and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be dishonest or unfaithful, that which he knows to be false he may propound and assert to be a truth, and so though himself be not deceived, he may deceive us. And by each of these ways, for want either of ability or integrity in the testifier, whose grounds his assent unto any thing as a truth upon the testimony of another, may equally be deceived.

But whosoever is so able as certainly to know the truth of that which he delivereth, and so faithful as to deliver nothing but what and as he knoweth, he, as he is not deceived, so deceiteth no man. So far therefore as any person testifying appeareth to be knowing of the thing he testifies, and to be faithful in the

¹ Τῷ γὰρ τοῦτο τινα φαίνεσθαι τῶν λέγωντα, πιστεύομεν τούτο ὅστις ἐν ἀγάθῳ φαίνῃς, ἦ εὐνοῦς, ἦ ἀμφω.—Aristot. Rhet. lib. i. cap. 8.
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8. Now there is in this case, so far as it concerns our present design, a double testimony: the testimony of man to man, relying upon human authority, and the testimony of God to man, founded upon divine authority: which two kinds of testimony are respective grounds of two kinds of credibility, human and divine; and consequently there is a two-fold faith distinguished by this double object, a human and a divine faith.

9. Human faith is an assent unto any thing credible merely upon the testimony of man.—Such is the belief we have of the words and affections one of another. And upon this kind of faith we proceed in the ordinary affairs of our life; according to the opinion we have of the ability and fidelity of him which relates or asserts any thing we believe or disbelieve. By this a friend assureth himself of the affection of his friend: by this the son acknowledgeth his father, and upon this is his obedience wrought. By virtue of this human faith it is that we doubt not at all of those things which we never saw, by reason of their distance from us either by time or place. Who doubts whether there be such a country as Italy, or such a city as Constantinople, though he never passed any of our four seas? Who questions now whether there were such a man as Alexander in the east, or Caesar in the west, and yet the latest of these hath been beyond the possibility of the knowledge of man these sixteen hundred years. There is no science taught without original belief; there are no letters learnt without preceding faith. There is no justice executed, no commerce maintained, no business prosecuted without this; all secular affairs are transacted, all great achievements are attempted, all hopes, desires, and inclinations are preserved by this human faith grounded upon the testimony of man.

In which case we all, by easy experience, may observe the


2 "Non dicat, Non credimus quia non vidimus; quoniam si haec ulcitant coguntur fateri incertos sibi esse parentes suos."—De Fide Rerum Invisibil., amongst the works of St. Augustin.
nature, generation and progress of belief. For in any thing which belongeth to more than ordinary knowledge, we believe not him whom we think to be ignorant, nor do we assent the more for his assertion, though never so confidently delivered: but if we have a strong opinion of the knowledge and skill of any person, what he affirmeth, within the compass of his knowledge, that we readily assent unto; and while we have no other ground but his affirmation, this assent is properly belief. Whereas if it be any matter of concernment in which the interest of him that relateth or affirmeth any thing to us is considerable, there it is not the skill or knowledge of the relater which will satisfy us, except we have as strong an opinion of his fidelity and integrity: but if we think him so just and honest, that he hath no design upon us, nor will affirm any thing contrary to his knowledge for any gain or advantage, then we readily assent unto his affirmations; and this assent is our belief. Seeing then our belief relies upon the ability and integrity of the relater, and being the knowledge of all men is imperfect, and the hearts of all men are deceitful, and so their integrity to be suspected, there can be no infallible universal ground of human faith.

But what satisfaction we cannot find in the testimony of man, we may receive in the testimony of God. If we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater. Yea, let God be true, the ground of our divine, and every man a liar, the ground of our human faith.

10.—As for the other member of the division, we may now plainly perceive that it is thus to be defined; Divine faith is an assent unto something as credible upon the testimony of God. This assent is the highest kind of faith, because the object hath the highest credibility, because grounded upon the testimony of God, which is infallible. Balaam could tell Balak thus much, God is not a man, that he should lie; and a better prophet confirmed the same truth to Saul, the strength of Israel will not lie; and because he will not, because he cannot, he is the strength of Israel, even my God, my strength, in whom I will trust.

For first, God is of infinite knowledge and wisdom, as Hannah hath taught us, the Lord is a God of knowledge, or rather, if our language will bear it, of knowledges, which are so plural, or rather infinite in their plurality, that the Psalmist hath said, Of his
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understanding there is no number.\textsuperscript{1} He knoweth therefore all things, neither can any truth be hid from his knowledge, who is essentially truth and essentially knowledge, and, as so, the cause of all other truth and knowledge. Thus the understanding of God is infinite in respect of comprehension,\textsuperscript{2} and not so only, but of certainty also and evidence. Some things we are said to know which are but obscurely known, we see them but as in a glass, or through a cloud: but God is light, and in him is no darkness at all:\textsuperscript{3} he seeth without any obscurity, and whatsoever is propounded to his understanding is most clear and evident; neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.\textsuperscript{4} Wherefore being all things are within the compass of his knowledge, being all things which are so, are most clear and evident unto him, being the knowledge he hath of them is most certain and infallible, it inevitably followeth that he cannot be deceived in any thing.

Secondly, the justice of God is equal to his knowledge, nor is his holiness inferior to his wisdom: a God of truth, saith Moses, and without iniquity, just and right is he.\textsuperscript{5} From which internal, essential and infinite rectitude, goodness and holiness, followeth an impossibility to declare or deliver that for truth which he knoweth not to be true. For if it be against that finite purity and integrity which is required of man, to lie, and therefore sinful, then must we conceive it absolutely inconsistent with that transcendent purity and infinite integrity which is essential unto God. Although, therefore, the power of God be infinite, though he can do all things, yet we may safely say, without any prejudice to his omnipotency,\textsuperscript{6} that he cannot speak that for truth which he knoweth to be otherwise.\textsuperscript{7} For the perfections of his will are as necessarily infinite as those of his understanding; neither can he be unholy or unjust more than he can be ignorant or unwise. If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself.\textsuperscript{8} Which words of the apostle, though properly belonging to the promises of God, yet are as true in respect of his assertions; neither should he more deny himself in violating his fidelity, than in contradicting his veracity. It is true, that God willing more
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abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation; but it is as true, that all this confirmation is only for our consolation; otherwise it is as impossible for God to lie, without an oath, as with one; for being he can swear by no greater, he sweareth only by himself, and so the strength even of the oath of God relieth upon the veracity of God. Wherefore being God, as God, is of infinite rectitude, goodness and holiness, being it is manifestly repugnant to his purity, and inconsistent with his integrity, to deliver any thing contrary to his knowledge, it clearly followeth that he cannot deceive any man.

It is therefore most infallibly certain, that God, being infinitely wise, cannot be deceived; being infinitely good, cannot deceive: and upon these two immovable pillars standeth the authority of the testimony of God. For since we cannot doubt of the witness of any one, but by questioning his ability, as one who may be ignorant of that which he affirmeth, and so deceived; or by excepting against his integrity, as one who may affirm that which he knoweth to be false, and so have a purpose to deceive us: where there is no place for either of these exceptions, there can be no doubt of the truth of the testimony. But where there is an intrinsical repugnancy of being deceived in the understanding, and of deceiving in the will, as there certainly is in the understanding and will of God, there can be no place for either of those exceptions, and consequently there can be no doubt of the truth of that which God testifieth. And whosoever thinketh any thing comes from him, and assenteth not unto it, must necessarily deny him to be wise or holy. He that believeth not God, said the apostle, hath made him a liar. That truth then which is testified by God, hath a divine credibility: and an assent unto it as so credible, is divine faith. In which the material object is the doctrine which God delivereth, the formal object is that credibility founded on the authority of the deliverer. And this I conceive the true nature of divine faith in general.

11.—Now being the credibility of all which we believe is founded
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upon the testimony of God, we can never be sufficiently instructed in the notion of faith, till we first understand how this testimony is given to those truths which we now believe. To which end it will be necessary to give notice that the testimony of God is not given unto truths before questioned or debated; nor are they such things as are first propounded and doubted of by man, and then resolved and confirmed by interposing the authority of God: but he is then said to witness when he doth propound, and his testimony is given by way of revelation, which is nothing else but the delivery or speech of God unto his creatures. And therefore upon a diversity of delivery must follow a difference, though not of faith itself, yet of the means and manner of assent.

Wherefore it will be farther necessary to observe, that divine revelation is of two kinds, either immediate, or mediate. An immediate revelation is that by which God delivereth himself to man by himself without the intervention of man. A mediate revelation is the conveyance of the counsel of God unto man by man. By the first he spake unto the prophets; by the second in the prophets, and by them unto us. Being then there is this difference between the revealing of God unto the prophets and to others, being the faith both of prophets and others relieth wholly upon divine revelation, the difference of the manner of assent in these several kinds of believers will be very observable for the explanation of the nature of our faith.¹

12.—Those, then, to whom God did immediately speak himself, or by an angel representing God, and so being in his stead, and bearing his name, (of which I shall need here to make no distinction,) those persons, I say, to whom God did so reveal himself, did by virtue of the same revelation perceive, know, and assure themselves that he which spake to them was God; so that at the same time they clearly understood both what was delivered, and by whom: otherwise we cannot imagine that Abraham would have slain his son, or have been commended for such a resolution, had he not been most assured that it was God who by an immediate revelation of his will clearly commanded it. Thus by faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house:² which warning of

¹ "Sicut duplex est auditus et locutio, scilicet, exterior sive corporalis, et interior ac spiritualis; ita duplex est fides,—una quae oritur in cordibus fidelium per auditorum exteriors, cum scilicet Deus per aliquos homines alia credenda proponit; et ista est fides quae nobis sive communi statui fidelium convenit, ex eo quod adhaeramus revelationibus prophetarum et apostolorum factis; alia est qua oritur in aliquibus per spiritualem locutionem, qua Deus aliquid per internam inspirationem credenda revelat, nullo hominibus ministerio utens; sic est fides apostolorum et prophetarum, qual ipso Deo per intrinsicum illuminationem sunt de credendis instruci."—Francis Ferrariensis in Thom. Contra Gent. cap. 40.

² Heb. xi. 7.
God was a clear revelation of God's determination to drown the world, of his will to save him and his family, and of his command for that end to build an ark. And this Noah so received from God, as that he knew it to be an oracle of God, and was as well assured of the author as informed of the command. Thus the judgments hanging over Judah were revealed in the ears of Isaiah by the Lord of Hosts. Thus the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh: at first, indeed, he knew him not; that is, when the Lord spake, he knew it not to be the voice of God: now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto him; but after that he knew him, and was assured that it was He which spake unto him, the Scripture teaching us that the ears of Samuel were revealed, and the word of God revealed, and God himself revealed to him. By all which we can understand no less, than that Samuel was so illuminated in his prophecies, that he fully understood the words or things themselves which were delivered, and as certainly knew that the deliverer was God. So Samuel the seer, so the rest of those prophets believed those truths revealed to them by such a faith as was a firm assent unto an object credible upon the immediate testimony of God.

But those faithful people to whom the prophets spake believed the same truth, and upon the testimony of the same God, delivered unto them not by God, but by those prophets, whose words they therefore assented unto as certain truths, because they were assured that what the prophets spake was immediately revealed to them by God himself, without which assurance no faith could be expected from them. When God appeared unto Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, and there immediately revealed to him first himself, saying, I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and then his will to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, Moses clearly believed God both in the revelation of himself and of his will, and was fully satisfied that the Israelites should be delivered, because he was assured it was God who promised their deliverance: yet notwithstanding still he doubted whether the Israelites would believe the same truth, when it should be delivered to them, not immediately by God, but by Moses: and
Moses answered and said, but behold they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, the Lord hath not appeared unto thee.\(^1\) Which words of his first suppose, that if they had heard the voice of God, as he had, they would have assented to the truth upon a testimony divine; and then as rationally affirm, that it was improbable they should believe, except they were assured it was God who promised, or think that God had promised by Moses, only because Moses said so. Which rational objection was clearly taken away when God ended Moses with power of evident and undoubted miracles; for then the rod which he carried in his hand was as infallible a sign to the Israelites that God had appeared unto him, as the flaming bush was to himself; and therefore they which saw in his hand God's omnipotency, could not suspect in his tongue God's veracity; insomuch as when Aaron became to Moses instead of a mouth, and Moses to Aaron instead of God, Aaron spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed.\(^2\) For being persuaded by a lively and active presence of omnipotency that God had appeared unto Moses, and what was delivered to them by him came to him from God, and being sufficiently assured out of the very sense and notion of a deity, that whatsoever God should speak, must of necessity be true, they presently assented, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses;\(^3\) Moses, as the immediate propounder, God, as the original revealer: they believed Moses that God had revealed it, and they believed the promise because God had revealed it. So that the faith both of Moses and the Israelites was grounded upon the same testimony or revelation of God, and differed only in the proposition or application of the testimony; Moses receiving it immediately from God himself, the Israelites mediately by the ministry of Moses.

13.—In the like manner the succeeding prophets were the instruments of divine revelation, which they first believed as revealed to them; and then the people as revealed by them: for what they delivered was not the testimony of man, but the testimony of God delivered by man. It was he who spake by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began.\(^4\) the mouth, the instrument, the articulation was theirs; but the words were God's. The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, saith David, and his word was in my tongue.\(^5\) It was the word of the Lord, which he spake by the hand of Moses,\(^6\) and by the hand of his servant Ahijah the prophet.\(^7\) The hand, the general instr-
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I. \[\text{1} \text{Num. xxii. 28.}\]

ment of man; the mouth, the particular instrument of speech; both attributed to the prophets as merely instrumental in their prophecies. The words which Balaam's ass spake were as much the ass's words, as those which Balaam spake was his; for the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth; and not only so, but a bridle with that word, only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that thou shalt speak. The prophets, as they did not frame the notions or conceptions themselves of those truths which they delivered from God, so did they not loosen their own tongues of their own instinct or upon their own motion, but as moved, impelled, and acted by God. So we may in correspondence to the antecedent and subsequent words interpret those words of St. Peter, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation: that is, that no prophecy which is written did so proceed from the prophet which spake or wrote it, that he of himself or by his own instinct did open his mouth to prophesy; but that all prophetical revelations came from God alone, and that whosoever first delivered them was antecedently inspired by him, as it followeth, for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. That therefore which they delivered was the word, the revelation of God; which they assented unto as to a certain and infallible truth, credible upon the immediate testimony of God, and to which the rest of the believers assented upon the same testimony of God mediately delivered by the hands of the prophets.

14.—Thus God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, and by so speaking propounded the object of faith both to the prophets and the fathers, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, and by so speaking hath enlarged the object of faith to us by him, by which means it comes to be the faith of Jesus. Thus the only-begotten Son, who was in the bosom of the Father, the express image of his person, he in whom it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell, he in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, revealed the will of God to the apostles, who being assured 'hat he knew all things, and convinced that he came forth from God, gave a full and clear assent unto those things which he delivered, and grounded their faith upon his words as upon the immediate testimony of God. I have given unto them, saith Christ unto his Father, the words which thou gavest me, and they have
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received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.\(^1\) Besides this delivery of these words by Christ to the Apostles, they received the promise of the Spirit of truth, which should guide them into all truth,\(^2\) and teach them all things, and bring all things into their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them.\(^3\) So clearly, so fully, so constantly were they furnished with divine illuminations and revelations from God, upon which they grounded their own faith, that each of them might well make that profession of St. Paul,\(^4\) *I know whom I have believed.* Thus the faith of the apostles, as of Moses and the prophets, was grounded upon the immediate revelations of God.

15.—But those believers to whom the apostles preached, and whom they converted to the faith, believed the same truths which were revealed to the apostles, though they were not so revealed to them as they were unto the apostles, that is, immediately from God. But as the Israelites believed those truths which Moses spake, to come from God, being convinced by the constant supply of miracles wrought by the rod which he carried in his hand: so the blessed apostles, being so plentifully endued from above with the power of miracles, gave sufficient testimony that it was God which spake by their mouths, who so evidently wrought by their hands. They which heard St. Peter call a lame man unto his legs, speak a dead man alive, and strike a living man to death with his tongue, as he did Ananias and Sapphira, might easily be persuaded that it was God who spake by his mouth, and conclude that where they found him in his omnipotency, they might well expect him in his veracity. These were the persons for whom our Saviour next to the apostles prayed, because by a way next to that of the apostles they believed. *Neither pray I for these alone,* saith Christ, *but for them also who shall believe on me through their word.*\(^5\) Thus the apostles believed on Christ through his own word, and the primitive Christians believed on the same Christ through the apostles’ word: and this distinction our Saviour himself hath clearly made; not that the word of the apostles was really distinct from the word of Christ, but only it was called theirs, because delivered by their ministry, otherwise it was the same word which they had heard from him, and upon which they themselves believed. *That which was from the beginning,* saith St. John, *which we have heard,* which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life; That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you.\(^6\)

\(^1\) John xvii. 8. \(^2\) John xvi. 13. \(^3\) John xiv. 26. \(^4\) 2 Tim. i. 12. \(^5\) John xvii. 20. \(^6\) 1 John, i. 1, 3.
1 Believe.

And this was the true foundation of faith in all them which believed, that they took not the words which they heard from the apostles to be the words of the men which spake them, no more than they did the power of healing the sick, or raising the dead, and the rest of the miracles, to be the power of them that wrought them; but as they attributed those miraculous works to God working by them, so did they also that saving word to the same God speaking by them. When St. Paul preached at Antioch, almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God; 1 so they esteemed it, though they knew a man whom they came to hear speak it. This the Apostle commendeth in the Thessalonians, that when they received the word of God, which they heard of him, they received it not as the word of man, but (as it is in truth) the word of God; 2 and receiving it so, they embraced it as coming from him who could neither deceive nor be deceived, and consequently as infallibly true; and by so embracing it they assented unto it, by so assenting to it they believed it, ultimately upon the testimony of God, immediately upon the testimony of St. Paul, as he speaks himself, because our testimony among you was believed. 3 Thus the faith of those which were converted by the apostles was an assent unto the word as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered to them by a testimony apostolical. Which being thus clearly stated, we may at last descend into our own condition, and so describe the nature of our own faith, that every one may know what it is to believe.

16.—Although Moses was endued with the power of miracles, and conversed with God in the mount, and spake with him face to face at the door of the tabernacle; although upon these grounds the Israelites believed what he delivered to them as the word of God; yet neither the miracles nor Moses did for ever continue with them; and notwithstanding his death, they and their posterity to all generations were obliged to believe the same truths. Wherefore it is observable which St. Stephen saith, he received the lively oracles to give unto them; 4 the decalogue he received from the hand of God, written with the finger of God, the rest of the divine patefactions he wrote himself and so delivered them not a mortal word to die with him, but living oracles, 5 to be in force when he was dead, and oblige the people to a belief, when his rod had ceased to broach the rocks and divide the seas. Neither did he only tie them to a belief of what he wrote himself, but by foretelling and describing the prophets which should be raised in future ages, he put a further obligation upon them to believe
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their prophecies as the revelations of the same God. Thus all the Israelites in all ages believed Moses, while he lived, by believing his words; after his death, by believing his writings. Had ye believed Moses, saith our Saviour, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?¹ Wherefore the faith of the Israelites in the land of Canaan was an assent unto the truths of the law as credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto them in the writings of Moses and the prophets.

17.—In the like manner is it now with us. For although Christ first published the Gospel to those who beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father;² although the Apostles first converted those unto the faith who heard them speak with tongues they never learned, they never heard before, and discover the thoughts of men they never saw before, who saw the lame to walk, the blind to see, the dead to revive, and the living to expire at their command: yet did not these apostles prolong their lives by virtue of that power which gave such testimony to their doctrine, but rather shortened them by their constant attestation to the truth of that doctrine further confirmed by their death. Nor did that power of frequent and ordinary miraculous operations long survive them; and yet they left as great an obligation upon the Church in all succeeding ages to believe all the truths which they delivered, as they had put upon those persons who heard their words and saw their works; because they wrote the same truths which they spake, assisted in writing by the same Spirit by which they spake, and therefore require the same readiness of assent so long as the same truths shall be preserved by those writings. While Moses lived and spake as a mediator between God and the Israelites, they believed his words, and so the prophets while they preached. When Moses was gone up to Mount Nebo, and there died, when the rest of the prophets were gathered to their fathers, they believed their writings, and the whole object of their faith was contained in them. When the Son of God came into the world to reveal the will of his Father, when he made known unto the apostles, as his friends, all things that he had heard of the Father,³ then did the apostles believe the writings of Moses and the prophets and the words of Christ; and in these taken together was contained the entire object of their faith, and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.⁴ When Christ was ascended up into heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down, when the words which Christ had taught the apostles were preached by them, and many thousand

¹ John v. 46, 47. ² John i. 14. ³ John xv. 15 ⁴ John iii. 22.
souls converted to the faith, they believed the writings of the prophets and the words of the apostles; and in these two was comprised the complete object of their faith. When the apostles themselves departed out of this life, and confirmed the truth of the gospel preached by the last of sufferings, their death, they left the sum of what they had received, in writing, for the continuation of the faith in the churches which they had planted, and the propagation thereof in other places, by those which succeeded them in their ordinary function but were not to come near them in their extraordinary gifts. *These things were written,* saith St. John, the longest liver, and the latest writer, *that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,* and that believing ye might have life through his name.*

Those Christians, then, which have lived since the apostles' death, and never obtained the wish of St. Augustine, to see either Christ upon earth or St. Paul in the pulpit, have believed the writings of Moses and the prophets, of the apostles and evangelists, in which together is fully comprehended whatsoever may properly be termed matter of divine faith; and so *the household of God is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets,* who are continued unto us only in their writings, and by them alone convey unto us the truths which they received from God, upon whose testimony we believe. And therefore he which put their writings into the definition of faith, considering faith as now it stands with us, is none of the smallest of the schoolmen. From whence we may at last conclude, that the true nature of the faith of a Christian, as the state of Christ's church now stands and shall continue to the end of the world, consists in this, that it is an assent unto truths credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto us in the writings of the apostles and prophets.

18.—To believe, therefore, as the word stands in the front of the CREED, and not only so, but is diffused through every article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God, (who by reason of his infinite knowledge cannot be deceived, and by reason of his transcendent holiness cannot deceive) and delivered unto us in the writings of the blessed apostles and prophets immediately inspired, moved and acted by God; cut of whose writings this brief sum of necessary points of faith was first col-

---

1 John xx, 31.
3 *Fides est habitus quo assentimus dictis scripturae propter auctoritatem Dei reve- lantis.—DuRandus, lib. iii. dist. 24, q. 1, sect. 9."
ected. And as this is properly to believe, which was our first consideration; so to say I believe, is to make a confession or external expression of the faith, which is the second consideration propounded.

19.—Faith is an habit of the intellectual part of man, and therefore of itself invisible; and to believe is a spiritual act, and consequently immanent and internal, and known to no man but him who believeth: For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? Wherefore Christ being not only the great apostle sent to deliver these revealed truths, and so the author of our faith, but also the head of the church, whose body consisteth of faithful members, and so the author of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of faith, he must needs be imagined to have appointed some external expression and communication of it: especially considering that the sound of the apostles was to go forth unto the ends of the world, and all nations to be called to the profession of the gospel, and gathered into the church of Christ; which cannot be performed without an acknowledgment of the truth, and a profession of faith, without which no entrance into the church, no admittance to baptism.

20.—What doth hinder me to be baptized? saith the eunuch. And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. So believing with all his heart, as Philip required, and making profession of that faith, he was admitted. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. The belief of the heart is the internal habit residing in the soul, and act of faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same; the confession of the mouth is an external signification of the inward habit or act of faith, by words expressing an acknowledgment of those truths which we believe or assent to in our souls. The ear receiveth the word, faith cometh by hearing; the ear conveyeth it to the heart, which being opened receiveth it, receiving believeth it; and then out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. In the heart faith is seated; with the tongue confession is made; between these two

---

1 OiX óe êdóexen ànaðrìpws ouc xoneî' òt tòv pîstwos, ãlì ek pèseis graffhí tòv kairìw- tata sullêghínta miaw ànâplhroì tòn tòv pîstwos didasqalw. — S. Cyril. Catech. 
2 Ecclesiarum patres de populorum salute solliciti, ex diversis voluminibus scripturarum colleguerunt testimonia divinis gravidia sacra-
3 mntis."—Euseb. GALL. In Syn. 
4 "Habes, homo, unde credere deboas, Corde creditur ad justitiam; habes unde deboas confitteri, Ove confessio fit ut salutem."— Chrysos. Serm. 56. Rom. x. 10. 
5 "Sermo creat auditum, auditus conceptum fidei, crediditatem parturit files, confessionem credullitas nutrit, confessio perpetuum dat salutem."—Chrysos. Serm. 60. 
6 Rom. x. 17. 
7 Matt. xii. 34.
salvation is completed. If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. This faith of the heart every one ought, and is presumed to have; this confession of the mouth every one is known to make, when he pronounceth these words of the CREED, I believe; and if true, he may with comfort say, the word of faith is nigh me, even in my mouth and in my heart: first in my heart really assenting, then in my mouth clearly and sincerely professing with the prophet David, I have believed, therefore have I spoken. Thus briefly from the second consideration concerning confession implied in the first words I believe, we shall pass unto the third consideration, of the necessity and particular obligation to such a confession.

21.—If there were no other argument, yet being the object of faith is supposed infallibly true, and acknowledged to be so by every one that believeth, being it is the nature of truth not to hide itself, but rather to desire the light that it might appear; this were sufficient to move us to a confession of our faith. But besides the nature of the thing, we shall find many arguments obliging, pressing, urging us to such a profession. For first, from the same God, and by the same means by which we have received the object of our faith, by which we came under a possibility of faith, we have also received an express command to make a confession of the same: be ready, saith St. Peter, always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you; and there can be no reason of hope but what is grounded on faith, nor can there be an answer given unto that without an acknowledgment of this. Secondly, it is true indeed that the great promises of the gospel are made unto faith, and glorious things are spoken of it; but the same promises are made to the confession of faith together with it; and we know who it is hath said, whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my father which is in heaven. Besides, the profession of the faith of one Christian confirmeth and edifieth another in his, and the mutual benefit of all layeth an obligation upon every particular. Again, the matters of faith contain so much purity of doctrine, persuade such holiness of life, describe God so infinitely glorious, so transcendently gracious, so loving in himself, so merciful in his son, so wonderful in all his works,
that the sole confession of it glorifieth God; and how can we expect to enter into that glory which is none of ours, if we deny God that glory which is his? Lastly, the concealing those truths which he hath revealed, the not acknowledging that faith which we are thought to believe, is so far from giving God that glory which is due unto him, that it dishonoreth the faith which it refuseth or neglecteth to profess, and casteth a kind of contumely upon the author of it, as if God had revealed that which man should be ashamed to acknowledge. Wherefore he that came to save us hath also said unto us, "whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his father's, and of the holy angels."1 Such a necessity there is of confession of faith, in respect of God, who commanded it, and is glorified in it; in respect of ourselves, who shall be rewarded for it; and in respect of our brethren, who are edified and confirmed by it.

22.—Which necessity the wisdom of our church in former ages hath thought a sufficient ground to command the recitation of the Creed at the first initiation into the church by baptism2 (for

---
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every one in particular, as he did him who was born blind, after
he had restored him his sight (and we are all in his condition),
dost thou believe on the Son of God? every single Christian is
taught to make the same answer which he made, Lord, I believe.¹
As if the Son of God did promise to every one of them which are
gathered together in his name, what he promised to one of the
multitude whose son had a dumb spirit, if thou canst believe, all
things are possible to him that believeth;² each one for himself
returneth his answer, Lord, I believe; Lord, help my unbelief. Not
that it is unlawful or unfit to use another number, and instead
of I, to say, we believe: for taking in of others, we exclude
not ourselves; and addition of charity can be no disparagement
to confession of faith. St. Peter answered for the twelve, we
believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living
God.³ For though Christ immediately replied that one of them
had a devil, yet is not St. Peter blamed, who knew it not. But
every one is taught to express his own faith, because by that he
is to stand or fall. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man
availeth much⁴ for the benefit of his brother, but his faith availeth
nothing for the justification of another. And it is otherwise very
fit that our faith should be manifested by a particular confession,
because it is effectual by particular application; therefore must
it needs be proper for me to say I believe, and to make profession
of my faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself
for me.⁵

24.—Being then I have described the true nature and notion of
belief, the duty of confessing our faith, and the obligation of every
particular Christian to believe and to confess; being in these three
explications all which can be imaginably contained in the first
word of the Creed must necessarily be included; it will now be
easy for me to deliver, and for every particular person to under-
stand what it is he says, and upon what ground he proceeds,
when he begins his confession with these words, I believe, which I
conceive may in this manner be fitly expressed.

Although those things which I am ready to affirm be not
apparent to my sense, so that I cannot say I see them; although
they be not evident to my understanding of themselves, nor
appear unto me true by the virtue of any natural and necessary
cause, so that I cannot say I have any proper knowledge or science
of them: yet being they are certainly contained in the scriptures,
the writings of the blessed apostles and prophets; being those
apostles and prophets were endued with miraculous power from

¹ John ix. 35, 36. ² Mark x. 7, 23, 24. ³ Gal. ii. 20. ⁴ John vi. 69. ⁵ James v. 16.
above, and immediately inspired with the Holy Ghost, and consequently what they delivered was not the word of man, but of God himself; being God is of that universal knowledge and infinite wisdom, that it is impossible he should be deceived, of that indefectible holiness and transcendent rectitude, that it is not imaginable he should intend to deceive any man, and consequently whatsoever he hath delivered for a truth must be necessarily and infallibly true; I readily and stedfastly assent unto them as most certain truths, and am as fully and absolutely, and more concernedly persuaded of them, than of anything I see or know. And because that God who hath revealed them hath done it not for my benefit only, but for the advantage of others, nor for that alone, but also for the manifestation of his own glory; being for those ends he hath commanded me to profess them, and hath promised an eternal reward upon my profession of them; being every particular person is to expect the justification of himself, and the salvation of his soul, upon the condition of his own faith: as with a certain and full persuasion I assent unto them, so with a fixed and undaunted resolution I will profess them; and with this faith in my heart, and confession in my mouth, in respect of the whole body of the CREED, and every article and particle in it, I sincerely, readily, resolutely say, I believe.

CHAPTER II.

I believe in God.

HAVING delivered the nature of faith, and the act of belief common to all the articles of the CREED, that we may understand what it is to believe; we shall proceed to the explication of the articles themselves, as the most necessary objects of our faith, that we may know what is chiefly to be believed. Where immediately we meet with another word as general as the former, and as universally concerned in every article, which is God; for if to believe be to assent upon the testimony of God, as we have before declared, then wheresoever belief is expressed or implied, there is also the name of God understood, upon whose testimony we believe. He therefore whose authority is the ground and foundation of the whole, his existence begins the CREED, as the foundation of that authority. For if there can be no divine faith without
the attestation of God, by which alone it becomes divine, and there can be no such attestation, except there were an existence of the testifier, then must it needs be proper to begin the confession of our faith with the agnation of our God. If his name were thought fit to be expressed in the front of every action even by the heathen, because they thought no action prospered but by his approbation; 1 much more ought we to fix it before our confession, because without him to believe as we profess, is no less than a contradiction.

1.—Now these words, I believe in God, will require a double consideration; one, of the phrase or manner of speech; another, of the thing or nature of the truth in that manner expressed. For to believe with an addition of the preposition in, is a phrase or expression ordinarily conceived fit to be given to none but to God himself, as always implying, beside a bare act of faith, an addition of hope, love, and affiance. An observation, as I conceive, Prevailing especially in the Latin Church, grounded principally upon the authority of St. Augustine. 2 Whereas among the Greeks, in whose language the New Testament was penned, I perceive no such constant distinction in their deliveries of the Creed; and in the Hebrew language of the Old, 3 from which

1 Θεός, θεός: Ἐθος Ἰπ., ὅτε κατάρχοντι τινος, θεω λέγειν ἐπεκφραζόμενοι.—HEST. Lex. [Edit. Schrevel, 1698.]
2 For, Scr. 181, which is upon the Creed, we find these words: "Non dict, Credo Deum, vel, Credo Deo, quamvis et hec salut necessaria sint Alid enim est credere illi, alid credere illum, alid credere illum. Credere illi, est credere vera esse quod loquitur; credere illum, credere quia ipse est Deus; credere in illum, diligere illum." And though that collection of Sermons de Tempore under the name of St. Augustine be not all his, (divers of them being translations of the Greek Homilies,) yet this distinction may be collected out of other parts of his works. For, first, he distinguisheth very clearly and seriously between credere Deo, and credere in Deum. "Numquam aliquid apostolorum dicere auderet, Qui credit in me. Credimus apostolo, sed non credimus in apostolo."—Tract. 54 in Psalm. And again: "Credimus Paulo, sed non credimus in Paulum; credimus Petro, sed non credimus in Petrum." Secondly, he distinguisheth between credere Deum and credere in Deum: "Multum inter istum utrum quis credat ipsum esse Christum, et utrum credat in Christum. Illa credit in Christum qui et sperat in Christum, et diligat Christum."—De Verba Dom. Serm. 61. And, which is the sum of all, he puts a high value upon the preposition, as if, by virtue of the addition in, the phrase did properly signify so great an accession unto faith: "Quid est credere in Deum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, et ejus membris incorporari."—Tract. 29 in Joch. Which doctrine of St. Augustine's being taken notice of by Peter Lombard, hath since been continued by the Schoolmen; and Aquinas, Sum. 26, q. 2, sect. 2, ad primum, bringing all three under one act of faith, hath been contradicted by Durandus, in 3 Sent. dist. xxiii. q. 7, sect. 6: "Credere in Deum non est praeclare actus fidei, sed fidel et caritatis simul; et sunt etiam plures, et non unus actus tantum:" by whose subtle, but yet clear, determination, (as many of his are beyond the rest of the Schools,) whatsoever is added by the preposition to "believe," appears not to be a part of belief, but an act superadded to the act of faith.

3 For Ἰς is sometimes joined with Ἰ, sometimes with Ἰ: when with Ἰ, it answers properly to πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ, credere Deo, 5 being nothing else but a signifier of the case; when with Ἰ, it corresponds to πιστεύειν εἰς τῷ Θεῷ, credere in Deum, 7 being a preposition of the same nature with εἰς or ἐν. But yet there is so little, or rather no, difference in the Hebrew, that in the first place where it is used, and that of the father of the faithful, even for the act of justifying faith, הָגַהְרֵי גֵּרָה (Gen. xv. 6;) it is translated by the LXX. Kai εὐσεβευές. Aβραάμ τῷ Θεῷ, not εἰς Θεόν, and that translation warranted by St. Paul (Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6) and St. James (i. 23.) In the
the Jewish and Christian Greeks received that phrase of believing in, it hath no such peculiar and accumulative signification. For it is sometimes attributed to God, the author and original cause, sometimes to the prophets, the immediate revealers, of the faith; sometimes it is spoken of miracles, the motives to believe; sometimes of the law of God, the material object of our faith. Among all which varieties of that phrase of speech, it is sufficiently apparent, that in this confession of faith it is most proper to admit it in the last acceptance, by which it is attributed to the material object of belief. For the CREED being nothing else but a brief comprehension of the most necessary matters of faith, whatsoever is contained in it beside the first word I believe, by which we make confession of our faith, can be nothing else but part of those verities to be believed, and the act of belief in

same manner, 2 Kings xvii. 14. Neither is this only spoken of Moses and the prophets, that the Israelites believed in them, but of David, not as a prophet, but as a bare relater of his own actions: (1 Sam. xxvii. 12.)

De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 14. Neither is this

[Mr. Nicholls observes in his edition that this is the Greek rendering, as it occurs in the sixth and preceding editions; but in others which were published long after bishop Pearson's decease, the clause is translated, proclamJam, Vaticanum, thus: "Kai επιστευθη /Δαβις εν των Άγγυοις σολφδρες. Both these versions will afford the Hebrew scholar a good specimen of the wonderful pliability of the Greek language in accommodating itself to the nicest variations of oriental phraseology. To give forcible expression to the conjunction Hiphil, the LXX. have employed επιστευθη in an impersonal sense, to convey this signification: "Complete credence was accorded to David by Achish;" or, divested of its passive adjuncts in English, "Achish implicitly believed David." ]
On the Creed.

[ART. I.

respect of them nothing but an assent unto them as divinely credible and infallible truths. Neither can we conceive that the ancient Greek fathers of the church could have any farther meaning in it, who make the whole body of the Creed to be of the same nature, as so many truths to be believed, acknowledged and confessed; insomuch as sometimes they use not believing in, neither for the Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost; sometimes using it as to them, they continue the same to the following articles of, the Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, &c., and generally speak of the Creed as of nothing but mere matter of faith, without any intimation of hope, love, or any such notion included in it. So that believing in, by virtue of the phrase or manner of speech, whether we look upon the original use of it in the Hebrew, or the derivative in the Greek, or the sense of it in the first Christians in the Latin Church, can be of no farther real importance in the Creed in respect of God, who immediately follows, than to acknowledge and assert his being or existence. Nor ought this to be imagined a slender notion or small part of the first article of our faith, when it really is the foundation of this and all the rest; that as the Creed is fundamental in respect of other truths, this is the foundation even of the fundamentals:

1. Pistoéwmen oin kai ëmolougoi'men éna mónon alhíndon kai ágathí theon, kai éna tôn muongeúnta autón Ícyp, kai eín mónon Píneuma "Agion.—S. BAsil.


3. Gregorius Nyssenus calls them εἰσεβείς πέρι Θεοῦ ὑπολογείς and Eusebíus, in his Confession exhibited to the Council of Nice, concludes, Pistoéwmen kai eis én Píneuma "Agion, toúton ékastov en ñnai kai ἐπάρχων πιστεύοντες signifying that every particular which he had rehearsed he believed to be; and that was all in the Confession intended. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, after a long declaration of the former articles concerning the Father and the Son, draws to a conclusion on the latter articles thus: Πρὸς δὲ τῇ εἰσεβείᾳ (I. εἰσεβεί) ταύτῃ περὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Ῥίου δόξη—ἐν Πίνεμα Ἀγιον ὑμολογοῦμεν—μὲν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν—μετὰ τούτον (νῦν τούτο) τὴν ἑκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν εἰδάμεν. —THEODORET. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. cap. 4. So Tertullian, De Præser. adv. Hæret.: “Regula est fidei illa qua creditur unum omnino Deum esse:” and, Adv. Præzexam, cap. 2, where he makes another rehearsal of his Creed, he begins with, “Unicum quidem Deum credimus.”

4. "Non est amor Dei articulis, neque etiam amor proximi; quia, etiam si sint præcepts generalis activa, tamen cum actio continetur, non oporet eurn constituere articulum: sed ista sunt fidei dogmata, quae sunt columnae et fundamenta legis divinae."—Is. ABRAYANEL. De Cap. Fidei, cap. 11. "Primus est deinitium culius, deos credere."—SEK.

5. "The foundation of foundations and pillar of wisdoms is to know that the first Being is, and that it giveth existence to every thing which is."—MADON De Fundam. Legis.
For he that cometh to God must believe that he is. And this I take for a sufficient explication of the phrase, I believe in God, that is, I believe that God is.

2.—As for the matter or truth contained in these words so explained, it admits a threefold consideration: First, of the notion of God, what is here understood by that name: Secondly, of the existence of God, how we know or believe that he is: Thirdly, the unity of God in that, though there be Gods many, and Lords many, yet in our CREED we mention him as but one. When, therefore, we shall have clearly delivered what is the true notion of God in whom we believe, how and by what means we come to assure ourselves of the existence of such a Deity, and upon what grounds we apprehend him of such a transcendent nature that he can admit no competitor; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the former part of the first article; then may every one understand what he says, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, I believe in God.

3.—The name of God is attributed unto many, but here is to be understood of him who by way of eminency and excellency bears that name, and therefore is styled God of gods; the Lord our God is Gods of gods, and Lord of lords: and in the same respect is called the most high God, (others being but inferior, or under him,) and God over or above all. This eminency and excellency, by which these titles become proper unto him and incommunicable to any other, is grounded upon the divine nature or essence, which all other who are called gods have not, and therefore are not by nature gods. Then when ye knew not God, saith St. Paul, ye did service to them which by nature are not gods. There is then a God by nature, and others which are called gods, but by nature are not so: for either they have no power at all, because no being, but only in the false opinions of deceived men, as the gods of the heathen; or if they have any real power or authority, from whence some are called gods in the scripture, yet have they it not from themselves or of their own nature, but from him who only hath immortality, and consequently only Divinity, and therefore is the only true God. So that the notion of a Deity doth at last expressly signify a being or nature of infinite perfection; and the infinite perfection of
a nature or being consisteth in this, that it be absolutely and essentially necessary, an actual being of itself; and potential or causative of all beings beside itself, independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed. It is true, indeed, that to give a perfect definition of God is impossible, neither can our finite reason hold any proportion with infinity: but yet a sense of this divinity we have, and the first and common notion of it consists in these three particulars, that it is a being of itself, and independent from any other; that it is that upon which all things which are made depend; that it governs all things. And this I conceive sufficient as to the first consideration, in reference to the notion of a God.

4.—As for the existence of such a being, how it comes to be known unto us or by what means we are assured of it, is not so unanimously agreed upon, as that it is. For although some have imagined that the knowledge of a deity is connatural to the soul of man, so that every man hath a connate inbred notion of a God; yet I rather conceive the soul of man to have no connatural knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it from the beginning; but being we can have no assurance of its pre-existence, we may more rationally judge it to receive the first apprehensions of things by sense, and by them to make all rational collections. If then the soul of man be at the first like a fair smooth table without any actual characters of knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rational collection; then must we not refer the apprehension of a deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion; at least we are assured God never chargeth us with the knowledge of him upon that account.

Again, although others do affirm that the existence of God is a truth evident of itself, so as whosoever hears but these terms once named, that God is, cannot choose but acknowledge it for a certain and infallible truth upon the first apprehension; that as no man can deny that the whole is greater than any part, who knoweth only what is meant by whole, and what by part; so no man can possibly deny or doubt of the existence of God, who knows but what is meant by God, and what it is to be; yet can we not ground our knowledge of God’s existence upon any such clear and immediate evidence: nor were it safe to lay it upon such a ground, because whosoever should deny it, could not by this means be convinced; it being a very irrational way of instruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth, that he must believe it because it is evident unto him, when he knows that he therefore only doubts of it because it is not evident unto him.
5.—Although therefore that God is, be of itself an immediate, certain, necessary truth, yet must it be evidenced and made apparent unto us by its connexion unto other truths;\(^1\) so that the being of the Creator may appear unto us by his creature, and the dependency of inferior entities lead us to a clear acknowledgment of the supreme and independent being. The Wisdom of the Jews thought this method proper; for by the greatness and beauty of the creatures, proportionably the maker of them is seen;\(^2\) and not only they, but St. Paul hath taught us, that the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.\(^3\) For if Thiodias could so contrive a

---

1 "Hec propositio, Deus est, quantum in se est, per se nota est, quia praeclatum est idem cum subjecto; Deus enim est suum esse.—Sed quia nos non scimus de Deo quid est, non est nobis per se nota, sed indiget demonstrari p. r. ea quae sunt magis nota quoad nos, et minus nota quoad natural. *Silicet per effectus.*"—AQUIN. 1 p. q. 2, art. i.

2 Wisd. of Sol. xiii. 5.

3 This place (Rom. i. 20) must be vindicated from the false gloss of Socinus, who contends that it cannot be proved from the creature that there is a God, and therefore to this place of St. Paul answers thus: "Scendium est verba . . . debere conjungi cum verbo invisibilita.—Atigitur eo in loco apostolus, et adversum divinitatem Dei, id est, quod nos Deus perpetuo facere vult, (divinitatem enim sequitur alibi quoque apud ipsum enunciatur, ut Col. ii. 9) *aeternamque potentiam,* id est, promissiones que nunquam intercedent; (quo sensu paulo superius dixerat *evangelium esse potentiam Dei*) hunc, inquam, que nunquam postquam mundus creatus est ab hominibus visa fuerat, id est, non fuerant eis cognita, per opera, hoc est, per mirabilia ipsius Dei et divinorum hominum, praesertim vero Christo et apostolorum ejus, operationes, conspecta fuisse." In which explication there is nothing which is not forced and distorted: for though his first observation seem plausible, yet there is no validity in it. He bringeth only for proof Matt. xiii. 35: *Keryxmenia apud katapholhe kovmu* which proves not at all that *ap' kovme* has the same sense: and it is more probable that it hath not, because that is usually expressed by *ap' arxhs kovme,* (Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; 2 Peter iii. 4) never by *ap' kovme.* Besides, the *keryxmenia* In St. Matthew bears not that analogy with *arxhas* which Socinus pretends, signifying not "things unseen or unknown" till then, but only "obscure sayings or parables;" for which purpose those words were produced out of the Psalms by the evangelist, to prove that the Messias was to speak in "parables," in the original, ἡρὶ ἡρὶ ἀργην ἥξει στοιχεία, ἡρὶ ἡρἰ
piece of his own work, as in it to preserve the memory of himself, never to be obliterated without the destruction of the work; 1 well may we read the great artificer of the world in the works of his own hands, and by the existence of any thing demonstrate the first cause of all things.

6.—We find by the experience of ourselves, that some things in this world have abeginning before which they were not; the account of the years of our age sufficiently infer our nativities, and they our conceptions, before which we had no being. Now if there be any thing which had a beginning, there must necessarily be something which had no beginning, because nothing can be a beginning to itself. Whatsoever is, must of necessity either have been made, or not made; and something there must needs be which was never made, because all things cannot be made. For whatsoever is made, is made by another, neither can any thing produce itself; otherwise it would follow, that the same thing is and is not at the same instant in the same respect: it is, because a producer; it is not, because to be produced: it is therefore in being, and is not in being; which is a manifest contradiction. If then all things which are made were made by some other, that other which produced them either was itself produced, or was not: and if not, then have we already an independent being; if it were, we must at last come to something which was never made, or else admit either a circle of productions, in which the effect shall make its own cause, or an infinite succession in causalities, 2 by which nothing will be made: both which are equally impossible. Something then we must confess was never made, something which never had beginning. And although these effects or dependent beings singly considered by themselves do not infer one supreme cause and maker of them all, yet the admirable order and connexion of things 3 show as much; and this one supreme cause is God. For all things which we see or know have their existence for some end, which no man who considereth

1 In the shield of Pallas.—ARISTOT. De Mundo.

2 Ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅσι ἔστιν ἀρχή τις, καὶ οὐκ ἀπειρὸν οὐκ αἰτία τῶν ὄντων, οὐκ εἰς εἰβοριάν, οὔτε κατ' έἴδος, δῆλον.—ARISTOT. Metaph. lib. ii. cap. 2. And again: Εἴπερ μηδὲν ἐστὶ τὸ πρῶτον, ὅλως αἰτίαν οὐδὲν ἐστὶ.

3 Πίθεν δῆλον εἰ ὅλως ἐστὶ Θεός; 'Εκ τῆς τῶν ὄντων συστασεως τε καὶ διαμορφῆς.—LUTIN. Quast. et Resp. ad Graecos.
the uses and utilities of every species can deny. Now whatsoever is and hath its being for some end, of that the end for which it is must be thought the cause; and a final cause is no otherwise the cause of any thing than as it moves the efficient cause to work: from whence we cannot but collect a prime efficient cause of all things, induded with infinite wisdom, who having a full comprehension of the ends of all, designed, produced, and disposed all things to those ends.

7.—Again, as all things have their existence, so have they also their operations for some end: and whatsoever worketh so, must needs be directed to it. Although then those creatures which are induded with reason can thereby apprehend the goodness of the end for which they work, and make choice of such means as are proportionable and proper for the obtaining of it, and so by their own counsel direct themselves unto it: yet can we not conceive that other natural agents, whose operations flow from a bare instinct, can be directed in their actions by any counsel of their own. The stone doth not deliberate whether it shall descend, nor doth the wheat take counsel whether it shall grow or no. Even men in natural actions use no act of deliberation: we do not advise how our heart shall beat, though without that pulse we cannot live; when we have provided nutriment for our stomach, we take no counsel how it shall be digested there, or how the chyle distributed to every part for the reparation of the whole; the mother which conceives taketh no care how that conceptus shall be framed, how all the parts shall be distinguished, and by what means or ways the child shall grow within her womb: and yet all these operations are directed to their proper ends, and that with a greater reason, and therefore by a greater wisdom, than what proceeds from any thing of human understanding. What then can be more clear, than that those natural agents which work constantly for those ends which they themselves cannot perceive, must be directed by some high and over-ruling wisdom? and who can be their director in all their operations tending to those ends, but he which gave them their being for those ends? and who is that, but the great artificer who works in all of them? For art is so far the imitation of nature, that if it were not in the artificer, but in the thing itself which by art is framed, the works of art and nature would be the same. 1

---

1 'Εν οἷον τέλος τι ἔστι, τοῦτον ἔνεκα πράττεται τὸ πρότερον καὶ τὸ ἐφεξῆς ὑπὸν ὡς πράττεται, οὕτω πέφκυ η γὰρ πέφκυ, καὶ ὡς πέφκυν, ἐν μὴ τι ἐποδέχησθαι οὕτω πράττεται ἐκαστοῦ: πράττεται δὲ ἐνεκά του, καὶ πέφκυν ἀρα τούτου ἔνεκα.—ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤ. ΨΥΓ. lib. ii. cap. 8.

2 Ἀτοπον τὸ μὴ οἶεσθαι ἐνεκά τοῦ γίνεσθαι, ἐὰν μὴ ἔδωκα τὸ κινοῦν βουλευσάμενον: καίτοι καὶ ἡ τέχνη οὐ βουλευεθαι καὶ γὰρ εἰ ἐνιά ἐν τῷ ἐνλε ἡ ναυπηγικῇ ἡμοιώς ἀν τῇ φύσει ἐποίει.—ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤ. ΨΥΓ. lib. ii. cap 8.
On the Creed.

ART. I.

Were that which frames a watch within it, and all those curious wheels wrought without the hand of man, it would seem to grow into that form; nor would there be any distinction between the making of that watch, and the growing of a plant. Now what the artificer is to works of art, who orders and disposes them to other ends than by nature they were made, that is the maker of all things to all natural agents, directing all their operations to ends which they cannot apprehend; and thus appears the maker to be the ruler of the world, the steerer of this great ship, the law of this universal commonwealth, the general of all the hosts of heaven and earth. By these ways, as by the testimony of the creature, we come to find an eternal and independent being, upon which all things depend, and by which all things else are governed; and this we have before supposed to be the first notion of God.

S.—Neither is this any private collection or particular ratiocination, but the public and universal reason of the world. No age so distant, no country so remote, no people so barbarous, but gives a sufficient testimony of this truth. When the Roman eagle flew over most parts of the habitable world, they met with atheism nowhere, but rather by their miscellany deities at Rome, which grew together with their victories, they showed no nation was without its God. And since the later art of navigation improved hath discovered another part of the world, with which no former commerce hath been known, although the customs of the people be much different, and their manner of religion hold small correspondency with any in these parts of the world professed, yet in this all agree, that some religious observances they retain, and a divinity they acknowledge. Or if any nation be discovered which maketh no profession of piety, and exerciseth no religious observances, it followeth not from thence that they acknowledge no God: for they may only deny his providence, as the Epicureans did; or if any go farther, their numbers are so few, that they must be inconsiderable in respect of mankind. And therefore so much of the Creed hath been the general confession of all nations, I believe in God. Which were it not a most certain truth grounded upon principles obvious unto all, what reason could be given of so universal a consent? or how can it be

1 Καθὸλος ὅπερ ἐν τῇ κυβερνήσει, ἐν ἐματι ἡμῶν, ἐν χορῷ δὲ κορυφαῖος, ἐν πόλει δὲ νόμος, ἐν στρατηγῷ δὲ γῆς, τὸν Θεόν ἐν κόσμῳ. — ARISTOT. De Mundo.

2 "Habet Dominus testimonium totum hoc quod sumus, et in quo sumus." — Tertullianus.

3 Ἀρχαῖος τις λόγος καὶ πατριῶς ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἀνθρώποις, ως ἐκ Θεοῦ τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ Θεοῦ ἡμῖν συνεστηκεν. — ARISTOT. De Mundo.

4 "Nulla gens usquam est adeo contra leges moresque projecta, ut non aliquos deo credat." — SENECA Epist. cxvii.
imagined that all men should conspire to deceive themselves and their posterity? 1

9.—Nor is the reason only general, and the consent unto it universal, but God hath still preserved and quickened the worship due unto his name, by the patefaction of himself. Things which are to come are so beyond our knowledge that the wisest man can but conjecture: and being we are assured of the contingency of future things, and our ignorance of the concurrence of several free causes to the production of an effect, we may be sure that certain and infallible predictions are clear divine patefacions. For none but he who made all things, and gave them power to work, none but he who ruleth all things, and ordereth and directeth all their operations to their ends, none but he upon whose will the actions of all things depend, can possibly be imagined to foresee the effects depending merely on those causes. And therefore by what means we may be assured of a prophecy, by the same we may be secured of a divinity. Except, then, all the annals of the world were forgeries, and all remarks of history designed to put a cheat upon posterity, we can have no pretence to suspect God's existence, having so ample testimonies of his influence.

The works of nature appear by observation uniform, and there is a certain sphere of every body's power and activity. If then any action be performed which is not within the compass of the power of any natural agent, if anything be wrought by the intervention of a body which beareth no proportion to it, or hath no natural aptitude so to work, it must be ascribed to a cause transcending all natural causes, and disposing all their operations. Thus every miracle proves its author, and every act of omnipotency is a sufficient demonstration of a deity. And that man must be possessed with a strange opinion of the weakness of our fathers, and the testimony of all former ages, who shall deny that ever any miracle was wrought. We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us what works thou didst in their days, in the times of old. 2 Blessed be the Lord God, who only doth wondrous works. 3

Nor are we only informed by the necessary dependency of all things on God, as effects upon their universal cause, or his external patefacions unto others, and the consentient acknowledgment of mankind; but every particular person hath a particular remembrancer in himself, as a sufficient testimony of his Creator, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of conscience in all

1 "Nec in hunc fuorem omnes mortales consensissent alloquendi surda numina ef beneficaces deos."—Seneca. Epist. cxvii.
2 Psalm xliv. 1. 3 Psalm lxxii. 18.
men, by which their thoughts are ever accusing or excusing them;" they feel a comfort in those virtuous actions which they find themselves to have wrought according to their rule, a sting and secret remorse for all vicious acts and impious machinations. Nay, those who strive most to deny a God, and to obliterate all sense of divinity out of their own souls, have not been least sensible of this remembrancer in their breasts. "Tis true, indeed, that a false opinion of God, and a superstitious persuasion which hath nothing of the true God in it, may breed a remorse of conscience in those who think it true; and therefore some may hence collect that the force of conscience is only grounded upon an opinion of a deity, and that opinion may be false. But if it be a truth, as the testimonies of the wisest writers of most different persuasions, and experience of all sorts of persons of most various inclinations, do agree, that the remorse of conscience can never be obliterated, then it rather proveth than supposeth an opinion of a divinity; and that man which most peremptorily denieth God's existence is the greatest argument himself that there is a God. Let Caligula profess himself an atheist, and with that profession hide his head, or run under his bed, when the thunder strikes his ears, and lightning flashes in his eyes; those terrible works of nature put him in mind of the power, and his own guilt of the justice, of God, whom, while in his wilful opinion he weakly denieth, in his involuntary action he strongly asserteth. So that a deity will either be granted or extorted, and where it is not acknowledged it will be manifested. Only unhappy is that man who denies him to himself, and proves him to others; who will not acknowledge his existence, of whose power he cannot be ignorant. God is not far from every one of us. The proper discourse of St. Paul to the philosophers of Athens was, that they might feel after him and find him. Some children have been so ungracious as to refuse to give the honour due unto their parent, but never any so irrational as to deny they had a father. As for those who have dishonoured God, it may stand most with their interest, and therefore they may wish there were none, but cannot consist with their reason to assert there is none, when even the very poets of the heathen have taught us that we are his offspring.

10.—It is necessary thus to believe there is a God, first, because there can be no divine faith without this belief. For all faith is therefore only divine because it relieth upon the authority of

1 Rom. ii. 15.
2 "Hec est summa delicti, nolle agnoscre quem ignorare non possis." — S. Cyprian De Idol. Van.
3 Acts xvii. 27.
4 Acts xvii. 28.
God giving testimony to the object of it; but that which hath no
being can have no authority, can give no testimony. The ground
of his authority is his veracity; the foundations of his veracity
are his omniscience and sanctity, both which suppose his
essence and existence, because what is not is neither knowing nor
holy.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe a deity, that thereby we
may acknowledge such a nature extant as is worthy of, and may
justly challenge from us, the highest worship and adoration.
For it were vain to be religious and to exercise devotion, except
there were a being to which all such holy applications were most
justly due. Adoration implies submission and dejection, so that
while we worship we cast down ourselves: there must be there-
fore some great eminence in the object worshipped, or else we
should dishonour our own nature in the worship of it. But when
a being is presented of that intrinsical and necessary perfection,
that it depends on nothing, and all things else depend on that,
and are wholly governed and disposed by it, this worthily calls us
to our knees, and shows the humblest of our devotions to be but
just and loyal retributions.

11.—This necessary truth hath been so universally received,
that we shall always find all nations of the world more prone
unto idolatry than to atheism, and readier to multiply than
deny the deity. But our faith teacheth us equally to deny them
both, and each of them are renounced in these words, I believe in
God. First, in God affirmatively. I believe he is, against atheism
Secondly, in God exclusively, not in gods, against polytheism and
idolatry. Although therefore the existence and unity of God be
two distinct truths, yet are they of so necessary dependence and
intimate coherence, that both may be expressed by one word,1
and included in one article.2

12.—And that the unity of the Godhead is concluded in this
article is apparent, not only because the Nicene council so ex-
pressed it by way of exposition, but also because this creed in the
churches of the east,3 before the council of Nice, had that

1 “Solam Deum confirmas quem tantum Deum nominas.”—Terr. De Testim.
Anima, cap. ii. When Leo, Bishop of Rome, in an epistle to Flavianus, had written
these words, “Fidelium universitas profetetur creedere se in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem,
et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus;” one of the Eutychians objected with this question:
“Cur non dixerit, in unum Deum Patrem, et in unum Jesum, juxta Niceni decretum
Concillii?” To which Viglius, Bishop of Trent, or rather of Tapsus, gives this answer:
“Sed Romae et antiquam Nicena Synodus conveniret, a temporibus Apostolorum usque
ad nunc, ita fidelibus symbolum traditur nec praedicat, verba ubi sensus incoluim per-
manet: magis enim cum Domino Jesu Christi sententia haec fidelis professio factit,
dicentis, Creditis in Deum, et in me credite; nec dixit, in unum Deum Patrem, et in unum
2 R. Chasdei in Or Adonai. R. Joseph
Albo in Hilkavin.
3 “Orientales Ecclesiae omnes ista tradunt,
addition in it, I believe in one God. We begin our Creed, then, as Plato did his chief and prime epistles, who gave this distinction to his friends, that the name of God was prefixed before those that were more serious and remarkable, but of gods, in the plural, to such as were more vulgar and trivial. Unto thee it was showed, saith Moses to Israel, that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God, there is none else beside him. And as the law, so the gospel teacheth us the same: We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but one. This unity of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the existence, so that it must be as impossible there should be more Gods than one, as that there should be none: which will clearly be demonstrated, first, out of the nature of God, to which multiplication is repugnant; and, secondly, from the government as he is lord, in which we must not admit confusion.

13.—For first, the nature of God consists in this, that he is the prime and original cause of all things, as an independent being upon which all things else depend, and likewise the ultimate end or final cause of all; but in this sense two prime causes are unimaginable, and for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings than one, is a clear contradiction. This primity God requires to be attributed to himself: Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called, I am he, I am the first, I also am the last. And from this primity he challengeth his unity: Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.

Again, if there were more Gods than one, then were not all perfections in one, neither formally, by reason of their distinction, nor eminently and virtually, for then one should have power to produce the other, and that nature which is producible is not divine. But all acknowledge God to be absolutely and infinitely perfect, in whom all perfections imaginable which are simply such must be contained formally, and all others which imply any mixture of imperfection, virtually.

But were no arguments brought from the infinite perfections of


2 Deut. iv. 35. 1 Cor. viii. 4.
3 Isai. xiv. 12. Isai. xliv. 6.
the divine nature able to convince us, yet were the consideration of his supreme dominion sufficient to persuade us. The will of God is infinitely free, and by that freedom doth he govern and dispose of all things. He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth,1 said Nebuchadnezzar out of his experience; and St. Paul expresseth him as working all things after the counsel of his own will.2 If there then were more supreme governors of the world than one, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing, than which nothing can be more prejudicial unto government. God is a God of order, not confusion; and therefore of unity, not admitting multiplication. If it be better that the universe should be governed by one than many,3 we may be assured that it is so, because nothing must be conceived of God but what is best. He, therefore, who made all things, by that right is lord of all, and because all power is his, he alone ruleth over all.4

14.—Now God is not only one, but hath an unity peculiar to himself,5 by which he is the only God; and that not only by way of actuality, but also of possibility. Every individual man is one, but so as there is a second and a third, and consequently every one is part of a number, and concurring to a multitude. The sun, indeed, is one; so as there is neither third nor second sun, at least within the same vortex: but though there be not, yet there might have been; neither in the unity of the solar nature is there any repugnancy to plurality, for that God which made this world, and in this the sun to rule the day, might have made another world by the same fecundity of his omnipotency, and another sun to rule in that. Whereas in the divine nature there is an intrin-

---

1 Dan. iv. 35. 2 Eph. i. 11. 3 ἄντα οὖ ἀνετεῖαι πολιτεύσει εἰς εἰς ἀναμαν. 4 “Unus omnium Dominus est Deus: neque enim illa sublimitas potest habere consortem, cum sola omnem tenet potestatem.”—S. Cyprian. De Idol. Vanit. 5 "Αλλά ο θεὸς ἡ ζωή αὐτοῦ λαμβάνει καὶ δόθηκεν αὐτῷ οὐκ οὐκ ἂν ἦν καὶ ἦν, καὶ ἦν υἱὸς τῆς ζωῆς· ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ημῶν, καὶ ἦν ὁ δύναμις τῆς σαρκός τοῦ τύχος τῆς σαρκός· οὐκ ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ημῶν, καὶ ἦν ὁ δύναμις τῆς σαρκός τοῦ τύχος τῆς σαρκός· ὁ δύναμις τῆς σαρκός τοῦ τύχος τῆς σαρκός."—Hebr. In Syn. 27.
sical and essential singularity, because no other being can have any existence but from that; and whatsoever essence hath its existence from another is not God. *I am the Lord, saith he, and there is none else, there is no God besides me: that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none Besides me, *I am the Lord and there is none else.*

He who hath infinite knowledge knoweth no other God beside himself. *Is there a God besides me? yea, there is no God, I know not any.* And we who believe in him, and desire to enjoy him, need for that end to know no other God but him: *for this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God;* as certainly one, as God.

15.—It is necessary thus to believe the unity of the Godhead, that being assured there is a nature worthy of our devotions, and challenging our religious subjection, we may learn to know whose that nature is to which we owe our adorations, lest our minds should wander and fluctuate in our worship about various and uncertain objects. If we should apprehend more Gods than one, I know not what could determinate us in any instant to the actual adoration of any one: for where no difference doth appear, (as, if there were many, and all by nature Gods, there could be none) what inclination could we have, what reason could we imagine, to prefer or elect any one before the rest for the object of our devotions? Thus is it necessary to believe the unity of God in respect of us who are obliged to worship him.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the unity of God in respect of him who is to be worshipped. Without this acknowledgment we cannot give unto God the things which are God’s, it being part of the worship and honour due unto God to accept of no compartner with him. When the law was given, in the observance whereof of the Israelites consisted, the first precept was this prohibition, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me:,* and whosoever violateth this denieth the foundation on which all the rest depend, as the Jews observe. This is the true reason of that strict precept by which all are commanded to give divine worship to God only: *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,*

---

1 Isai. xl. 5, 6; Deut. iv. 35; xxxii. 39; Psalm xviii. 31.
2 Isai. xliv. 8 xlvi. 21, 22.
3 John xvii. 3.
4 *Veritas Christiana distincte pronunciavit, Deus, si non unus est, non est; quia dignius credimus non esse, quodunque non sita fuerit ut esse debuit.*—Tertull. Adv. Marcion, lib. i. cap. 3. *Deus cum sumnum magnum sit, puta veritas nostra pronunciavit, Deus, si non unus est, non est. Non quasi obdeam us esse Deum, dicendo, *Sit non unus, non est Deus; sed quia, quem confidimus esse, idem definimus esse, quod si non est, Deus non est, summum scilicet magnum. Porro, summum magnum unicum sit necesse est; ergo et Deus unicus erit; non alter Deus, nis summum magnum; nec alter summum magnum, nisi parentem habens; nec alter parentem non habens, nisi unicum fuerit.*—Ruffinus In symb.
5 Exod. xx. 3
6 Moses Maimon. De Funitum. Legis cap. i. 3.
and him only shalt thou serve; because he alone is God: him only shalt thou fear, because he alone hath infinite power; in him only shalt thou trust, because he only is our rock and our salvation; to him alone shalt thou direct thy devotions because he only knoweth the hearts of the children of men. Upon this foundation the whole heart of man is entirely required of him, and engaged to him. 

Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one God: And (or rather, Therefore) thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. Whosoever were truly and by nature God, could not choose but challenge our love upon the ground of an infinite excellency, and transcendent beauty of holiness: and therefore if there were more Gods than one, our love must necessarily be terminated unto more than one, and consequently divided between them; and as our love, so also the proper effect thereof, our cheerful and ready obedience, which, like the child propounded to the judgment of Solomon, as soon as it is divided is destroyed. No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other.

16.—Having thus described the first notion of a God, having demonstrated the existence and unity of that God, and having in these three particulars comprised all which can be contained in this part of the article, we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he says when he makes his confession in these words: I believe in God; which in correspondence with the precedent discourse may be thus expressed:

Forasmuch as by all things created is made known the eternal power and Godhead, and the dependency of all limited beings infers an infinite and independent essence; whereas all things are for some end, and all their operations directed to it, although they cannot apprehend that end for which they are, and in prosecution of which they work, and therefore must be guided by some universal and over-ruling wisdom; being this collection is so evident, that all the nations of the earth have made it; being God hath not only written himself in the lively characters of his creatures, but hath also made frequent patefactions of his deity by most infallible predictions and supernatural operations;

---

1 Matt. iv. 10. 2 Psalm lxvi. 2. 3 2 Chron. vi. 30. 4 Deut. vi. 4, 5. 5 "Numerus Divinitatis summa ratione constare debet, vel quoniam et cultura ejus in ances deducetur. Ecce, enim, duo intuem Deos, tam pares quam duo summa magna, quid facerem si ambos colerem? Vererer ne abundanta officii superstitione pateat quam religio existimaretur; quia duos tam pares et in altero ambos possem in uno demereri; hoc ipsum testimonium praestans parilitati et unitati eorum, dum alterum in altero venerarer, dum in uno nihil duo sunt."—TERTUL. Adv. Marcion, lib. i. cap. 5. 6 Matt. vi. 21. 7 Rom i. 20.
therefore I fully assent unto, freely acknowledge, and clearly profess this truth, that there is a God.

Again, being a prime and independent being supposed all other to depend; and consequently no other to be God: being the entire fountain of all perfections is incapable of a double head, and the most perfect government of the universe speaks the supreme dominion of one absolute lord; hence do I acknowledge that God to be but one, and in this unity or rather singularity of the Godhead, excluding all actual or possible multiplication of a deity, I believe in God.

CHAPTER III.

I believe in God the Father.

AFTER the confession of a Deity, and assertion of the divine unity, the next consideration is concerning God's paternity; for that one God is Father of all, and to us there is but one God, the Father.1

Now, although the Christian notion of the divine paternity be some way peculiar to the evangelical patefaction; yet whosoever God hath been acknowledged,2 he hath been understood and worshipped as a Father: the very heathen poets so describe their gods,3 and their vulgar names did carry father in them,4 as the most popular and universal notion.

2.—This name of Father is a relative; and the proper foundation of paternity, as of a relation, is generation. As, therefore, the phrase of generating is diversely attributed unto several acts of the same nature with generation properly taken, or by consequence attending on it: so the title of Father is given unto venerabiliores." And before him Lucilius:

"Ut nemo sit nostrum, quin Pater optimus Divum,
Ut Neptunu' Pater, Liber, Saturnu' Pater, Mars,
Janu', Quirinu' Pater nomen dicatur ad unum."—LACTAN. ibid.

4 As Jupiter, which is Iovis Pater, or Ζευς Πάτερ, otherwise Diespter, or Διήθερατωρ, and Marspiter, of whom Servius: "Apid pontifices Marspiter dicitur."—Aeneid. lib. iii. So Semipater for Semo, and Σαρδητάτωρ, for Sardus, the proper deity of Sardis.—Ptolemais.

1 Eph. iv. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 6.
2 "Omnem Deum, qui ab homine colitur, necesse est inter solemnes ritus et precationes Patrem nuncupari; non tantum honoris gratia, sed et rationis, et quod antiquor est homine, et quod vitam, salutem, victum prastat ut pater. Itaque et Jupiter a praecantibus Pater vocatur, et Saturnus, et Janus, et Liber, et cateri deinceps."—LACTAN. De vera Sapientia, lib. iv. cap. 3.
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divers persons or things, and for several reasons unto the same God. These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, saith Moses. So that the creation or production of anything by which it is, and before was not, is a kind of generation, and consequently the creator or producer of it a kind of Father. Hath the rain a father? or who hath begotten the drops of dew? By which words Job signifies, that as there is no other cause assignable of the rain but God, so may he as the cause be called the Father of it, though not in the most proper sense, as he is the Father of his Son: and so the philosophers of old who thought that God did make the world, called him expressly, as the maker, so the Father of it. And thus to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things; to which the words following in the CREEED may seem to have relation, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth. But in this mass of creatures and body of the universe, some works of the creation more properly call him Father, as being more rightly sons: such are all the rational and intellectual offspring of the Deity. Of merely natural beings and irrational agents he is the creator, of rational, as so, the Father also; they are his creatures, these his sons. Hence he is styled the Father of spirits, and the blessed angels, when he laid the foundations of the earth, his sons; When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy: hence man, whom he created after his own image, is called his offspring, and Adam, the immediate work of his hands, the son of God: hence may we all cry cut with the Israelites taught by the prophet so to speak, Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us? Thus the first and most universal notion of God’s paternity in a borrowed or metaphorical sense is founded rather upon creation than pro-creation.

1 Gen. ii. 4. 2 Job xxxviii. 28. 3 'Ετέρως γὰρ τις ὑπὸν Πατέρα Θεοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ εὐτέρως Υἱοῦ.—SEVER, In Job. 4 Plutarch of Plato calling God Πατέρα πάντων καὶ Ποιητής, says: Τῇ μεταφορᾷ χρώμενος, ὡσπέρ εἰσεν, τῶν αἰτίων Πατέρα τοῦ κόσμου κέκληκε.—Platon, Quest. And Alcinus: Πατήρ δὲ ἐστὶ τῶν αἰτίων εἰναι πατέρα. 5 1 Cor. viii. 6. 6 Plutarch terms God the Maker and Father of all things: "Η τῶν μὲν θεῶν τῶν γεννητῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων Πατήρ ἐστιν. Ποιητής δὲ τῶν ἀλόγων καὶ ἀφίκων. "Father of gods and men, Maker of things immanent and irrational." Οὐ γὰρ χρόνου φησί Χρύσιττος πατέρα καλεῖδαι τὸν παρασχόντο τὸ σπέρμα. αὐτέρ περ ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος γενοντός, *Non enim agri pater, si Chrysippo credimus, is dictur qui eum consevativum quamquam e semine deinde fruges nascantur: " as the Latin translation most absurdly. For there is neither “corn," nor “field," nor any “seed" belonging to them, in the words of Plutarch. But χόριον (not χώριον) is the secunda, the coat (or rather coats in the acceptance of Chrysippus, and the language of these times) in which the foetus is involved in the mother’s womb. Though therefore both the secunda and the foetus be made of the seed of the male in the philosophy of Chrysippus, yet he is not called the father of the after-birth, but of the child; the one being endowed with life and reason, and the other not.

7 Heb. xii. 9. 8 Job xxxviii. 7 9 Acts xvii. 25. 10 Luke iii, 34. 11 1 Tim. i, 10.
Unto this act of creation is annexed that of conservation, by which God doth uphold and preserve in being that which at first he made, and to which he gave its being. As therefore it is the duty of the parent to educate and preserve the child, as that which had its being from him; so this paternal education doth give the name of Father unto man, and conservation gives the same to God.¹

Again, redemption from a state of misery by which a people hath become worse than nothing, unto a happy condition, is a kind of generation, which joined with love, care, and indulgence in the redeemer, is sufficient to found a new paternity, and give him another title of a father. Well might Moses tell the people of Israel, now brought out of the land of Egypt from their brick and straw, unto their quails and manna, unto their milk and honey, is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee?² Well might God speak unto the same people as to his Son, even his first-born,³ thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb; hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb.⁴ And just is the acknowledgment made by that people instructed by the prophet, doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, from everlasting is thy name.⁵ And thus another kind of paternal relation of God unto the sons of men is founded on a restitution or temporal redemption.

Besides, if to be born causeth relation to a Father, then to be born again maketh an addition of another: and if to generate foundeth, then to regenerate addeth a paternity. Now though we cannot enter the second time into our mother’s womb, nor pass through the same door into the scene of life again; yet we believe and are persuaded that except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.⁶ A double birth there is, and the world consists of two, the first and the second man.⁷ And though the incorruptible seed be the word of God, and the dispensers of it in some sense may say, as St. Paul spake unto the Corinthians, I have begotten you through the gospel;⁸ yet he is the true Father, whose word it is, and that is God, even the Father of lights, who of his own will begat us with the word of truth.⁹ Thus whosoever

¹ So Eustathius observes out of an ingenuous Erymologist: Πατὴρ Θεὸς μὲν, ὥς τὸ πάντα γένος ἀνθρώπως δὲ, ὥς τους πατάδας τῆς ἡμᾶς. Thuc. Θ. ² Deut. xxxii. 6. ³ Exod. iv. 22. ⁴ Isai. xlv. 24; xlvi. 3. ⁵ Isai. lxiii. 16. ⁶ John iii. 3. ⁷ “Totum hominum genus quodammodo sunt homines duo, primus et secundus.”—Prosper. ⁸ 1 Cor. iv. 15. ⁹ James 1. 17, 18.
believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God; 1 which regeneration is as it were a second creation: for we are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, 2 And he alone who did create us out of nothing, can beget us again, and make us of the new creation. When Rachel called to Jacob, give me children or else I die; he answered her sufficiently with this question, am I in God's stead? 3 And if he only openeth the womb, who else can make the soul to bear? 4 Hence hath he the name of Father, and they of sons who are born of him; and so from that internal act of spiritual regeneration another title of paternity redoundeth unto the Divinity.

Nor is this the only second birth or sole regeneration in a Christian sense; the soul, which after its natural being requires a birth into the life of grace, is also after that born again into a life of glory. Our Saviour puts us in mind of the Regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory. 5 The resurrection of our bodies is a kind of coming out of the womb of the earth, and entering upon immortality, a nativity into another life. For they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection; 6 and then as sons, they become heirs, coheirs with Christ, receiving the promise and reward of eternal inheritance. 7 Beloved, now we are the sons of God, saith St. John, even in this life by regeneration, and it doth not yet appear, or, it hath not been yet made manifest, 8 what we shall be; but we know, that if he appear, we shall be like him: the manifestation of the Father being a sufficient declaration of the condition of the sons, when the sonship itself consisteth in a similitude of the Father. And blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us. 9 Why may not then a second kind of regeneration be thought a fit addition of this paternal relation?

Neither is there only a natural, but also a voluntary and civil, foundation of paternity: for the laws have found a way by which a man may become a father without procreation: and this imitation of nature is called adoption, 10 taken in the general signifi-

---

1 John v. 1. 2 Eph. ii. 10. 3 Gen. xxx. 1, 2. 4 Ού γὰρ ἄντι Θεοῦ ἐγὼ εἰμὶ τοῦ μονοῦ δυναμῆντος τὰς φυγών μὴ τρέσαι ἀναγυναναίς, καὶ σπειρέων ἐν αὐταῖς ἁρτάς, καὶ ποιεῖν ἐγκύουμον καὶ τίκτουσα τὰ καλά. — ΡΗΜΙΩΚ ΔΕΙΚΕ. 5 Matt. xix. 28. 6 Luke xx. 35, 36. 7 Rom. viii. 17; Col. iii. 24; Heb. ix. 15. 8 Καὶ οὐκ ἐσοφανερώθη. 1 John iii. 2. 9 1 Pet. i. 3, 4. 10 "Adoptio nature similitudo est, ut aliquis filium habere possit, quem non generavit." — CAN Inst. i. tit. 5, § 1. ΤΙ ἸΣΤΙ.
cution. Although, therefore, many ways God be a father, yet lest any way might seem to exclude us from being his sons, he hath made us so also by adoption. Others are wont to fly to this, as to a comfort of their solitary condition, when either nature hath denied them, or death bereft them of their offspring.\(^2\) Whereas God doth it not for his own, but for our sakes; nor is the advantage his, but ours. Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God;\(^3\) that we, the sons of disobedient and condemned Adam by natural generation, should be translated into the glorious liberty of the sons of God by adoption; that we, who were aliens, strangers and enemies, should be assumed unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom all the family of heaven and earth is named,\(^4\) and be made partakers of the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.\(^5\) For as in the legal adoption, the Father hath as full and absolute power over his adopted son as over his own issue;\(^6\) so in the spiritual, the adopted sons have a clear and undoubted right of inheritance. He then who hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself,\(^7\) hath thereby another kind of paternal relation, and so we receive the spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father.\(^8\)

3.—The necessity of this faith in God as in our Father appeareth, first, in that it is the ground of all our filial fear, honour and obedience due unto him upon this relation. Honour thy Father is the first Commandment with promise, written in tables of stone with the finger of God; and, children obey your parents in the Lord, is an evangelical precept, but founded upon principles of reason and justice; for this is right, saith St. Paul.\(^9\) And if there be such a rational and legal obligation of honour and obedience to the fathers of our flesh,\(^10\) how much more must we think

---

\(^1\) "Hic viobesia. "ρωμαϊκη φωυνη λεγεται αδοπτων" autē uousa genikev 6homa eis daw diaireietai, —eis adrogatious, kai tēn omoungon adestaion. —Idem. ibid.

\(^2\) Spadones autem, qui generare non possunt, adoptare possunt; et licet filios generare non possint, quos adoptaverunt filios habere possunt."—Caes. Inst. i. 5, § 3.

\(^3\) "Hi qui generare non possunt, velut spado, utroque modo possunt adoptare. Idem juris est in coeli."—Ulpian. tit. 9, § 5.

\(^4\) Tychon 6uk ejcois teis paideis dia to mu elthein evi gaumon, eis elthein meiv, mu paideuqwe sa de, h paideqwe sa meiv, apoballathai de tontov, to ek tis thes eva eklamwma, h kai to syvmban duxtylhma, boulomemos epitousyfetai, elabes eis viobesian tin. —Theoph. Inst. i. tit. 11.

\(^5\) Titus 3 αποχυσσον απαιδιαν λιυνεν boulomenvos to duxtylhma tomos viobetiseiav prostatavesi, kai genwv eksei kstatv, o mu evpovon lafein parà tis fuvos. —Leonis Nocel. 27.

\(^6\) 3 i. 111. 1.

\(^7\) "In alienam familiam transitus," is the description in Aulus Gellius, lib. v. 19. "Cum in alienam familiam inque liberorum locum extranei sumuntur, aut per praetorem fit, aut per populum: quod per praetorem fit, adoptio dicitur; quod per populum, arrogatio."—Ibid. Ep. iii. 14, 15.

\(^8\) Ep. i. 18.

\(^9\) As appears out of the form of rogamation yet extant in this manner: —Vellitis, jubebatis, Quirites, uti Lucius Valerius Lucio Titio tam jure legeque filiis sibi siet, quam si in co patre matreque familias elus natus esset, utique ei vita necisque in eo potestas siet, uti patri endo filio est?"—Idem ibid.

\(^10\) Eph. i. 5. 7 Eph. vi. 1, 2. 8 Rom. viii. 15. 9 Heb. xlii. 9.
ourselves oblied to him whom we believe to be our heavenly and everlasting Father? A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master. If then I be a father, where is my honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts.1 If we be heirs, we must be co-heirs with Christ; if sons, we must be brethren to the Only-begotten: but being he came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him, he acknowledgeth no fraternity but with such as do the same: as he hath said, Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother.2 If it be required of a bishop in the church of God, to be one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;3 what obedience must be due, what subjection must be paid, unto the Father of the family?

The same relation in the object of our faith is the life of our devotions, the expectation of all our petitions. Christ, who taught his disciples, and us in them, how to pray, propounded not the knowledge of God, though without that he could not hear us; neither represented he his power, though without that he cannot help us; but comprehended all in this relation, when ye pray, say, Our Father.4 This prevents all vain repetitions of our most earnest desires, and gives us full security to cut off all tautology; for our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him.5 This creates a clear assurance of a grant without mistake of our petition: What man is there of us, who if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? or if he ask fish will give him a serpent? If we then who are evil know how to give good gifts unto our children; how much more shall our Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?6

Again, this paternity is the proper foundation of our Christian patience, sweetening all afflictions with the name and nature of fatherly corrections. We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live? especially considering that they chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness:7 they, as an argument of their authority; he, as an assurance of his love: they, that we might acknowledge them to be our parents; he,

---

1 Mal.i. 6. 2 Matt.xii. 50. 3 1 Tim. lit. 4. 4 Luke xi. 2. 5 Matt. vi. 8. 6 'Αντι περικες σκορπιων παρομια επι των τα χειρω αϊρουμενων αντι των βελτιωνων.— Zenob. Οσ' αντι πιπους σκορπιων λαμψι σπασας.— Lycophr. Alc. 476. Matt. viii. 9-11. 7 "Quod si a Domino nonnulla acreditum incuti, cui magis patientiam quam Domino praebemus? Quin insuper gratulabi et gaudere nos docet dignatione divinae castigationis. Ego, inquit, quos diligo castigo. O servum illum beatum, culus emendationem Dominus instat, cui dignatur irasci, quem admonendi dissimulatione non decipit!"— Tertullianus De Pat. Heb. xii. 9, 10.
that he may persuade us that we are his sons: For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. And what greater incitement unto the exercise of patience is imaginable unto a suffering soul, than to see in every stroke the hand of a Father, in every affliction a demonstration of his love? Or how canst thou repine, or be guilty of the least degree of impatience, even in the sharpest corrections, if thou shalt know with thine heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee? How canst thou not be comforted, and even rejoice in the midst of thy greatest sufferings, when thou knowest that he which striketh pitieth, he which afflicteth is as it were afflicted with it? for like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.3

Lastly, the same relation strongly inferreth an absolute necessity of our imitation; it being clearly vain to assume the title of son without any similitude of the Father. What is the general notion of generation but the production of the like;4 nature, ambitious of perpetuity, striving to preserve the species in the multiplication and succession of individuals? And this similitude consisteth partly in essentials, or the likeness of nature; partly in accidental or the likeness in figure,5 or affections.6 Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image:7 and can we imagine those the sons of God which are no way like him? A similitude of nature we must not, of figure we cannot pretend unto: it remains then only that we bear some likeness in our actions and affections. Be ye therefore followers,8 saith the apostle, or rather imitators of God, as dear children.9 What he hath revealed of himself, that we must express within ourselves. Thus God spake unto the children of Israel whom he styled his son: Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.10 And the apostle upon the same ground speaketh unto us, as to obedient children: As he that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation.11 It is part of the general beneficence and universal goodness of our God, that he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.12 These impartial beams and undistinguishing showers are but to show us what we ought to do, and to make us fruitful in

1 Heb. xii. 6. 2 Dent. viii. 5. 3 Psa. cii. 13. 4 Πάν το γεννών ὅμοιον έαυτῷ γεννᾷ.—S. Epiph. Hær. lxxxvi. 6. 5 Τά ὁμοία γίγνεσθαι τοῦ γεννήσας τα ἐκγόνα, εὐλογοῦν.—Aristot. De General. Animal. lib. i. cap. 19. 6 "Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis: Est in juvencis, est in equis patrum Virtus: nec imbellem feroces Progenentur aquilae columbam."
—Hos. Carm. lib. iv. od. 4, 20

7 Gen. v. 3. 8 Ἐμφατ. "Fili huminum sunt quando male faciunt; quando bene, filii Del."—S. August. in Psalm. lit. 9 Eph. v. 1. 10 Lev. xi. 44; xix. 2; xx. 7. 11 1 Peter i. 15. 12 Vide S. August. in Psalm. c. Matt. v. 46, 45.
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the works of God; for no other reason Christ hath given us this command: Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven. No other command did he give us this ground, but, Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father is merciful.

So necessary is this faith in God as in our Father, both for direction to the best of actions, and for consolation in the worst of conditions.

4.—But although this be very necessary, yet is it not the principal or most proper explication of God's paternity. For as we find one person in a more peculiar manner the Son of God, so must we look upon God as in a more peculiar manner the Father of that Son. I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, saith our Saviour; the same of both but in a different manner, denoted by the article prefixed before the one and not the other: which distinction in the original we may preserve by this translation: I ascend unto the Father of me, and Father of you; first of me, and then of you: not therefore his, because ours; but therefore ours, because his. So far we are the sons of God, as we are like unto him; and our similitude unto God consisteth in our conformity to the likeness of his Son. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. He the first-born, and we sons, as brethren unto him: he appointed heir of all things, and we heirs of God, as joint-heirs with him. Thus God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. By his mission are we adopted, and by his Spirit call we God our Father. So we are no longer servants, but now sons; and if sons, then heirs of God, but still through Christ. It is true indeed, that both he that sanctifieth, that is, Christ, and they who are sanctified, that is, faithful Christians, are all of one, the same Father, the


2 'Αναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα μου, καὶ Πατέρα υἱῶν. Παιδαρία in both places had its article, there would have seemed two Fathers: had the article been prefixed to Πατέρα υἱῶν, he would have seemed first ours, then Christ's: but being prefixed to Πατέρα μου, it shows God to be principally and originally Christ's, and by our reference unto him our, Father. Πατέρα μου, μὲν κατὰ υἱῶν εἰς τὴν θεότητι, καὶ Πατέρα υἱῶν, διὰ χάριν εἰς τὴν κυριευσία. —S. ΕΡΙΦΑΝ.

3 Rom. viii. 29.

4 Heb. i. 2.

5 "Hoc facit Deus ex filiis hominum filios Dei, quia ex Filio Dei factit Deus Filium hominis."—S. AUGUST. in Psal. iii. Gal. iv. 4-6.

6 Gal. iv. 7.
same God; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren: but Christ the beloved, the first-born, the only-begotten, the Son after a more peculiar and more excellent manner; the rest with relation unto and dependence on his sonship; as given unto him, Behold I, and the children which God hath given me; as being so by faith in him; For we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; as receiving the right of sonship from him, For as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God. Among all the sons of God there is none like to that one Son of God. And if there be so great a disparity in the filiation, we must make as great a difference in the correspondent relation. There is one degree of sonship founded on creation, and that is the lowest, as having unto all, both good and bad: another degree above that is grounded upon regeneration, or adoption, belonging only to the truly faithful in this life: and a third above the rest founded on the resurrection, or collation of the eternal inheritance, and the similitude of God, appertaining to the saints alone in the world to come: For we are now the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him. And there is yet another degree of filiation, of a greater eminency and a different nature, appertaining properly to none of these, but to the true Son of God alone, who amongst all his brethren hath only received the title of his own Son, and a singular testimony from heaven, This is my beloved Son, even in the presence of John the Baptist, even in the midst of Moses and Elias (who are certainly the sons of God by all the three other degrees of filiation), and therefore hath called God after a peculiar way his own Father. And so at last we come unto the most singular and eminent paternal relation, unto the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore; the Father of him and

1 Heb. li. 11.
2 "Dictum et filii Dei, sed ille aliter Filius Dei."—S. Augustin. in Psal. lxxviii.
3 "Ergo toivn o Theos pollov mén kataxomatoi Patirh, éndes de múnoi fúsei kai áltheia, tov monofeurón Yios.—S. Cyril. Catech. vii.
4 Heb. li. 10. 4 Isai. viii. 18; Heb. li. 13.
5 Gal. iii. 26. 6 John i. 12.
6 "Ergo nemo in filius Dei similis erit Filio Dei. Et ipse dicitus est Filius Dei, et nos dicti sumus filii Dei: sed quis erit similis Domino in filiis Dei? Ilii unicos, nos multos: ille unus, nos in illo unum: ille natus, nos adoptati: ille ab aeterno Filius unigenitus per naturam, nos a tempore facti per gratiam."—S. Augustinus in Psal. lxxviii.
7 1 John iii. 2.

9 "Ut magnificentia Dei dilectio ex comparationis genere nosceretur, non percerisse Deum propin Filio suse dociit: non utique pro adoptandis adoptato, neque pro creatis creaturae; sed pro alienis suo, pro communcupandis proprio."—S. Hilary. De Trin. lib. vi. cap. 45. Rom. viii. 32.
10 "Anne tibi in eo quod dicitur, hic est, non hoc signifiicat visidur, Allos quidem cognominatos ab eo in filios, sed hic Filius mess est? Domini adoptionis plurimarum nomen, sed ine mihhi Filius est."—Ibidem, De Trin. lib. vi. cap. 23. Matt. lii. 17; xvii. 5.
11 John v. 18: Περερα ἵνα εἶλε τὸν Θεόν· as Rom. viii. 22: "Os ye of the idion Yios ou ými efeisato.——2 Cor. xi. 31.
of us, but not the Father of us as of him. 1 Christ hath taught us to say, Our Father: a form of speech which he never used himself: sometimes he calls him the Father, sometimes my Father, sometimes your, but never our: he makes no such conjunction of us to himself, as to make no distinction between us and himself; so conjoining us as to distinguish, though so distinguishing as not to separate us.

5.—Indeed I conceive this, as the most eminent notion of God's paternity, so the original and proper explication of this article of the CREED: and that not only because the ancient fathers deliver no other exposition of it; but also because that which I conceive to be the first occasion, rise, and original of the CREED itself, requireth this as the proper interpretation. Immediately before the ascension of our Saviour, he said unto his apostles, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 2 From this sacred form of baptism did the church derive the rule of faith, 3 requiring the profession of belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before they could be baptized in their name. When the eunuch asked Philip, What doth hinder me to be baptized? Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest: and when the eunuch replied, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; he baptized him. 4 And before that, the Samaritans, when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women. 5 For as in the

1 *Non sicut Christi Pater, ita et noster Pater. Nuncum enim Christus ita nos con-

junxit, ut nullam distinctionem faceret inter nos et se. Ille enim Filius aequalis Patri, ille

eternus cum Patre, Patricie coepterus: nos

antem facit per Filium, adoptati per unicum.

Proinde nunquam auditum est de ore Domini nostri Jesus Christi, cum ad discipulos loque-

retur, dixisse illum de Deo summo Patre suo, 
Pater noster; sed, aut Pater noster dixit, aut

Pater easter: Pater noster, non dixit, usque

adeo ut quodam loco poneret hoc duum: Vado

ad Deum meum, inquit, et Deum vestrum. 

Quare non dixit, Deum nostrum? Et, Patrem

meum, dixit, et Patrem vestrum; non dixit,

Patrem nostrum. Sic jungit ut distinguat, sic

distinguat ut non sejunget. Unam nos

vult esse in se, unum antem Patrem et se; "—

S. August. in Joan. Tract. 21.

2 Matt. xxviii. 18, 19.

3 *Arius and Euzouis, in their Creed de-

livered to Constantine: "hâve pâtiâ

perâleipomene ék tôn ágyôn eisâgeôlon,

lêgôn toutò toù Kýriou toutoù éautou máthtisai,

Hóreîn thêrêtei máthtêrisenâ pànta taè èdê

baktiôntes èautous eis, ómna toutou Patrôs,

kai tou' Yióu, kai tou' 'Aniou Pánwmatos.—

Socrat. lib. i. cap. 26. And upon the ex-

hibiting this confession of faith, they were

restored to the communion of the church by

the Synod of Jerusalem.—Sozomen. lib. ii.

cap. 27. In the same manner Eusebius deli-

vered his Creed unto the Council of Nice

concluding and deducting it from the same

text: "Koûs kai Kýrous ëmwn, ùpoostelôs 
eis to kërýmû toû éautou máthtisai, èpê 

Porevøéntes máthtêrisenâte. &c.—Socrat. lib.

i. cap. 8. Theodoret. lib. i. cap. 12. The 

same is also alleged by the Council of An-

toch, under the Emperor Constantius and 

Pope Julius.—Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 10. Vide 

S. Athanas. in Epist. ad Eunuch. Orat. 


Ex Deo Deus Vide S. Basil. De Spir. 

Sancto. So Vigilius Tapsensis, vid. lib. l.

makes Arius and Athanasius jointly spea-

cethese words: "Credimus in Deum Patrém: 

Omnipotentem, et in Jesum Christum Filium 

ejus, Dominum nostrum, et in Spiritum 

Sanctum. Haec est fidei nostra regula, quam 

cælesti magisterio Dominus tradidit Apost- 

tolis, dicens, Íte, baptizate," &c.

Acts of the Apostles there is no more expressed than that they 1 baptized in the name of Jesus Christ: so is no more expressed of the faith required in them who were to be baptized, than to believe in the same name. But being the Father and the Holy Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first institution, being the expressing of one doth not exclude the other, being it is certain that from the apostles’ times the names of all three were used; hence upon the same ground was required faith, and a profession of belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Again, as the eunuch said not simply, I believe in the Son, but I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, as a brief explication of that part of the institution which he had learned before of Philip: so they who were converted unto Christianity were first taught, not the bare names, but the explications and descriptions of them in a brief, easy, and familiar way; which when they had rendered, acknowledged, and professed, they were baptized in them. And these being regularly and constantly used, made up the rule of faith, that is, the CReED. The truth of which may sufficiently be made apparent to any who shall seriously consider the constant practice of the church, from the first age unto this present, of delivering the rule of faith to those which were to be baptized, and so requiring of themselves, or their sureties, an express recitation, profession, or acknowledgment of the CReED. From whence this observation is properly deducible; that in what sense the name of Father is taken in the form of baptism, in the same it also ought to be taken in this article. And being nothing can be more clear than that, when it is said, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, the notion of Father hath in this particular no other relation but to that Son whose name is joined with his; and as we are baptized into no other Son of that Father, but that only-begotten Christ Jesus, so into no other Father, but the Father of that only-begotten: it followeth, that the proper explanation of the first words of the CReED is this, I believe in God the Father of Christ Jesus.

6.—In vain then is that vulgar distinction applied unto the explication of the CReED, whereby the Father is considered both personally, and essentially: personally, as the first in the glorious Trinity, with relation and opposition to the Son; essentially, as comprehending the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For that the Son is not here comprehended in the Father is evident, not only out of the original, or occasion, but also from the very letter of the CReED, which teacheth us to believe in God the

1 Acts ii 18; vili. 16; x. 42; xix. 6.
I Believe in God the Father.

Father, and in his Son; for if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the Father of himself. As, therefore, when I say, I believe in Jesus Christ his Son, I must necessarily understand the Son of that Father whom I mentioned in the first article; so when I said, I believe in God the Father, I must as necessarily be understood of the Father of him whom I call his Son in the second article.¹

7.—Now as it cannot be denied that God may several ways be said to be the Father of Christ; first, as he was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary;² secondly, as he was sent by him with special authority as the King of Israel;³ thirdly, as he was raised from the dead,⁴ out of the womb of the earth unto immortal life, and made heir of all things in his father’s house: so must we not doubt but, beside all these, God is the Father of that Son in a more eminent and peculiar manner, as he is and ever was with God,⁵ and God: which shall be demonstrated fully in the second article, when we come to show how Christ is the only-begotten Son. And according unto this paternity by way of generation totally divine, in which he who begetteth is God, and he which is begotten the same God, do we believe in God as the eternal Father of an eternal Son. Which relation is coeal with his essence: so that we are not to imagine one without the other; but as we profess him always God, so must we acknowledge him always Father,⁶ and that in a far more proper manner than the same title can be given to any creature.⁷ Such is the fluctuant condition of human generation, and of those relations which arise from thence, that he which is this day a son, the next may prove a father, and within the space of one day more, without any real alteration in himself, become neither son nor father, losing one relation by the death of him that begot him, and the other by the departure of him that was begotten by him. But in the Godhead these relations are more

¹ “Pater cum audis, Fili intellige Patrem, qui Filius supradicte sit imago substantiae.”—Reffin. In Symb.
² Luke i. 35. ³ John x. 35, 36; i. 49, 50.
³ Acts xiii. 32, 33. ⁴ John i. 1.
⁷ “Deus solus proprie versus est Pater, qui sine initio et fine Pater est; non enim aliquando copetis esse quod Pater est, sed semper Pater est, semper habens Filium ex se gentium.”—Faustinus, Lib. cont. Arist. "Επι της Θεουτος κοτις ο Πατήρ κυριος ο Πατήρ εστι, και το Υδως κυριος Υδω εστι· και επι τουτων δε μονων στηθε το Πατηρ αει Πατηρ ειναι, και το Υδω αει Υδω ειναι.—S. Athana. Narr. Dict. πατερα Ατρινως. 
proper, because fixed, the Father having never been a Son, the Son never becoming Father, in reference to the same kind of generation.

A farther reason of the propriety of God's paternity appears from this, that he hath begotten a Son of the same nature and essence with himself, not only specifically but individually, as I shall also demonstrate in the exposition of the second article. For generation being the production of the like, and that likeness being the similitude of substance; where is the nearest identity of nature, there must be also the most proper generation, and consequently, he which generateth, the most proper father. If, therefore, man, who by the benediction of God given unto him at his first creation in these words: Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, begeth a Son in his own likeness, after his image, that is, of the same human nature, of the same substance with him, (which if he did not, he should not according to the benediction multiply himself or man at all,) with which similitude of nature many accidental disparities may consist, if by this act of generation he obtaineth the name of father, because and in regard of the similitude of his nature in the son; how much more properly must that name belong unto God himself, who hath begotten a Son of a nature and essence so totally like, so totally the same, that no accidental disparity can imaginably consist with that identity?

8.—That God is the proper and eternal Father of his own eternal Son is now declared: what is the eminency or excellency of this relation followeth to be considered. In general, then, we may safely observe, that in the very name of Father there is something of eminence which is not in that of Son: and some kind of priority we must ascribe unto him whom we call the first; in respect of him whom we term the second person: and as we cannot but ascribe it, so must we endeavour to preserve it.

Now that privilege or priority consisteth not in this, that the

---

1 'Επὶ μόνης τής Θεότητος τὸ Πατήρ καὶ τὸ Υἱὸς ἐστὶ καὶ εἰστιν ἀεί· τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων εἰ πατήρ λέγεται τις, ἀλλ' ἔτερον γέγονεν νῦν, καὶ εἰ νῦν λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἐτέρον λέγεται πατήρ· ὡστε ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὴ σωζέσθαι κυρίως τὸ πατρὸς καὶ νῦν ὑπόνοα.—S. Απανθράκ. tom. I. Πατήρ κυρίως, ὅτι μὴ καὶ Ὑἱὸς ὡστε καὶ Ὑἱὸς κυρίως, ὅτι μὴ καὶ Πατήρ τὰ γὰρ ἡμέτερα οὐ κυρίως, οὐ καὶ ἄμωφο.—S. Grégo. Naz. Orat. 35.


3 Gen. I. 25. 4 Gen. v. 3.


6 Τὸ μὲν ἀγεννησίῳ Πατρὶ οἰκεῖον ἄξωμα φυλακτέων, μηδένα τού ἐπιναι αὐτῷ τοῦ αἰτίων λέγεται.—Alex. apud Theodoret. lib. I. cap. 4.

7 Ἡμεῖς δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὴν τῶν αἰτίων πρός τα ἐς αὐτῶν σχέσιν, προστετάχθαι τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸν Πατέρα φαμεῖν· κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῆς φύσεως διάφορον οὐκέτι.—Basil. Cond. Epist. lib. I.
I Believe in God the Father.

essence or attributes of the one are greater than the essence or attributes of the other; (for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in both) but only in this, that the Father hath that essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father. From whence he acknowledgeth that he is from him,\(^1\) that he liveth by him,\(^2\) that the Father gave him to have life in himself,\(^3\) and generally referreth all things to him, as received from him. Wherefore in this sense some of the ancients have not stuck to interpret those words, the Father is greater than I,\(^4\) of Christ as the Son of God, as the second person in the blessed Trinity; but still with reference not unto his essence, but his generation, by which he is understood to have his being from the Father, who only hath it of himself, and is the original of all power and

---

\(^{1}\) John vii. 29.

\(^{2}\) John vi. 57.

\(^{3}\) John v. 26.

\(^{4}\) Meisov. εἰπέν, οὐ μεγέθει τινι, οὐδὲ κρόνου, ἀλλὰ διὰ την εἰς αὐτοῦ του Πατέρος γεννήσειν.—S. Athanas. Contra Arianos, lib. ii. Λειταίται τοινύν κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον ἐντάθια τὸ μείζον λέγεσθαι ἐπείδη γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρός ἡ ἀρχὴ τῷ Υἱῷ, κατά τοῦτο μείζον οἱ Πατήρ, ὡς καὶ κράτης καὶ ἀρχή. Διὸ καὶ οἱ Κύριος ὑδάτων εἰπέν, "Ο Πατήρ μου μείζον μοι ἦσθι, καθὼς Υἱὸς θελοῦσθαι. Τὸ δὲ Πατρός τί ἄλλῳ σημαίνει, ἢ σῦχο τὸ αὐτίν εἰναι καὶ ἀρχὴ τοῦ εἰς αὐτοῦ γεννήθηντος;—S. Basil. Contra Eunom. lib. i. And the same St. Basil doth not only acknowledge this to be true in respect of the divine nature of Christ, but thinketh the divinity of the Son may be proved from hence. Ἑγὼ δὲ καὶ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς φωνῆς, τὸ ὄνομαύσιν εἰναι τὸν Υἱὸν τῷ Πατρὶ δηλοῦσθαι πεπιστεύκας· τὰς γὰρ συγκερίσεις οἶδα κυρίως ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς αὐτῆς φωνῶν γνωμῶν· ἀγγελον γὰρ ἀγγέλου λέγομεν μείζονα, καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπων διακείστερα, καὶ σημείων πτηνού ταχυτέρου· ei τοινύν· αἰκεγερίσεις ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοιωδῶν γίνεσθαι, μείζων δὲ κατὰ σύγκρασιν εἰρητὰς ὁ Πατήρ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ὄνομαύσιος τοῦ Πατρὶ οἱ Υἱῶσ. —Ad Cæsarienses Epist. 141. Τὸ μείζον μὲν ἐστὶ τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἵνα τῶν φωνῶν. —S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 36; et Orat. 40. Οὐ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τὸ μείζον, κατὰ τὴν φύσιν δὲ, Vide S. Euth. in Anc. cap. 17. Εἰ δὲ λέγει τῆς μεῖζονα εἰναι τὸν Πατρός καθὸ αἰτίος τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀντιπόθεν.—S. Chrysostom. Homil. in Joan. 15. Ἰσος ταχυγραμμα κατὰ τῶν της ὑσίας λόγῳ υπάρχων ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὶ, καὶ δύος κατὰ πάντα, μεῖζονα αὐτῶν φησίν ὡς ἄναρχον, ἔγενναν ἀρχήν κατὰ μόνον τὸ εἰς οὐ, καὶ καὶ συνόρμων αὐτῷ τὴν ἐναρέιν ἐγναν·—S. Cyril. Alex. Theor. cap. 11. And Isidore Pleshiota, lib. iii. Epist. 334, cites this saying of an ancient father: Καὶ τὸ μείζον ἵσταται ἡ Γεννήστρια, καὶ τὸ ἵνα καθ’ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ οἰκουμένος. So Vigilius professes to believe the Son "equalem per omnia Patria, excepto eo quod file ingenius est et iste genus."—De Trin. lib. xi. "Ideo totum quod habet, quod potest, non tribuit sibi, sed Patri, quia non est a seipso, sed a Patre. ~Epist. 176. "Æqualis est enim Patri, sed his quoque accepta a Patre."—S. August. Epist. 66. "Necessis est quodammodo prior sit, qua Patre sit; quoniam anteecedat nesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Similis ut hic minor sit, dumi in illo esse se scit, habens originem quia nascitur."—Novatianes. "Major et haec Pater Filio est; et plane major, cui tantum donat esse quantus ipsa est, cui inascibilitatis esse imaginem sacramento naturalitatis imperit, quem ex se in forma sua generat."—S. Hilarius De Trin. lib. ix. cap. 54. "Non præstantem quecumquam genere substantiæ, sed subjectum alterum alteri nativitate naturae: Patrem in eo majorem esse quod Pater est, Filium in eo non minorem esse quod Filius sit."—Idem, De Syn. cont. Arianos, cap. 64. "Quis non Patrem potiorem confitebitur, ut ingenium a genite, ut Patrem a Filio, ut eum qui misit ab eo qui missus sit, ut vo lentem ab eo qui obiediat? Et ille nobis testis est, Pater major me est."—Idem, De Trin. lib. iii. cap. 12. "In eo, quod in sese sunt, Dei ex Deo divinitatem cognoscere; in eo vero quod Pater major est, confessionem paternae autoritatis intellige."—Idem, lib. xi. cap. 12. And before all these, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria: Τὸ δὲ αὐγήνων τὸν Πατρὶ μὸνον ἰδιωμα παρεῖναι δοξαζόμενο, οὐ δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ φαινόμενο τοῦ ηὐστρία, Ο Πατρὶ μου μείζων μοῦ ἐστι, Theodoret. Hist. lib. i. cap. 4. Lastly, we have the testimony of Photius, that many of the ancient fathers so expounded it: Тὸν, ὁ Πατὴρ μου μείζων μοῦ ἐστιν, τοῦ ἐνυγγυγίων φωνῆς διαφόρως οἱ πατέρες θημον εξελεχθῆσαι οἱ μὲν γὰρ φασί τῷ αἰτίῳ μείζων εἰρησθαι.—Epistol. 176. "Æqualia Patri; sed major Pater, quod ipsa dedit ipsi omnia, et causa est ipsi Filio ut sit, ut isto modo sit."—Victor. Anf. lib. i. "Pater, inequit, major me est; merito major, quia solus hic auctor sine auctore est."—Philaeus. John xiv. 24.
On the Creed.

essential i in the Son. *I can of mine own self do nothing,* saith our Saviour, because he is not of himself; and whosoever receives his being, must receive his power from another, especially where the essence and the power are undeniably the same, as in God they are. The Son then can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; because he hath no power of himself, but what the Father gave: and being he gave him all the power, as communicating his entire and undivided essence, therefore what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise, by the same power by which the Father worketh, because he had received the same Godhead in which the Father subsisteth. There is nothing more intimate and essential to anything than the life thereof, and that in nothing so conspicuous as in the Godhead, where life and truth are so inseparable, that there can be no living God but the true, no true God but the living. The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King, saith the prophet Jeremy; and St. Paul putteth the Thessalonians in mind, how they turned from idols, to serve the living and true God. Now life is otherwise in God than in the creatures: in him originally, in them derivatively; in him as in the fountain of absolute perfection, in them by way of dependence and participation: our life is in him, but his is in himself; and as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; both the same life, both in themselves, both in the same degree, as the one, so the other; but only with this difference, the Father giveth it, and the Son receiveth it. From whence he professeth of

1 John v. 30.
2 "Quicquid Filius habet ut faciat, a Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet a Patre ut faciat? Quia a Patre habet ut Filius sit. Quare a Patre habet ut Filius sit? Quia a Patre habet ut possit: quia a Patre habet ut sit."—S. AUGUST. Tract. 20 in Joan.
3 John v. 19.
4 "Non alia potentia est in Filio, et alia substantia; sed ipsa potentia quae et substantia; substantia ut sit, potentia ut possit. Ergo quia Filius de Patre est,ideo dixit, *Non potest Filii a se facere quicquam:* quia non est Filius a se, idem non potest a se."—Ibid. "Totum quod est, de Patre est; totum quod potest, de Patre est; quoniam quod potest et est, hoc unum est, et de Patre totum est."—Ibid. "Non potest Filii a se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem:* quia de Patre est totus Filii, et tota substantia et potentia ejus ex filio est qui genuit eum."—Ibid., Tract. 21.
6 Jer. x. 10.
7 "Sicut habet Pater vitam in semitipso, sic dedit et Filio vitam habere in semitipso: ut hoc solum interst inter Patrem et Filium, quia Pater habet vitam in semitipso quam nemo eis dedi, Filium autem habet vitam in semitipso quam Pater dedi."—S. AUGUST. Tract. 19 in Joan. "Incommutabili est vita Filii, sicut Patris; et tamen de Patre est, et inseparabilis est operatio Patris et Filii; sed tamen ita operari Filii de illo est de quo ipsa est, id est, de Patre."—Ibid., De Trin. lib. ii. cap. 1. John v. 26.
8 "Sicut habet, dedit; quo habet, dedit; qualcum habet, talem dedit; quantam habet, tantam dedit."—S. AUGUST. Cont. Maximin. lib. iii. cap. 14. "Erge, quod dicitur, *Dedit Filio, tale est ac si diceretur, Genuit Filium*
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9.—We must not therefore so far endeavour to involve ourselves in the darkness of this mystery, as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Father; whose pre-eminence undeniably consists in this, that he is God not of any other, but of himself. It is no diminution to the Son, to say he is from another, for his very name imports as much; but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of him: and there must be some pre-eminence, where there is place for derogation. What the Father is, he is from none; what the Son is, he is from him: what the first is, he giveth; what the second is, he receiveth.² The first is a Father indeed by reason of his Son, but he is not God by reason of him; whereas the Son is not so only in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same.

10.—Upon this pre-eminence (as I conceive) may safely be grounded the congruity of the divine mission. We often read that Christ was sent; from whence he bears the name of an apostle

generando enim dedit. Quomodo enim dedit ut esset, sic dedit ut vita esset, et sic dedit ut in semetipso vita esset."—Idem, Tract. 22 in Joan. "Connectitur, tal confessione originis suis, discutia naturae perfectae naturalvis. Quod enim in utroque vita est, id in utroque significatione futurum; et in vita quae generatur ex vita, id est, essentia quae de essentia naturae, dux non dissimilis naturae, scilicet quia vita ex vita est, tenet in se originis suae inindissimam nuturem, quae et natae et gigantis esse se, id est, quae ut habet et data est, similiter non discrepet."—S. HILAR. De Syn. adv. Arianos. "Quia ergo appareat vita Patris hoc esse quod ipse sit; sicut habet vitam in se, sic dedit; sic dedit Filio habere vitam, id est, sic est Esse Filii, scit Esse Patris."—VITOL. AFRICAN. Deip. "In vita naturae et essentiae significati iste, quae sicut habetur, ita nata esse doctur ad habendum."—S. HILAR. ibid. 1 "Propter Patrem vivit Filius, quod ex Patre Filius est; propter Patrem, quod erat in Patre coram quae Patre processit, quod ex paterno generatu est utero, quod fons Paterni est, quod radix Fili Patris est."—S. AMBROS. De Fide, lib. iv, cap. 10. John vi. 57.

² "Pater de nullo patre, Filius de Deo Patre: Pater quo est, a nullo est; quod autem Patre est, propter Filium est. Filius vero et quod Filius est, propter Patrem est, et quod est, a Patre est;"—S. AUGUST. Tract. 19 in Joan. "Filium dicitur Deum de Deo; Patrem autem Deum tantum, non de Deo. Unde manifestum est quod Filius habeat alium de quo sit, et cui Filius est; Pater autem non Filium de quo sit habeat, sed cui Pater sit. Omnus enim filius de patre est quo est, et patri filius est: nullo autem pater de fillo est quo quot;—Idem, De Trin. lib. ii, cap. 1. "Filius non habet tantum habet nascendo, ut Filius sit, sed omnino ut sit."—Ibid. lib. v, cap. 15. "Filius non tantum ut sit Filius, quodrelative dicitur, sed omnino ut sit, ipsum substantiam nascendo habet."—Ibid. cap. 15. "Pater non habet patrem de quo sit, Filius autem de Patre est ut sit, atque ut Illi coeternus sit."—Ibid. lib. vi, cap. 10. "Ab ipso, inquit, sum; quia Filius de Patre, et quicquid est Filius de illo est cujus est Filius. Ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo; Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo, sed tantum Deum; et dicimus Dominum Jesum de Lumine; Patrem non dicimus de Lumine, sed tantum Lumen. Ad hoc ergo pertinent quod dixit, "Ab ipso sum."—Idem, Tract. 31 in Joan. "Pater non est si non habeat Filium, et Filius non est si non habeat Patrem: sed tamen Filius Deus de Patre; Pater autem Deus, sed non de Filio: Pater Filii, non Deus de Filio; ille autem Filius Patris, et Deus de Patre."—Ibid., Tract. 29 in Joan. "Hoc tamen intent Patrem et Filium interest, quia Pater a nullo hoc accipit, Filius autem per generationem omnia Patris accipit."—S. AMBROS. in Epist. ad Eph. cap. 2. "Est ergo Deus Pater omnium institutor et creator, solus originem nesciens."—NOVATIAN. De Trin. cap. 31. Whereas he speaks after of the Son: "Est ergo Deus, sed in hoc ipsum genitum, ut esset Deus." "Pater est Deus de quo Filius est Deus, de quo autem Pater nullus est Deus."—S. AUGUST. Epist. 66.
himself, as well as those whom he therefore named so, because as the Father sent him, so sent he them: 1 the Holy Ghost is also said to be sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son: but we never read that the Father was sent at all, 2 there being an authority in that name which seems inconsistent with this mission. 3 In the parable, a certain householder which planted a vineyard first sent his servants to the husbandmen, and again other servants, but last of all he sent unto them his Son: 4 it had been inconsistent even with the literal sense of an historical parable, as not at all consonant to the rational customs of men, to have said, that last of all the Son sent his Father to them. So God, placing man in the vineyard of his church, first sent his servants the prophets, by whom he spoke at sundry times and in divers manners; but in the last days he sent his Son: 5 and it were as incongruous and inconsistent with the divine generation, 6 that the Son should send the Father into the world. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, 7 saith our Saviour; intimating, that by whom he lived, by him he was sent, and therefore sent by him, because he lived by him, laying his generation as the proper ground of his mission. Thus he which begetteth sendeth, and he which is begotten is sent. 8 For I am from him, and he hath sent me, 9 saith the Son: from whom I received my essence by communication, from him also received I this commission. As therefore it is more worthy to give than to receive, to send than to be sent; so in respect of the Sonship there is some priority in the divine paternity: from whence divers of the ancients read that place of St. John with this addition, 10 The Father

1 Heb. iii. 1; John xx. 21. 2 “Pater enim solus susquam legitur missus.”—S. Augustinus, De Trin. lib. ii. cap. 5. 3 “Solus Pater non legitur missus, quia solus non habet authorem a quo genitus sit, vel a quo procedat. Et ideo non prop- ter naturae diversitatem, quae in Trinitate nulla est, sed propter ipsam autoritatem, solus Pater non dicitur missus: non enim splendor aut fervor ignem, sed ignis mittit sive splendorem sive fervorem.”—S. August. Sermo contra Arianos, cap. 4. “Quin mittit, potestatem suam in eo quod mittit ostendit.”—S. Hilarius De Trin. lib. viii. cap. 19. 4 Matt. xxi. 33, &c. 5 Heb. i. 1, 2. 6 “Si voluisset Deus Pater per subjec- tam creaturam visibiliter apparens, absurdis- sime tamen aut a Filio, quem genuit, aut a Spiritu Sancto, qui de illo procedit, missus diceretur.”—S. August. De Trin. lib. iv. cap. ult. 7 John vi. 57. 8 “Filius est igitur a Patre missus, non Pater a Filio; quia Filius est a Patre natus, non Pater a Filio.”—Fulgent. lib. vii. Cont. Fabianum, in Collect. Theod. de S. S. “Quis autem Christianus ignorat quod Pater misit, missusque sit Filius? Non enim Genitore ab eo quem genuit, sed geniture a Genitore mitti oportebat.”—S. August. Cont. Maximin. lib. iii. cap. 14. “Ubi audis, Ipsa me misit, noli intelligere naturae dissimilitudinem, sed generalis au- thoritatatem.”—Idem, Tract. 31 in Joan. 9 Matt. xxi. 35. “Est autem non 5 apostellae et 5 apostel- lorum, 30 deique, 30 autem 5 aequalium 30 viarum, 30 5 min 5 in terris 30 5 solvatur 30 5 incorruptibilis 30 5 corpore.”—S. August. De Capit. De Trin. § 4. Hence the language of the Schools: “Missio importat processionem originis,” as Thomas Aquinas, lib. 4. q. 34, art. i. 5 “primum” or, “authori- tatatem principii,” as Durandus, lib. i. dist. 15, q. 1. 9 John vii. 29. 10 “Δόξος γάρ, τοί ἡμών τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κάκως ἐμφανίζεται, ο才可以 the apostelles με Πα- τηρι μείζον μη σπέρνῃ, saith Epiphanius of the Arians; and, answering, grants in these words which follow: Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν, ο才可以 the apostelles με Πατηρι, φάσκει, καὶ ο才可以, ο才可以 κτίσας με.—Heres. Ixix. § 53. To the same purpose, Athanasius, De buman, Nat. Soc. 4. and
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(which sent me) is greater than I. He then is that God who sent forth his Son made of a woman, that God who hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. So that the authority of sending is in the Father: which therefore ought to be acknowledged, because upon this mission is founded the highest testimony of his love to man; for herein is love, saith St. John, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

Again, the dignity of the Father will farther yet appear from the order of the persons in the blessed Trinity, of which he is undoubtedly the first. For although in some passages of the apostolical discourses the Son may first be named (as in that of St. Paul, The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all, the latter part of which is nothing but an addition unto his constant benediction); and in others the Holy Ghost precedes the Son (as, Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all): yet where the three Persons are barely enumerated, and delivered unto us as the rule of faith, there that order is observed which is proper to them; witness the form of Baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; which order hath been perpetuated in all confessions of the faith, and is for ever inviolably to be observed. For that which is not instituted or invented by the will or design of man, but founded in the nature of things themselves, is not to be altered at the pleasure of man. Now this priority doth properly and naturally result from the divine paternity; so that the Son must necessarily be second unto the Father, from whom he receiveth his
origination, and the Holy Ghost unto the Son. Neither can we
be thought to want a sufficient foundation for this priority of the
first Person of the Trinity, if we look upon the numerous testi-
monies of the ancient doctors of the church, who have not stuck
to call the Father the origin, the cause, the author, the root,
the fountain, and the head of the Son, or the whole divinity.
12. For these titles it appeareth clearly, first, that they made a considerable difference between the person of the Father, of whom principio, quod est Pater, et principium a principió, quod est Filium." — Tito. Aquin. 1, q. 33, art. 4. And to this all the Schoolmen writing on his Sums agree, as all upon the Sentences. 1 Dist. 29.

2 Aitia estin του Θεου φυσις, και του Υιου, και του Αγιου Πνευματος, και της κτισεως πασης. — S. Athanas. Dissert. Orthod. et Anom. 'Αλλα της εστι δυναμεις αγενινως και αναρχως υπεστω, ητις εστιν αιτια της απαντων των ωνων αιτιαις εκ γαρ του Πατρος ο Υιος, δι' ου τα παντα. — S. Basil. Epist. 43. And upon that place, "This day have I begun to see: 'Αλλα το μεν, Γενενηκα, την αιτιαν αδιο ιης ετε της αρχης του εστιν σημαινεις;' — Idem. Cont. Epist. 43. Ποιο σαν εις την τις καταλειπε, ουδε την εν αιτιοις προς τα εξ αιτιων ενωπαρτυαισται;" — Idem, lib. I. Prorsus to, 'οτι εγω θηδην εν τω ονοματι του Πατρος μου, εκεινο ειδον ενα, οτι αρχην αετου και αιτιαν επιγραφομεν των Πατερα, ταυτα λεγει. — Idem. Epist. 64. Diaphorom των υποστασεων εν μοινα ταις τρισιν ιδιοτητι, τη αιτια και πατρικι, και αιτιατη ινικη και τη αιτιατη και εκπετηκη, επιγραφομεν. — Damasc. lib. iv. cap. 5. Των Πατερα του Λαογα και της Ζωδιας, και Προβολεω του Πνευματος του Αγιου, την προ την αιτιαν και αρχην φαμον της Θεοτοκιος ειναι. — Zachiae. Miltelen. And although Thomas Aquinas, and Eugenius bishop of Rome, in the definition of the Council of Florence, have observed that the Greeks in this case do use the term of "causa," but the Latin only "principium;" yet the very Latin fathers in the twenty-fifth session of the same Council have have these words: Μιας γινουσαμεν των Πατερα αιτιων, και ιδιας, και πηγην της Θεοτοκιος and we have before cited Victorinus Afer, who says, "Pater causa est ipsi Filio ut sit." So St. Hilary: "Deum nasci, non est aliud quam in ea natura esse qua Deus est; quia nasci cum causam nativitatis ostendit, non disciprit tamen in genere authoris existere." — De Trin. lib. xi. cap. 11. "Ex spiritu enim spiritus nascens, licet de proprietate spiritus, per quam et ipsa spiritus est, nascatur, non tamen alla eft præerquant perfectarum atque Indemutabilium causarum ad Id quod nascit causas est; et ex causa, licet perfecta atque Indemutabilii, nascens, necesse est ex causa in causa ipsius proprietate nascatur." — Idem, lib. xii. cap. 8. "Qui ex eo co quem est natus est, intelligi non potest ex eo quod non fuit natus esse, quia et is qui est, ad id quod causas est, non etiam id quod non est origini nascendi est." — Ibid. cap. 17. "Deus omnium quae sunt causa est. Quod autem rerum omnium causa est, etiam sapientia sua causa est, nec unquam Deus sine sapientia sua. Igitur semperna sapientia sua causa est semipientia." — S. August. Lib. de divers. Quest. lxxiii. quest. 16. And as they called the Father the cause of the Son, so they accounted it the propriety of the Father to be without a cause, as appears out of Alexander the bishop of Alexandria's Epistle before produced.

3 We have cited Pheadius speaking so before; to which may be added: "Si quis igitur adhuc et de apostolo requirit Dominicum statum, id est, singularis substantiae dualitatem quae per naturam autori suo jugitur:" et paulo post: "Sed cum referitur ex Ipso, certe ad Patrem, ut ad rerum omnium respectur autorem." St. Hilary is known to speak frequently of the authority of the Father, as of the author of his Son; and several places have been already collected, especially by Petavius, to which these may be added, beside what have been already produced: "Ipso quod Pater dicitur, ejus quem genuit anther ostenditur." — De Trin. lib. iv. cap. 9. "Cum potius honor Filio dignitas sit paterna, et gloriosus auter sit ex quo is, qui tali gloria sit dignus, exstiterit." — Ibid. cap. 10. "Allud est sine autore esse semper aeternum, allud quod Patri, id est, autori, est aeternum. Ub ienim Pater auter est, ibi et nativitas est. At vero ubi auter aeternus est, ibi et nativitas aeternae est, quia sicut natus auter est, ibi et ab aeterno aeterna nativitas est." — Idem, lib. xii. cap. 21. "Quod vero ex aeterno natum est, id si non aeternum natura est, jam non erit et pater auter aeternus. Si quid igitur ei, qui ab aeterno Patre natus est, ex aeternitate defuerit, id ipsum auteri non est ambiguum defuisse." — Ibid. cap. 51. "Natus autem ibi, ut nihil ab illo quam te sibi significet auterum." — Ibid. cap. 51. "Ipsiut tamen auter est Pater generando sine initio." Ruffin. In Symb. "Si propterea Deum Patrem Deo Filiorum auterum, quia ille genuit, genitus est iste, quia iste de illo est, non ille de isto; fator et concedo." — S. August. Cont. Maximin. lib. iii. cap. 14.

are all things, and the person of the Son, by whom are all things.\(^1\) Secondly, that the difference consisteth properly in this: that as the branch is from the root, and river from the fountain, and by their origination from them receive that which they have; whereas the root receiveth nothing from the branch, or fountain from the river: so the Son is from the Father, receiving his subsistence by generation from him; the Father is not from the Son, as being what he is from none.

13.—Some indeed of the ancients may seem to have made yet a farther difference between the persons of the Father and the Son, laying upon that relation terms of greater opposition. As if, because the Son hath not his essence from himself, the Father had;\(^2\) because he was not begotten of himself, the Father had been so;\(^3\) because he is not the cause of himself, the Father were.\(^4\) Whereas, if we speak properly, God the Father hath neither his being from another, nor from himself;\(^5\) not from another, that

---

\(^{1}\) "Caput enim omnium Filius, sed caput Filii Deus." — S. HILAR. De Syn. "Cum ipse sit omnium caput, ipsius tamen caput est Pater." —RUFFIN. In Symb.

"Tu capitis primique caput, tu fontis origo." —HILAR. ad Leonem.

\(^2\) "Nunc magis Dei Vocom credendum est et manere in aternum, et sensu ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tanquam rivos de fonte traduxit?" —LACTAN. De ver. Sap. iv. cap. 8; etversus, cap. 29. "Cum itugur et Pater Filium faciat, et Filium Patrem, una mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est; sed ille quasi exuberrans fons est, hic tanquam de-fluens ex eo rivus, ille tanquam sol, hic tanquam radius a sole porrectus.

\(^{3}\) "Caput, quod est principium omnium, Filius: caput, autem, quod est principium Christi, Deus." —Concilium Sirm. accepted and expounded as orthodox by S. HILAR.

---

\(^{2}\) LACTAN. lib. 1. cap. 8. S. HILAR. lib. ii. ZACH. MITYLEN.

\(^{3}\) LACTAN. ibid. SYNES. IHPMN.

\(^{4}\) S. HIERON. in cap. iii. ad Eph.

\(^{5}\) "Avarosq ouv ouv Pater: ou ypar eteterous autwh, oude parv autou to eliva." —S. GREG. NAZ. Orat. 30. "O ageneinou ouv ouv ageneinetai ouv ouv autou, ouv ouv etetous." —S. ATHANAS. "Si rursum quod a semetipsc sit accipias, nemo sibi ipse et numerato et manus est." —S. HILAR. De Trin. lib. ii. cap. 7. "Quo putant Deum ejus potentias esse ut seipsum ipsum genetnit, eo plus errant, quod non solum Deus ita non est, sed neque corporalis neque spiritualis creatura. Nulla enim omnino res est que seipsum gignat ut
were repugnant to his paternity; not from himself, that were a contradiction in itself. And therefore those expressions are not to be understood positively and affirmatively, but negatively and exclusively, that he hath his essence from none, that he is not begotten of any, nor hath he any cause of his existence. So that

---

Ita. Et ideo non est credendum, vel dicens, what is given of such words as seem to bear the affirmation: as, ἀυτογενής, ἀυτόγονος, ἀυτογενής, &c. Αὐτογενής, αὐτογενεῖς, &c. Ἀυτογενεῖς, ἀυτογενεῖον, οἷς ἐκ των γεννώμενον.—Hesybius. And, Ἀυτολόγευτος, ὁ Θεός ἁγίειτο, ἀυτογενεῖτο, ὁ Θεός ἀγίειτο. And if ἀυτογενεῖτο be not ἀυτοῖς γενεῖτο, no more is αὐτόθεος to be taken for αὐτοῖς ὑπὲρ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦν. Eusebius in his Panegyrical Oration gives this title to the Son: Οἷά τοῦ καθούν Θεοῦ Πατάκην ἢν καινέων καὶ αὐτοθεον προκυνέωσθαι.—St. Basil. And, Αὐτογενεῖσθαι, ἀυτογενεῖσθαί, καὶ τι δὲ ἀυτοκαλύναι καὶ ἀυτοσχαδέσθαι. Lib. iv. cap. 2. And in the thirteenth chapter of the same book, with relation to the former words: Τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, αὐτογενῆς τυγχάνων, καὶ αὐτοθέους νοερόν, καὶ σῶσα ἤλλα προκατελείκται. Theodoret terms him, Ἀυτόνυμος, and αὐτολογικός, ὁ Ἀυτοσοφιαί. (On the Personalities of the Divinity, 141.) St. Chrysostom, Αὐτοσαναντιαί, αὐτολαμβανότα. St. Athanasius gives him them, and many more to the same purpose. And before all these Origen: Ὑν μὲν νομίζωμεν καὶ πεπεσόβαμεν ἀρχῆς γεννεῖ Ἰησοῦν, καὶ Ἰησοῦν Ἰησοῦν, εὑρέτω ἡ αὐτολογία, καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία, καὶ ἡ αὐτολαμβάνει. And again: Τίς μαλλόν τῆς Ἰησοῦ ψυχῆς καί κατά παραπληρῶς καταληγία τοῦ Κυρίου, τοῦ αὐτολόγου καὶ αὐτοσοφίας καὶ αὐτολαμβάνει καὶ αὐτοδιδοκισμήν; Lib. vi. Eikonen μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Πρωτότοκος πάσης κατεσάντων ἡ αὐτολόγου, καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία, ἦτα λέγει καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία. —Ibid. And certainly in the same sense that αὐτὸς is joined with one attribute, it may be joined with any other, and with the Godhead: because all the attributes of God are really the same, not only with themselves, but with the essence. But in what sense it ought to be understood, when thus used by the fathers, it will be necessary to inquire, lest it be so attributed to the Son, as it prove derogatory to the Father: for, as St. Basil, I confess I may seem so to speak, as if the Son were therefore αὐτογενός, because he hath life of himself, not from the Father; (and consequently he may be termed αὐτοθεος, as God of himself, not from the Father;) for he denieth those words, "I live by the Father," to be spoken of Christ according to his divine nature; and that only for this reason, that if it were so understood he could not be called αὐτογενός.

Ei διὰ τοῦ Πατέρα ὁ Υἱός εἶ, δι' ἐτερον καὶ οὐ δι' ἐαυτοῦ εἶ; δι' ἐτερον ζων, αὐτογενής εἶναι ὑπὲρ δύναται: from whence he concludes, Εἰς τὴν εἰναύθησαν οὖν καὶ οὐ εἰς τὴν Θεοτητα, τὸ εἰρρημένον νοεῖν δὲ—Cont. Ennom. lib. iv. But because the authority of that book is questioned, I shall produce the same author upon the same scripture, speaking to the same purpose, in his 141st Epistle, which is unquestionably genuine: 'Εστάναι δὲ το οἴησαν οὐκ αὐτού προαιρών, ως οίμαι, ζωὴν ορομαξή' παν γὰρ τὸ δι' ἐτερον ζων, αὐτογενής εἶναι οὐ δύναται. To which testimonies I answer, first, that those words of his, ὡς οίμαι, (as I think,) show that he doth not absolutely deny these words of Christ to be understood of his Divinity, of which the rest of the fathers quoted before did understand it; and not only they, but St. Basil himself, in his book De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 8, hath delivered a clear resolution of this point according to that interpretation, wholly consonant to his doctrine of the Trinity in other parts of his works: Ὅμως μέντοι, ἵνα μὴ ποτε ἐκ τοῦ μεγεθοῦς τῶν ἐνέργειων πεπεσόσθαις εἰς τὸν καταλαμβάνον ἰαραχων εἶναι τοῦ Κυρίου, τῷ ήνίωτον ἁυτογενῆ; Ἕγεραν διὰ τοῦ Πατέρα. Kai τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως; Ὡν δύναται οὐ θεός ποιεῖν ἀδ' εαυτοῦ οὐδέν. Kai καὶ ἡ αὐτωτελεία σοφία; Ἑσταναὶ έλαβον τί εἴπον, καὶ τα λαλησ. Christ therefore as αὐτογενός spake those words, I live by the Father, and by them showed his origination from him, from whom he received his life, power, and wisdom, as receiving his essence, which is the same with them: wherefore those former passages are to be looked upon, as if αὐτὸς in composition did not deny origination, but participation, or receiving by way of affection. And that he understood it so, appears out of the places themselves: for in the first, after 'Ο δι' ἐτερον ζων, αὐτογενής εἶναι οὐ δύναται, immediately followeth, Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ κατὰ χάριν ἀγνός αὐτογενός: and in the second, after Πάν γὰρ τὸ δι' ἐτερον ζων, αὐτογενής εἶναι οὐ δύναται, followeth likewise, Ὁ οὖδέ τὸν υἱὸν δύναται ἑρμηνευθεῖν αὐτοθεομότητος εἶναι. The meaning then of St. Basil must be this, that he which receiveth life from another merely as a grace or favour, as the saints receive their sanctity, cannot properly be termed αὐτογενός, no more than they αὐτός: or if he receive it by derivation or participation, as water receiveth heat from fire, he deserveth the same name no more than water heated to be called αὐτοθεομότης. And this is fully consonant to the expressions of the rest of the ancients: as particularly Athanasius: Οὐ εἰς τα μετοχήν ταῦτα ὑν, οὖν ἐξερεύνη επιγενεμένως τούτων αὐτῷ κατα τοις αὐτοῦ
the proper notion of the Father in whom we believe is this, that he is a person subsisting eternally in the one infinite essence of the Godhead; which essence or subsistence he hath received from no other person, but hath communicated the same essence, in which himself subsisteth by generation to another person, who by that generation is the Son.

Howsoever, it is most reasonable to assert that there is but one person who is from none; and the very generation of the Son and procession of the Holy Ghost undeniably prove, that neither of those two can be that person. For whosoever is generated is from him which is the genitor, and whosoever procedeth is from him from whom he procedeth, whatsoever the nature of the generation or procession be. It followeth, therefore, that this person is the Father, which name speaks nothing of dependence, nor supposeth any kind of priority in another.

14.—From hence it is observed that the name of God, taken absolutely, 1 is often in the Scriptures spoken of the Father: as when we read of God sending his own Son; of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God; 2 and generally wheresoever Christ is called the Son of God, or the Word of God, the name of God is to be taken particularly for the Father, because he is no

1. *On the Creed.* [Art. 1.]
2. *2 Cor. xiii. 14.*
Son of the Father. From hence he is styled one God, the true God, the only true God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.  

15.—Which, as it is most true, and so fit to be believed, is also a most necessary truth, and therefore to be acknowledged, for the avoiding multiplication and plurality of Gods.  

For if there were more than one which were from none, it could not be denied but there were more Gods than one. Wherefore this origination in the divine paternity hath anciently been looked upon as the assertion of the unity: and therefore the Son and Holy Ghost have been believed to be but one God with the Father, because both from the Father, who is one, and so the union of them.

Secondly, it is necessary thus to believe in the Father, because our salvation is propounded to us by an access unto the Father.
We are all gone away and fallen from God, and we must be brought to him again. There is no other notion under which we can be brought to God as to be saved, but the notion of the Father; and there is no other person can bring us to the Father, but the Son of that Father: for, as the apostle teacheth us, through him we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father.  

16.—Having thus described the true nature and notion of the divine paternity, in all the several degrees and eminencies belonging to it, I may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he speaks, when he makes his confession in these words, I believe in God the Father: by which I conceive him to express thus much.

As I am assured that there is an infinite and independent being, which we call a God, and that it is impossible there should be more infinities than one: so I assure myself that this one God is the Father of all things, especially of all men and angels, so far as the mere act of creation may be styled generation; that he is farther yet, and in a more peculiar manner, the Father of all those whom he regenerateth by his Spirit, whom he adopteth in his Son, as heirs and co-heirs with him, whom he crowneth with the reward of an eternal inheritance in the heavens. But beyond and far above all this, beside his general offspring, and peculiar people, to whom he hath given power to become the sons of God, 2 I believe him the Father, in a more eminent and transcendent manner, of one singular and proper Son, his own, his beloved, his only-begotten Son; whom he hath not only begotten of the blessed Virgin, by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the overshadowing of his power; not only sent with special authority as the King of Israel; not only raised from the dead, and made heir of all things in his house; but, antecedently to all this, hath begotten him by way of eternal generation in the same divinity and majesty with himself: by which Paternity, coeval to the Deity, I acknowledge him always Father, as much as always God. And in this relation, I profess that eminency and priority, that as he is the original cause of all things as created by him, so is he the fountain of the Son begotten of him, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from him.

1 Eph. ii. 18. 
2 John i. 12.
CHAPTER IV.

I Believe in God the Father Almighty.

AFTER the relation of God’s paternity, immediately followeth the glorious attribute of his omnipotency: ¹ that as those in heaven in their devotions, so we on earth in our confessions might acknowledge that Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come; ² that in our solemn meetings at the church of God, with the joint expression and concurring language of the congregation, we might some way imitate that voice of a great multitude, ³ as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. ⁴

2.—This notion of Almighty in the CREED must certainly be interpreted according to the sense which the original word beareth in the New Testament: and that cannot be better understood than by the Greek writers or interpreters of the Old, especially when the notion itself belongs unto the gospel and the law indifferently. Now the word which we translate Almighty, ⁵ the most ancient Greek interpreters used sometimes for the title of God, the Lord of hosts, sometimes for his name Shaddai, as generally in the book of Job: by the first they seem to signify the rule and dominion which God hath over all; by the second, the strength, force, or power by which he is able to perform all things. The heavens and the earth were finished, saith Moses, and all the host of them; ⁶ and he which begun them, he which finished them, is the ruler and commander of them. Upon the right of creation doth he justly challenge this dominion. I have made the earth, and created man upon it; I, even my hands have stretched out the heavens, and

¹ For the oldest and shortest Creed had always this attribute expressed in it. In somuch that Παντοκράτωρ was ordinarily by the ancients taken for the Father; as, ἐκρήν δὲ αὐτὸν—ἐκθεσθαι αὐταίς λέξεσις τας προφητείας, εἰτ' ἐν αἷς Θεὸς Παντοκράτωρ ἑπταμελεῖτο εἶναι ὁ λέγων, εἰτ' ἐν αἷς ὁ Υἱός του Θεοῦ, εἰτ' ἐν αἷς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγιὸν λέγων εἶναι ἐπιστεύετο—Origen, lib. vii. Contra Celsum. And according to this general confession did Polycarp begin his prayer at his martyrdom: Κυρὶε ὁ Θεός ὁ Παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ και εὐλογητοῦ Παντός σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Πατήρ—Eccles. Smyrn. Epist.


⁵ Παντοκράτωρ, translated by Tertullian and St. Augustine, Omnitemens, (as Tertullian translates κοσμοκράτορας, munditientes, by Prudentius, Omnipollens, by all, Omnipotens, (as St. Hilary translated κοσμοκράτορας, munditientes,) and, as I conceive, it is translated, Capax universorum, by the Latin interpreter of Hermas, “Primum omnium credo quod unus est Deus, qui omnia creavit, et consummavit, et ex nihilum omnia fecit. Ipsa Capax universorum, solus intermundus est.”—Lib. ii. Mand. 1. Which, by the interpreter of Irenaeus, is thus translated: “Omnium Capax, et qui a nemo capiatur.”—Lib. iv. cap. 37. ⁶ Gcn. ii. 1.
all their host have I commanded.2 And on this dominion or command doth he raise the title of the Lord of hosts;2 which, though preserved in the original language both by St. Paul and St. James, yet by St. John is turned into that word which we translate Almighty.3 Wherefore from the use of the sacred writers, from the notation of the word in Greek,4 and from the testimony of the ancient fathers,5 we may well ascribe unto God the Father, in the explication of this article, the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

This authority or power properly potestative is attributed unto God in the sacred scriptures:6 from whence those names or titles which most aptly and fully express dominion7 are frequently given unto him; and the rule, empire, or government of the world is acknowledged to be wholly in him, as necessarily following that natural and eternal right of dominion.

3.—What the nature of this authoritative power is, we shall the more clearly understand, if we first divide it into three degrees or

1 Isai. xlv. 12. 2 Κύριος Σαβαωθ. 3 Εἰ μὴ Κύριος Σαβαωθ ἐγκατέλειψεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα.—Rom. ix. 29, the words of Isai. 4, and a great many of the other Psalms, are expressed in these words. 4 Αἰείος, ζωός, ζωός, Κύριος, Θεός ὁ Παντοκράτωρ.—Rev. iv. 8, which were before in Isaiah: Αἰείος, ζωός, ζωός, Κύριος, Σαβαωθ.—Isai. vi. 3. To δ’ ὅμοιον ἔρωμεν καὶ περὶ τῆς Σαβαωθ φωνῆς, πολλαχοῦ τῶν ἐπώνυμων παραλαμβανομένης: ὅτε εἰ μεταλαμβάνετο τὸ ὅρμα εἰς τὸ Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, η Κύριος στρατιωτικ., ἡ Παντοκράτωρ, (διάφορος γὰρ αὐτὸ ἐξεξυάλων ὦ ἐρμηνεύρεται αὐτῷ,) σοφῶν ποίησες.—Oviss. Or. Cont. Celsum, lib. ν. 4 That Παντοκράτωρ should have the signification of government in it, according to the composition in the Greek language, no man can doubt, who but only considers those vulgar terms of their politics, δημοκρατία and αριστοκρατία, from whence it appears that μονοκρατία might as well have been used as μοναρχία; and in that sense αὐτοκράτωρ is the proper title given by the Greeks to the Roman emperor, not only by the later historians, but even [in] the coins of Julius Caesar. Hesychius: Αὐτοκράτωρ, αὐτεξοιον ή κοσμοκράτωρ, because the Roman emperor was ruler of the known world. So the devils or princes of the air are termed by St. Paul κοσμοκράτορες, (Eph. vi. 12,) which is all one with ἀρχωτες τοῦ κόσμου, as will appear, John xii. 31, and xlv. 30, and xvi. 11. As therefore κράτος signifieth of itself "rule and authority":—Hesychius, Κράτος, βασιλεία, ἐξουσία. Κράτει, ἀρχῇ, ἐξουσία, to which sense, Eustathius hath observed, Homer led the following writers by these words of his: Σὺν δὲ καταὐτ οἰν ἁμέν.—Il. M. 214. Τὸ μὲν κράτος συλλαμβάνεται τι τοῖς ὑστεροι τὶς βασιλείας κράτος λέγουσι, whence Ἐσχήλλος calls Agamemnon and Menelaus ἄρχοντα κράτους Αχαιών, and Sophocles after him, ἀρχαῖα της Ἀτρείδες—and as κρατεῖ ὁ Οντος, ἢ Θεός, ἢ Κύριος, ἢ Ψυχήν ἢ Τούτων κράτους, "the Ruler of all," ἡΠαντοκράτωρ ὁ Θεός, πάντων κράτων.—Hesych. Παντοκρατορία, πανταρχία.—Suidas. 5 Αριστοκρατία,—οὐκ ἐδίδασκαν ἕνα Παντοκρατορία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Παντοκράτωρ γὰρ ἤτοι τὸν πάντων κράτων, ἢ πάντων ἐξουσιάσων. Οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν τὸν μὲν εἶναι τὴς ψυχῆς Διονυσίαν, τὸν δὲ των τοῦ σωμάτων, οὐδέτερον αὐτῶν τέλεων λέγουσι, τὸ λείπειν ἐκάθερον βαθύρ. ὁ γὰρ ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, σωμάτως δὲ ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχων, πῶς Παντοκράτωρ; καὶ ὁ δεσπότως σωμάτως, καὶ ἐξουσίας δὲ πνευμάτως, πῶς Παντοκράτωρ;—S. Cyril. Hier. Catech. viii. Ὅσο γὰρ τὸ πύραγγον τῶν στοιχείων, καὶ πάντων κρατῶν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ Θεός Παντοδιάνοιμος καὶ Παντοκράτωρ, δὴ δύναμιν κρατήσας, κτίσθαι ποιήσας, τρέφειν, ἀνείπως, σώζειν, σωμάτως καὶ ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων.—Theodotus, Joseph. v. 7. Clem. Alex. ex Script. Prophet. Elog. cap. 26. "Unus est Dominus Jesus Christus, per quem Deus Pater dominatum omnium tenet; unde et sequens sermo Omnipotentem pronunciavit Dominum. Omnipotens autem ab eo [esse] dicitur, quod omnium [ille] teneat potentatum."—Ruffin. In Symb. 6 Ἐξουσία. Luke xii. 5; Acts i. 7: Jude 25; Rev. v. 13. 7 Αὐτοκράτωρ, Διονύστης. Ἑν μὲν τὸ κύριον καὶ πρῶτος ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ παντι θεοῦ καὶ δὲ ἀπάντων διὰ τοῦτο. Καὶ γὰρ σύμμετρον δοῦλα σα.—Ioh. Exs. 162.
branches of it: the first whereof we may conceive, a right of making and framing anything which he willeth, in any manner as it pleaseth him, according to the absolute freedom of his own will; the second, a right of having and possessing all things so made and framed by him, as his own, properly belonging to him, as to the lord and master of them, by virtue of direct dominion; the third, a right of using and disposing all things so in his possession, according to his own pleasure. The first of these we mention only for the necessity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it. God's actual dominion being no otherways necessary, than upon supposition of a precedent act of creation; because nothing, before it hath a being, can belong to any one, neither can any propriety be imagined in that which hath no entity.

4.—But the second branch, or absolute dominion of this Almighty, is farther to be considered in the independency and infinity of it. First, it is independent in a double respect, in reference both to the original, and the use thereof. For God hath received no authority from any, because he hath all power originally in himself, and hath produced all things by the act of his own will, without any commander, counsellor, or coadjutor. Neither doth the use or exercise of this dominion depend upon any one, so as to receive any direction or regulation, or to render any account of the administration of it; as being illimited, absolute, and supreme, and so the fountain from whence all dominion in any other is derived. Wherefore he being the God of gods, is also the Lord of lords and King of kings, the only Potentate;¹ because he alone hath all power of himself, and whosoever else hath any, hath it from him, either by donation or permission.

The infinity of God's dominion, if we respect the object, appears in the amplitude or extension; if we look upon the manner, in the plenitude or perfection; if we consider the time, in the eternity of duration. The amplitude of the object is sufficiently evidenced by those appellations which the Holy Writ ascribeth unto the Almighty, calling him the Lord of heaven, the Lord of the whole earth, the Lord of heaven and earth;² under which two are comprehended all things both in heaven and earth. This Moses taught the distrustimg Israelites in the wilderness: Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God, the earth also with all that is therein.³ With these words David

¹ مَالِكُ اللهُ الْمُخْلِصُ. 2 Pet. xiv. 5; Ὅψασθε Δυνάστης. 2 Mac. xv 29: Ὁ Δύναστης. ν. 23: Δυναστής τῶν θεωρών, III. 21: ὁ πάτερ τῶν Κύριων, καὶ πάσης Συναντήσεως Δυνάστης. Ὁ πατήρ κρατίστων.—

² Deut. x. 17; Psalm cxxxvi 3; 1 Tim. vi. 15.

³ Dan. v. 23; Joshua iii. 11, 13; Psalm xcvii 5; Micah iv. 13; Zech. iv. 14; vi. 5; Matt. xi. 25; Acts xvi. 24.
glorifeth God: The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine; so acknowledging his dominion: as for the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them; so expressing the foundation or ground of that dominion. And yet more fully, at the dedication of the offerings for the building of the temple, to show that what they gave was of his own, he saith, Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all. If then we look upon the object of God's dominion, it is of that amplitude and extension, that it includeth and comprehendeth all things; so that nothing can be imagined which is not his, belonging to him as the true owner and proprietor, and subject wholly to his will as the sole governor and disposer: in respect of which universal power we must confess him to be Almighty.

If we consider the manner and nature of this power, the plenitude thereof or perfection will appear: for as in regard of the extension, he hath power over all things; so in respect of the intenseness, he hath all power over everything, as being absolute and supreme. This God challenged to himself, when he electively the prophet Jeremy in a potter's house, saying, O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel. That is, God hath as absolute power and dominion over every person, over every nation and kingdom on the earth, as the potter hath over the pot he maketh, or the clay he mouldeth. Thus are we wholly at the disposal of his will, and our present and future condition framed and ordered by his free, but wise and just, decrees. Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? And can that earth-artificer have a freer power over his brother potsherder (both being made of the same metal) than God hath over him, who, by the strange fecundity of his omnipotent power, first made the clay out of nothing, and then him out of that?

The duration of God's dominion must likewise necessarily be eternal, if anything which is be immortal. For, being everything is therefore his, because it received its being from him, and the continuation of the creature is as much from him as the first production; it followeth that so long as it is continued it must be

---

1 Psalm lxxxix. 11.
2 1 Chron. xxix. 11, 12: 
3 Jer. viii. 6.
4 Rom. ix. 21
his, and consequently, being some of his creatures are immortal, his dominion must be eternal. Wherefore *St. Paul expressly calleth God the King eternal,* with reference to that of David, *Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom,* and *thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.* 2 And *Moses* in his song hath told us, *The Lord shall reign for ever and ever.* 3 Which phrase for ever and ever in the original 4 signifieth thus much, and there is no time to come assignable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God shall reign.

The third branch of God's authoritative or potestative power consisteth in the use of all things in his possession, by virtue of his absolute dominion. For it is the general dictate of reason, that the use, benefit, and utility of anything, redoundeth unto him whose it is, and to whom as to the proprietor it belongeth. It is true indeed, that God, who is all-sufficient and infinitely happy in and of himself, so that no accession ever could or can be made to his original felicity, cannot receive any real benefit and utility from the creature. *Thou art my Lord, saith David, my goodness extendeth not to thee.* 5 And therefore our only and absolute Lord, because his goodness extendeth unto us, and not ours to him, because his dominion is for our benefit, not for his own: for us who want, and therefore may receive; not for himself, who cannot receive, because he wanteth nothing, whose honour standeth not in his own, but in our receiving. 6

But though the universal cause made all things for the benefit of some creatures framed by him, yet hath he made them ultimately for himself; and God is as universally the final as the efficient cause of his operations. The apostle hath taught us, that not only of him and by him, as the first author, but also to him and for him, as the ultimate end, are all things. 7 And

1 *Tē Basilei tōn aiónon. 1 Tim. i. 17.*
2 *LXX. Basileia pánων tōn aiónon.* Psalm cxiv. 13.
3 *Exod. xv. 18.*
4 *LXX. ét' aióna kai étī.* S. Hier. in seculum et ultra. So Aquila, Tholotion, and the fifth edit. in Psalm xxi. 4. So the LXX. again, *eis tōn aiónas kai étī.* Dan. xii. 7; and *eis tōn aióna kai épē-* keina. Micah iv. 5.
5 *Ille nostra servitute non indiget, nos vero dominatione illius indigemus ut operetur et custodiat nos: et ideo verus et solus est Dominus, quia non mitt ad suam, sed ad nostram, utilitatem salutemque servimus. Nam si nobis indigeret, eo ipsò non verus Dominus esset, cum per nos ejus adjuvaretur necessitas, sub qua et ipsè serviret.*—S. August. De Gen. ad Lit. lib. viii. cap. 11.
7 *Tuiη poieitai τον άνένδοτον τον την αντεκείνου ποντειμοένου γαθον υποδοχην.*—Hierocles In Aur. Curti. And again: *Ottòs tymi τον Θεόν ὡς προσδόκειν, δοτος λεληθην οίδιμον ιντον τον Θεού εἶναι κρετον.*
8 *Rom. xi. 36; Heb. ii. 10; 1 Cor. viii. 6.*
it is one of the proverbial sentences of Solomon, The Lord hath made all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the day of evil. For though he cannot receive any real benefit or utility from the creature, yet he can and doth in a manner receive that which hath some similitude or affinity with it. Thus God rejoiceth at the effects of his wisdom, power, and goodness, and taketh delight in the works of his hands. Thus doth he order and dispose of all things unto his own glory, which redoundeth from the demonstration of his attributes.

5.—An explicit belief of this authoritative power and absolute dominion of the Almighty is necessary, first for the breeding in us an awful reverence of his majesty, and entire subjection to his will. For to the highest excellency the greatest honour, to the supreme authority the most exact obedience is no more than duty. If God be our absolute Lord, we his servants and vassals, then is there a right in him to require of us whatsoever we can perform, and an obligation upon us to perform whatsoever he commandeth. Whosoever doth otherwise, while he confesseth, denieth him; while he acknowledgeth him with his tongue, he sets his hand against him. Why call ye me Lord, Lord, saith our Saviour, and do not the things which I say?

Secondly, this belief is also necessary to breed in us equanimity and patience in our sufferings, to prevent all murmuring, repining, and objecting against the actions or determinations of God, as knowing that he, who is absolute Lord, cannot abuse his power; he, whose will is a law to us, cannot do anything unwisely or unjustly. Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth: shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What maketh thou? But let the man after God’s own heart rather teach us humble and religious silence. I was dumb, saith he, and opened not my mouth, because thou didst it. When Shimei cast stones at him, and cursed him, let us learn to speak as he then spake; The Lord hath said unto him, Curse David: who shall then say, Wherefore hast thou done so?

Thirdly, the belief of God’s absolute dominion is yet farther necessary to make us truly and sufficiently sensible of the benefits we receive from him, so as by a right value and estimation of them to understand how far we stand obliged to him. No man can duly prize the blessings of heaven, but he who acknowledg-

1 Prov. xvi. 4. 2 Psalm civ. 31. 3 ὁμεῖς δὲ μεγάλοι Διὸς πεθώμεθα βούλη, 4 οὐ πᾶσι θυμοῦσι καὶ ἀβανατούσιν ἀνάσσει. — Ἑωμεῖς Πλατ. M. 241. 5 Εστὶν δὲ τὸ θετικὸν καὶ καὶ καὶ γνώμη. 6 Καὶ τοῦ δικαίου τοῦ τ’ ἀδικοῦ παρτὸν κρίτης. 7 Luke vi. 46. 8 Isai. xlv. 9. 9 Psalm xxxix. 9. 10 2 Sam. xvi. 10.
ledgeth they might justly have been denied him: nor can any be sufficiently thankful for them, except it be confessed that he owed him nothing who bestowed them.

6.—But as the original word for Almighty is not put only for the Lord of hosts, but often also for the Lord Shaddai: so we must not restrain the signification to the power authoritative, but extend it also to that power which is properly operative and executive. In the title of the Lord of Sabaoth we understand the rule and dominion of God, by which he hath a right of governing all: in the name Shaddai we apprehend an infinite force and strength, by which he is able to work and perform all things. For whether we take this word in composition, as signifying the all-sufficient;\(^1\) whosoever is able to supplant all things to the sufficing all, must have an infinite power: or whether we deduce it from the root denoting devastation or destruction;\(^2\) whosoever can destroy the being of all things, and reduce them unto nothing, must have the same power which originally produced all things out of nothing, and that is infinite. Howsoever, the first notion of Almighty necessarily inferreth the second, and the infinity of God’s dominion speaketh him infinitely powerful in operation.\(^3\) Indeed in earthly dominions, the strength of the governor is not in himself, but in those whom he governeth: and he is a powerful prince whose subjects are numerous. But the King of kings hath in himself all power of execution, as well as right of dominion. Were all the force and strength of a nation in the person of the king, as the authority is, obedience would not be arbitrary, nor could rebellion be successful: whereas experience teacheth us that the most puissant prince is compelled actually to submit, when the stronger part of his own people hath taken the boldness to put a force upon him. But we must not imagine that the governor of the world ruleth only over them which are willing to obey, or that any of his creatures may dispute his commands with safety, or cast off his yoke with impunity. And if his dominion be uncontrollable, it is because his power is irresistible. For man is not more inclinable to obey God than man, but God is more powerful

\(^{1}\) So R. Solomon will have it compounded of יְה (the pronoun, and יִל: יְה יִל) "because in God there is sufficiency," that is, sufficient power, "over every creature:" from whence the LXX. (Ruth i. 20, 21; Job xxx. 15; xxxi. 2) translate it ἐκαθός, as Symmachus, Job xxxi. 3, and Aquila with him, Ezek. i. 24.

\(^{2}\) מָשְׂכֵל "vastavit, destructit, perdidit:" from whence מָשְׂכֵל, "the Destroyer;" and because utter destruction requireth power equivalent to production, "the Omnipotent," from whence the LXX., Job viii. 3, translate it, ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιησεν. And this etymology, rather than the former, seemeth to be confirmed by the prophet, Isal. xiii. 6: "Howl ye, for the day of the Lord is at hand." יְהוָֹו יִשְׂרָאֵל "It shall come as a destruction from the Almighty (Destroyer)."

\(^{3}\) Homer hath well joined these two—

Ω πάτερ ὑμέτερα, Κρονίδε, ὑποτε κρειοντῳ, έν νυ και ρημαί εἶδον ι τον σθενον αυτ ὑμιν ἐκεν.—Ἰ. Θ. 31.
On the Creed. [Art. I.

to exact subjection, and to vindicate rebellion. In respect of the infinity and irresistibility of which active power we must acknowledge him Almighty; and so, according to the most vulgar acception, give the second explication of his omnipotency.¹

7.—But because this word Almighty is twice repeated in the Creed, oncethis in this first article, and again in the sixth, where Christ is represented sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; and although in our English and the Latin the same word be expressed in both places, yet in the ancient Greek copies there is a manifest distinction; being the word in the first article may equally comprehend God's power in operation, as well as authority in dominion, whereas that in the sixth speaketh only infinity of power, without relation to authority or dominion: I shall therefore reserve the explication of the latter unto its proper place, designing to treat particularly of God's infinite power where it is most peculiarly expressed: and so conclude briefly with two other interpretations which some of the ancients have made of the original word, belonging rather to philosophy than divinity, though true in both. For some have stretched this word Almighty, according to the Greek notation,² to signify that God holdeth, incircleth, and containeth all things. Who hath gathered the wind in his fists; who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? who but God? Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure? who but he?⁴ Thus then may he be called Almighty, as holding, containing, and comprehending all things.

8.—Others extend it farther yet, beyond that of containing or comprehension, to a more immediate influence of sustaining or preservation.⁵ For the same power which first gave being unto all things, continueth the same being unto all. God giveth to all


² Πιστεύω εἰς θεὸν Πατέρα Παντοκράτορα. —Art. i. Καθεξής καὶ καί ἐν δεξίᾳ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Παντοδύναμου.—Art. vi.: as it is in the ancient copy of the Creed taken out of the Library of Bene't College, and set forth by the archbishop of Armagh.

³ As Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, giving account of those words which are attributed unto God, as Θεὸς, Κύριος, Ὑψιστος, tells us he is called Παντοκράτωρ, ὅτι αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα κρατεῖ καὶ ἐμπεριέχεται. Τὰ γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τὰ βάθη τῶν ἀβύσσων, καὶ τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμενῆς ἐν τῇ χειμα αὐτῶν ἔστιν.—Ad Autol. lib. 1.

⁴ Prov. xxx. 4; Isai. xl. 12.

⁵ As Gregorius Nyssenus: Ὁκαὶ ὅταν τῆς Παντοκράτορος φωνῆς ἀκούσαμεν, τούτῳ νοοῦμεν, τὸ πάντα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εἶναι συνεχές. Neither, says he, would God be termed Παντοκράτωρ, εἰ μὴ πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις του περικράτουσαν αὐτή, καὶ εἰ τῷ εἶναι συντηροῦσαν, ἔδειτο.—Contra Eunom. lib. i.

I Believe in God the Father Almighty.

life, and breath, and all things. In him we live, move, and have our being,\(^1\) saith the strangest philosopher that ever entered Athens, the first expositor of that blind inscription, To the unknown God. How could anything have endured, if it had not been thy will? or been preserved, if not called by thee? as the Wisdom of the Jews confesseth.\(^2\) Thus did the Levites stand and bless: Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein, the sea and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all.\(^3\) Where the continual conservation of the creature is in an equal latitude attributed unto God with their first production. Because there is as absolute a necessity of preserving us from returning unto nothing by annihilation, as there was for first bestowing an existence on us by creation. And in this sense God is undoubtedly Almighty, in that he doth sustain, uphold, and constantly preserve all things in that being which they have.

9.—From whence we may at last declare what is couched under this attribute of God, how far this omnipotency extends itself, and what every Christian is thought to profess, when he addeth this part of the first article of his creed, I believe in God the Father Almighty.

As I am persuaded of an infinite and independent essence, which I term a God, and of the mystery of an eternal generation by which that God is a Father: so I assure myself that Father is not subject to infirmities of age, nor is there any weakness attending on the ancient of days; but, on the contrary, I believe omnipotency to be an essential attribute of his deity, and that not only in respect of operative and active power (concerning which I shall have occasion to express my faith hereafter), but also in regard of power authoritative, in which I must acknowledge his antecedent and eternal right of making what, and when, and how he pleased, of possessing whatsoever he maketh by direct dominion, of using and disposing as he pleaseth all things which he so possesseth. This dominion I believe most absolute in respect of its independency, both in the original, and the use or exercise thereof: this I acknowledge infinite for amplitude or extension, as being a power over all things without exception; for plentitude or perfection, as being all power over everything without limitation; for continuance or duration, as being eternal without end or conclusion. Thus I believe in God the Father Almighty.

\(^1\) Acts xvii. 25, 28.  
\(^2\) Wisd. xi. 25  
\(^3\) Neh. ix. 6.
CHAPTER V.

Maker of Heaven and Earth.

ALTHOUGH this last part of the first article were not expressed in the ancient creeds,1 yet the sense thereof was delivered in the first rules of faith,2 and at last these particular words inserted both in the Greek and Latin confessions. And indeed the work of creation most properly followeth the attribute of omnipotency, as being the foundation of the first, and the demonstration of the second explication of it. As then we believe there is a God, and that God Almighty; as we acknowledge that same God to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in him of us: so we also confess that the same God the Father made both heaven and earth. For the full explication of which operation, it will be sufficient, first, to declare the latitude of the object, what is comprehended under the terms of heaven and earth; secondly, to express the nature of the action, the true notion of creation, by which they were made; and thirdly, to demonstrate the person to whom this operation is ascribed.

1 For we find it not mentioned by St. Augustin De Vide et Symbolo; neither hath Ruffinus expounded it in the Aquileian, or noted it to be found in the Roman or Oriental Creeds. Leo, reciting the three first Articles in his Epistle to Flavianus, maketh no mention of it. (Ep. x.) Maximus Taquinensis hath it not in Traditio Symboli, nor Petrus Chrysologus in his Sermons, amongst six several expostions. It is not in the Homilies of Eusebius Gallicanus, or the exposition of Venantius Fortunatus, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, left it not at Rome with Julijus; nor did Arius in his Catholic Confession unto Constantine acknowledge it: neither are the words to be found in the Latin or Greek copy of the Creed, written about the beginning of the eighth century, and published out of the mass, by the most reverend and learned archbishop of Armagh; or in that which Etherius and Beatus produced against Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, toward the end of the seventh century.

2 As in that delivered by Ireneus: Eic ένα θεον Πατέρα Παντοκράτορα, τόν ιερόν και τόν γάρ και τής θαλάσσας, και πάντα τά εν αυτώι,—Adr. Hier. lib. i. cap. 2. And that by Tertullian: "Unum omnino Deum esse, nec aliquam praeter mundi Conditorum, qui universa de nihilo produxerit."—De Præser. adv. Hier. cap. 13. And that under the name of Nostrian, not in formal words, but with an "id est," by way of explication: "Regula exigit veritatis ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et Dominum Omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum Conditorum, quem unicum alta sublimitate suspendit, terram dejecta mole solidavit, maria soluto liquore diffudit, et hæc omnia propriis et condignis instrumentis et ornata et plena digessit."—De Trin. cap. I. It was also observed by Origen, that the Christians were wont most frequently to mention God under that as the most common title: "Η γάρ αριστέως ὅμολογος τού κοίνου ἄνωμα, τό, ο ὁ θεός, ἦ καὶ μετὰ προσβήσεως τῆς, ὁ δημιουργός τῶν ὅλων, ὁ Ποιητής υἱονοῦ καὶ γῆς."—Contra Cels. lib. i. Eusebius delivered the first Article thus in his Confession to the Nicene Council: Παντενομεν εἰς ένα θεον Πατέρα Παντοκράτορα, τόν ιερόν καὶ τόν γάρ καὶ τής θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τά εν αὐτώι. And by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechism, and St. Epiphanius in Ancorato: which addition was received, confirmed, and transmitted to us by the Council of Constantinople. By which means at last we find this Article thus expressed in the Western Confessions: "Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem coeli et terrae."
2.—For the first, I suppose it cannot be denied as the sense of the CREED, that under the terms of heaven and earth are comprehended all things; because the first rules of faith did so express it, and the most ancient creeds had either instead of these words, or together with them, the maker of all things visible and invisible, which being terms of immediate contradiction, must consequently be of universal comprehension; nor is there anything imaginable which is not visible, or invisible. Being then these were the words of the Nicene creed; being the addition of heaven and earth in the Constantinopolitan could be no diminution to the former, which they still retained together with them, saying, I believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; it followeth, that they which in the Latin Church made use only of this last addition, could not choose but take it in the full latitude of the first expression.

3.—And well may this be taken as the undoubted sense of the CREED, because it is the known language of the sacred scriptures. In six days, saith Moses, the Lord made heaven and earth:1 in the same time, saith God himself, the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.2 So that all things by those two must be understood which are contained in them; and we know no being which is made or placed without them. When God would call a general rendezvous, and make up an universal auditory, the prophet cries out, Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth.3 When he would express the full splendour of his majesty, and utmost extent of his actual dominion, Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool.4 When he would challenge unto himself those glorious attributes of immensity and omnipresence, Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord.5 These two then taken together signify the universe, or that which is called the world. St. Paul hath given a clear exposition of these words in his explication of the Athenian altar; God that made the world and all things therein; seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands.6 For being God is necessarily the Lord of all things which he made, (the right of his direct dominion being clearly grounded upon the first creation), except we should conceive the apostle to exempt some creature from the authoritative power of God, and so take some work of his hand out of the reach of his arm; we must confess that heaven and earth are of as large extent and ample signification as the world and all things therein. Where it is yet farther observable, that the apostle hath

---

1 Exod. xxxi. 17  2 Exod. xx. 11.  3 Is. i. 2.  4 Isai. lxvi. 1  5 Jer. xxvii. 24  6 Acts xvii. 24
conjoined the speech of both Testaments together. For the ancient Hebrews seem to have had no word in use amongst them which singly of itself did signify the world, as the Greeks had, in whose language St. Paul did speak; and therefore they used in conjunction the heaven and earth, as the grand extremities within which all things are contained.¹ Nay, if we take the exposition of the later writers in that language, those two words will not only as extremities comprehend between them, but in the extension of their own significations contain all things in them. For when they divide the universe into three worlds, the inferior, superior, and the middle world,² the lower is wholly contained in the name of earth, the other two under the name of heaven. Nor do the Hebrews only use this manner of expression, but even the Greeks themselves; and that not only before, but after³ Pythagoras had accustomed them to one name.⁴ As therefore under the single name of world or universe,⁵ so also under the conjunctive expression of heaven and earth, are contained all things material and immaterial, visible and invisible.

4.—But as the apostle hath taught us to reason, When he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him:⁶ so when we say, all things were

---

¹ Kalōs de pantes ἕξεδεξαν τοὺς ἄρκους, οὐρανοὶ τε καὶ γῆ, τὰ μέσα συμπεριεληφθέντα στοιχεῖα. Ποὺς δὲ ἀκρὰ φήμη; Ἡ γῆ μὲν τὸ κέντρον παντὸς ἐπερειλήφθη. Καὶ ἐπτὶ κατοθεῖ μὲν ἄρχῃ πάντων ἡ γῆ, πέρας δὲ τούτων ὁ πάντα περιέχων οὐρανοὶ· τούτου ἡ γῆ, ἀρχὴ μὲν ὁ οὐρανός, πέρας δὲ πάντων ἡ γῆ· μετὰ δὲ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ λοιπά τρία περιελήφθησαν στοιχεῖα.

—JO. PHILOP. De Mund. Creat. lib. i. cap. 5.

Τῷ μὲν οὐρανῷ σώματι (ὑ ὡς) τὸ πέρι τοῦ παντός ἀπένεγε· τῷ δὲ περιεγέ τὸ κέντρον· ἐν δὲ σφαιρῇ ἄλλῳ μὲν τὸ κέντρον ἄρχη, ἄλλως δὲ τὸ περιέχοντος ὅρος.—HIEROCLES In Aur. CARM.

² For the Rabbins usually divide the whole frame of things into three worlds: the first, ὁ παντὸς ἡ ἡγεμονία, “the superior world;" the second, ὁ παντὸς ἐν μία ἐνσωστία, “the middle world;" or ὁ ἐν ἐνοίκῳ ὁ παντὸς ἐν ἄλλῃ ἐνσωστίᾳ, “the depressed and lowest world." "That is this world," say they, to wit, this globe of earth on which we live. This they divide into three parts: θαῦμα, "the sea," lakes, and rivers; ἡ γῆ, "the desert," solitary and inhabitable places, ἐκ τῆς σίκουσμος, "the earth inhabited." The second is called, ὁ παντὸς ἐν μίᾳ ἐνσωστίᾳ, "the middle or inmost world;" ὁ ἐν ἐνοίκῃ ὁ παντὸς ἐν ἄλλῃ ἐνσωστίᾳ, "this is the world of the spheres," containing the arial region, and the starry heavens.

The third is, ἡ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἡ ἐνοίκια, "the superior world;" ὁ παντὸς ἐν σύσπαστᾳ "this is the world of angels;" ὁ παντὸς ἐν θεοῖς "of God;" ὁ παντὸς ἐν καταλήψεσιν "of souls;" ὁ παντὸς ἐν ἄνθρωποι "the spiritual world." Now being [seeing] these three comprehend all things imaginable being [seeing] the first is sufficiently expressed in ἡ γῆ "the earth," and the two last in ἡ γῆ "the heaven;" it followeth that, in the sense of the Hebrews, “heaven and earth" signify "all things."

³ Else, ταῖς ἀξίωσις, ἐκ ἀνόητος θέου, "Οἵ οὐρανοὺς δέσποινα καὶ γαῖας μακράν.

—SOPHOCLES, apud JUST. MART., CLEM. ALEX., &c.

⁴ Πυθαγόρας πρῶτος ὄνομασε τὴν τῶν ἰδίων περιοχήν, κόσμου, ἐκ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τάξεως.—PLUTARCH. De Plac. Philosoph. lib. ii. cap. 1.

⁵ Si mundum dixeris, illic erit et coelum, et que in eo, sol, et luna, et sidera, et terra, et frea, et omnis census elementorum. Omnia dixeris, cum id dixeris quod ex omnibus constat.—TERTUL. De Virg. vulg. cap. 4. Παρὰ δὲ οἱ καὶ οἰκῖαν καὶ γῆν καὶ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων τὴν κοινωνίαν συνέχει, καὶ Φίλιαν, καὶ κοιμήτριας, καὶ σωφροσύνην, καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὸ ὀλον τούτο διὰ ταῦτα κόσμον καλοῦσιν.—LAMBERT, Protrept.; but the words are Plato’s in Gorgias.

⁶ 1 Cor. xv. 27.
made by God, it is as manifest that he is excepted who made all things. And then the proposition is clearly thus delivered: All beings whatsoever beside God were made. As we read in St. John concerning the Word, that the world was made by him; and in more plain and express words before, All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made.\(^1\)

Which is yet farther illustrated by St. Paul: For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him.\(^2\) If then there be nothing imaginable which is not either in heaven or in earth, nothing which is not either visible or invisible, then is there nothing beside God which was not made by God.

5.—This then is the unquestionable doctrine of the Christian faith, that the vast capacious frame of the world, and everything any way contained and existing in it, hath not its essence from or of itself, nor is of existence absolutely necessary; but what it is, it hath not been, and that being which it hath was made, framed and constituted by another. And as every house is builded by some man,\(^3\) for we see the earth bear no such creature of itself; stones do not grow into a wall, or first hew and square, then unite and fasten themselves together in their generation; trees sprout not cross like dry and sapless beams, nor do spars and tiles spring with a natural uniformity into a roof, and that out of stone and mortar: these are not the works of Nature, but superstructions and additions to her, as the supplies of art, and the testimonies of the understanding of man, the great artificer on earth: so if the world itself be but an house,\(^4\) if the earth, which hangeth upon nothing,\(^5\) be the foundation, and the glorious spheres of heaven the roof (which hath been delivered as the most universal hypothesis), if this be the habitation of an infinite intelligence, the temple of God,\(^6\) then must we acknowledge the world was built by him, and, consequently, that he which built all things is God.

6.—From hence appears the truth of that distinction, Whatever hath any being is either made or not made: whatsoever is not made, is God; whatsoever is not God, is made. One uncreated and independent essence; all other depending on it, and created by it. One of eternal and necessary existence; all other indifferent, in respect of actual existing, either to be or not to be,

---

1 John i. 10, 3. 2 Col. i. 16. 3 Heb. iii. 4. 4 ὁ αἰσθητὸς οὐτοίς, κόσμος οὗδέν ἀρα ἴλλο ἐὰν τί φιλάτως. —Πίπειο De Insomni. Κόσμος εὐπρέπις καὶ ἐτώμως, αἰσθητός ὁ κόσμος τοῦ Θεοῦ.—Idem, De Plant. Nat. Θεῖον τι μέγαθος, ο κόσμος, καὶ θείον Θεῷ αἰσθητός. —Idem, De Mundi Incor. 5 Lucretius calls the heavens, "Mundi magnum et versatile templum." —De Rer. Nat. lib. v. 1435. 6 Jof xxvi. 7.
and that indifference determined only by the free and voluntary act of the first cause.

7.—Now because to be thus made includes some imperfection, and among the parts of the world some are more glorious than others, if those which are most perfect presuppose a maker, then can we not doubt of a creation where we find far less perfection. This house of God, though uniform, yet is not all of the same materials, the footstool and the throne are not of the same mould; there is a vast difference between the heavenly expansions. This first aerial heaven, where God setteth up his pavilion, where he maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind, is not so far inferior in place as it is in glory to the next, the seat of the sun and moon, the two great lights, and stars innumerable, far greater than the one of them. And yet that second heaven is not so far above the first as beneath the third, into which St. Paul was caught. The brightness of the sun doth not so far surpass the blackness of a wandering cloud, as the glory of that heaven of presence surmounts the fading beauty of the starry firmament. For in this great temple of the world, in which the Son of God is the High Priest, the heaven which we see is but the veil, and that which is above, the holy of holies. This veil indeed is rich and glorious, but one day to be rent, and then to admit us into a far greater glory, even to the mercy-seat and cherubins. For this third heaven is the proper habitation of the blessed angels, which constantly attend upon the throne. And if those most glorious and happy spirits, those morning stars which sang together, those sons of God which shouted for joy when the foundations of the earth were laid, if they and their habitation were made; then can we no ways doubt of the production of all other creatures, so much inferior to them.

8.—Forasmuch then as the angels are termed the sons of God, it sufficiently denoteth that they are from him, not of themselves; all filiation inferring some kind of production; and being God hath but one proper and only-begotten Son, whose propriety and singularity consisteth in this, that he is of the same increated essence with the Father, all other offspring must be made, and consequently even the angels created sons; of whom the Scripture speaking saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. For although those words, as first spoken by the psalmist, do rather express the nature of the wind and lightning; yet being the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews hath applied the same to the angels properly so called, we cannot but conclude

1 Psalm civ. 3. 2 2 Cor. xii. 2. 3 Ἰδιόν οἰκοτρίπον. Jude 5. 4 Job xxxviii. 7, 4. 5 Psalm civ. 4.
upon his authority, that the same God who created the wind and made a way for the lightning of the thunder, hath also produced those glorious spirits; and as he furnished them with that activity there expressed, so did he frame the subject of it, their immaternal and immortal essence.

If then the angels and their proper habitation, the far most eminent and illustrious parts of the world, were made; if only to be made be one character of imperfection; much more must we acknowledge all things of inferior nature to have dependence on their universal cause, and consequently this great universe, or, all things, to be made, beside that one who made them.

This is the first part of our Christian faith, against some of the ancient philosophers, who were so wildly fond of those things they see, that they imagined the universe to be infinite and eternal, and, what will follow from it, to be even God himself. It is true that the most ancient of the heathen were not of this opinion, but all the philosophy for many ages delivered the world to have been made.

9.—When this tradition of the creation of the world was delivered in all places down successively by those which seriously considered the frame of all things, and the difference of the most ancient poets and philosophers from Moses was only in the manner of expressing it; those which in after ages first denied it made

1 Amos iv. 13; Job xxviii. 26.
3 Τέκμενον μὲν οὖν ἀπαντές εἶναι φασιν, says Aristotle (De Celo, lib. i. cap. 10), confessing it the general opinion that the world was made. Which was so ancient a tradition of all the first philosophers, that from Linus, Musaeus, Orpheus, Homer, Hesiod, and the rest, they all mention the original of the world, entitling their books, Κοσμογονία, Οἰςογονία, or Θεογονία, or the like. Εἰς τὸ γὰρ των οἱ φασιν οὐθὲν ἀγένετο εἶναι τῶν τραγικάτων, ἀλλὰ πάντα γεγένησαν· γεγένεται δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄφθαρτα διαμεῖναι, τὰ δὲ πάλιν φθείρεσθαι· μάλιστα μὲν οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀιώνα, εἰτα δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ πρωτοὶ φυσιολογισμαί, says Aristotle, De Celo, lib. iii. cap. 1. In which words he manifestly attributes the doctrine of the creation of the world, not only to Hesiod, but to all the first natural philosophers; which learning, beginning with Prometheus, the first professor of that science, continued in that family amongst the Atlanteans, who all successively delivered that truth. After them the Ionian philosophy did acknowledge it, and the Italian received it by Pythagoras, whose scholars all maintained it beside Ocellus Lucanus, the first of them that fancied the world not made, whom Plato, though he much esteemed him, yet followed not; for there is nothing more evident than that he held the world was made. Δέλπουν, says Aristotle, τὸ δὲ οὐ κατεπνίσατο τοῦ εἰσεσπέρατος ἀγάθου ἤν. In which words he delivers not only the generation of the universe, but also the true cause thereof, which is the goodness of God. For he which asks this plain and clear question, Πάντερον ἢν ἀεί, γενέστως ἀρχὴν ἢν οὐδὲν ἄφθαρτον, ἡ γένεσις, ἢ τίς ἀρχή των ἀρχημέων; and answers the question briefly with a γεγένησαν, he which gives this general rule upon it, Τῷ δ' αὐτοῦ γενεσμένου φασίν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀρχήν ἀνάγκην εἶναι γενεσθαι: and then immediately concludes: Τὸν μὲν οὖν Πανεύρημα καὶ Πατέρα τοῦ τῶν ἁπάντων εὑρεῖν τὸ ἐργον, καὶ εὑρώντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγεις cannot (notwithstanding all the shifts of his Greek expositors) be imagined to have conceived the world not made. And Aristotle, who best understood him, tells us clearly his opinion: Ἐν τῷ Τιμαιῳ (from whence I cited the preceding words), εἰς γὰρ φύσιν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (where by the way observe that in Plato's Timaeus οὐρανός and κόσμος are made synonymous) γενέσθαι μὲν, οὐ μὲν φθαρτον.
use of very frivolous and inconcluding arguments, grounding their new opinion upon weak foundations.

For that which in the first place they take for granted as an axiom of undoubted truth, that whatsoever hath a beginning, must have an end, and consequently, whatsoever shall have no end, had no beginning, is grounded upon no general reason, but only upon particular observation of such things here below as from the ordinary way of generation tend in some space of time unto corruption. From whence, seeing no tendency to corruption in several parts of the world, they conclude that it was never generated, nor had any cause or original of its being. Whereas, if we would speak properly, future existence or non-existence hath no such relation unto the first production. Neither is there any contradiction that at the same time one thing may begin to be, and last but for an hour, another continue for a thousand years, a third beginning at the same instant remain for ever: the difference being either in the nature of the things so made, or in the determinations of the will of him that made them. Notwithstanding then their universal rules, which are not true but in some limited particulars, it is most certain the whole world was made, and of it part shall perish, part continue unto all eternity; by which something which had a beginning shall have an end, and something not.

The second fallacy which led them to this novelty was the very name of universe, which comprehendeth in it all things; from whence they reasoned thus: If the world or universe were made, then were all things made; and if the world shall be dissolved, then all things shall come to nothing: which is impossible. For if all things were made, then must either all, or at least something, have made itself, and so have been the cause of itself as of the effect, and the effect of itself as of the cause, and consequently in the same instant both have been and not been; which is a contradiction. But this fallacy is easily discovered: for when we say the universe or all things were made, we must be always understood to except him who made all things, neither can we by that name be supposed to comprehend more than the frame of heaven and earth, and all things contained in them; and so he which first devised this argument hath himself acknowledged.

Far more gross was that third conceit, that if the world were

1 Ocellus Lucanus, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Παρτὸς Φυσικῆς, which book Aristotle hath made use of, and transcribed in many parts.

2 Τὸ πᾶν γενόμενον συν πάσι γίνεται, καὶ τὸ φερόμενον σὺν πᾶσι φεβεῖται: καὶ τούτο γε ἀδύνατον ἄναρχον σὺν καὶ ἀτελεῖ·

3 Τὸ δὲ γε ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁμοφύτων τὸν σύμπαυτον κόσμον, διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς προσαγοράσεως τοῦ πατρὸς, εἶκ τῶν ἀπαρτίων ἀναφημουσών.
ever made, it must be after the vulgar way of ordinary natural generations; in which two mutations are observable: the first from less to greater, or from worse to better; the second from greater to less, or from better to worse. (The beginning of the first mutation is called generation, the end of it perfection: the beginning of the second is from the same perfection, but conclusion in corruption or dissolution.) But none hath ever yet observed that this frame of the world did ever grow up from less to greater, or improve itself from worse to better: nor can we now perceive that it becomes worse or less than it was, by which dejection we might guess at a former increase, and from a tendency to corruption collect its original generation. This conceit, I say, is far more gross. For certainly the argument so managed proves nothing at all, but only this, (if yet it prove so much,) that the whole frame of the world, and the parts thereof which are of greater perfection, were not generated in that manner in which we see some other parts of it are; which no man denies. But that there can be no other way of production beside these petty generations, or that the world was not some other way actually produced, this argument doth not endeavour to infer, nor can any other prove it.

The next foundation upon which they cast off the constant doctrine of their predecessors, was that general assertion, that it is impossible for anything to be produced out of nothing, or to be reduced unto nothing: from whence it will inevitably follow, that the matter of this world hath always been, and must always be. The clear refutation of which difficulty requires an explication of the manner how the world was made: the second part before propounded, this argument doth not endeavour to infer, nor can any other prove it.

1 Πάν τὸ γενέτευσις ἀρχὴν εἰληφός, καὶ διαλύσεως ὀφείλειν κυκλοφορίαν, δύο ἐπιδέχεται μεταβολή: μιαν μὲν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μείωσος ἐπὶ τὸ μείον, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χειρόσως ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιστον—διεύθυναν δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μείωσος ἐπὶ τὸ μείον, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου ἐπὶ τὸ χειρόσως. Ἐὰν οὖν καὶ τὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν γεννητὸν ἅπας καὶ ἑβαθρὸν, γενόμενον, ἀπὸ τοῦ μείωσος ἐπὶ τὸ μείον μετεβαλε, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ χειρόσως ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιστον.—OCELLUS LUCANUS.

2 Τὸ δέ γε ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν οὐδὲν ἦμιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ παρέχεται τεκμήριον τοιοῦτον: οὕτω γάρ γενόμενον αὐτῷ εἴδομεν, οὑτε μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιστον καὶ τὸ μείον μεταβάλλων, οὑτε χειρόσως ποτὲ ἦ μείον γενόμενον ἀλλ' ἀεὶ κατὰ τ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἱσομόν διατείλει, καὶ ἵσον καὶ ὁμοιοὶ αὐτῷ ἔστων.—OCELLUS.

3 Αμήχαρον γὰρ τὸ ὅν ἀποτελεῖσθαι ἐκ τῶν μῆτην ὄντων, ἢ ἐς τὸ μήν ἀναλυθῆναι ἀφθαρτὸν ὄρα καὶ ἀναλιθρὸν τὸ πνεῦμα.—IDEM.
in reference to the effect. I conceive to be the production of their total being; so that whatsoever entity they had when made, had no real existence before they were so made. And this manner of production we usually term *creation*, as excluding all concurrence of any material cause, and all dependence of any kind of subject, as presupposing no privation, as including no motion, as signifying a production out of nothing;¹ that is, by which something is made, and not anything preceding out of which it is made. This is the proper and peculiar sense of the word *creation*: not that it signifies so much by virtue of its origination or vulgar use in the *Latin* tongue;² nor that the *Hebrew* word used by *Moses*, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*, hath of itself any such peculiar acceptance. For it is often used synonymously with words which signify any kind of production or formation,³ and by itself it seldom denotes a production out of nothing, or proper creation, but most frequently the making of one substance out of another pre-existing, as the fishes of the water;⁴ and man of the dust of the earth;⁵ the renovating or restoring anything to its former perfection, for want of *Hebrew* words in composition;⁶ or, lastly, the doing some new or wonderful work,⁷ the producing some strange and admirable effect, as

¹ So I conceive it best expressed by *Anselm*, archbishop of Canterbury: "*Dictur aliquid esse factum de nilo, cum intelligimus esse quidem factum, sed non esse aliquid unde sit factum."—Monolog. cap. 8.

² "*Creatio* apud nos generatio vel nativitas dicitur, apud Grecos vero sub nomine *creationis* verbam facture et conditionis accepitur."—S. HIERONYM. In Epist. ad Eph. cap. 4.

³ *Word* is promiscuously used with *creation*, which is of the greatest latitude, denoting any kind of effection, and with *creation*, which rather implies a formation out of something, from whence *creation* "a potter." For the first, we read, Gen. ii. 3, that "God rested from all his work," *creationem* et *urbe* ut liquet, not that on the sixth day he did the work of two days, that he might rest on the seventh, as Rabbi Solomon; not that in six days he made the roots of things, that they might afterward produce the like, as Aben Ezra; not these or any other fancies of the Rabbins; as if *creation* signified one work, and another; for they both express the production, as appears clearly in the following verse: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth," *creationem* *urbe* ut liquet, "when they were created," *creationem* *urbe* ut liquet, "in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." So "I have made the earth, and created man upon it," *Isai.* xiv. 12: where the first expresseth the proper, the second the improper, creation. Which indifferent acceptance appeareth in collating *Psalm* cxv. 15, and cxxi. 2, with *Isai.* xiii. 5, and xlv. 18, as also *Isai.* xvii. 7, with *Eccles.* xi. 2. From whence the LXX. translate ἠμηρίων indifferently τοιεύς or κτίσεως. For the second, ἠμηρίων is usually rendered by the Targum *creationem*, and by the LXX., though generally *creationem*, yet sometimes κτίσεως. And that it hath the same signification, will appear by conferring Gen. ii. 7, with *Isai.* xlv. 12; and not only so, but by that single verse, *Isai.* xlii. 1: "Now thus saith the Lord" אֶלֶף אֲשֶׁר "that created thee, O Jacob," אֶלֶף "and he that formed thee, O Israel." Lastly: all these are jointly used in the same validity of expression, *Isai.* xliii. 7: "Every one that is called by my name: for" אֶלֶף אֲשֶׁר "I have created him for my glory," אֶלֶף אֲשֶׁר "I have formed him," אֶלֶף אֲשֶׁר "I have made him." ⁴ Gen. i. 21. ⁵ Gen. i. 27; ii. 7. ⁶ *Psalm* lii. 10; *Isai.* lxv. 17. ⁷ "*Creatio* atque *conditio* nunquam nisi in magnis operibus nominatur: verbi causa, mundus creatus est, urbs condita est: *domus* vero, quamvis magna sit, adificata potius diciatur, quam condita vel creat. In magnis enim operibus atque facturis verbam *creationis* assumitur."—S. HIERONYM. In Epist. ad Eph. cap. 4.
the opening the mouth of the earth, and the signal judgments on the people of Israel.

11.—We must not therefore weakly collect the true nature of creation from the force of any word which by some may be thought to express so much; but we must collect it from the testimony of God the Creator, in his word, and of the world created, in our reason. The opinion of the church of the Jews will sufficiently appear in that zealous mother to her seventh and youngest son; I beseech thee, my son, look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein, and consider that God made them of things that were not: which is a clear description of creation, that is, production out of nothing. But because this is not by all received as canonical, we shall therefore evince it by the undoubted testimony of St. Paul, who, expressing the nature of Abraham's faith, propoundeth him whom he believed as God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were. For as to be called in the language of the scripture is to be, (Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God, saith St. John in his Epistle, who in his Gospel told us, he had given us power to become the sons of God:) so to call is to make, or cause to be. As where the prophet Jeremy saith, Thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them; the original may be thought to speak no more than this, thou hast called this evil to them. He therefore calleth those things which be not, as if they were, who maketh those things which were not, to be, and produceth that which hath a being out of that which had not, that is, out of nothing. This reason, generally persuasive unto faith, is more peculiarly applied by the apostle to the belief of the creation: for through faith, saith he, we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. Not as if the earth, which we see, were made of air, or any more subtle body, which we see not; nor as if those things which are seen were in equal latitude commensurable with the worlds which were framed: but that those things which are seen, that is, which are, were made of those which did not appear, that is, which were not.

12.—Vain therefore was that opinion of a real matter coeval

1 Num. xvi. 30. 2 Isa. xlv. 7. 3 2 Mac. vil. 23. 4 1 John iii. 1. 5 Jer. xxxii. 23. 6 Heb. xi. 3. 7 For I take μ' εκ φανομένων in this place to be equivalent unto οὐκ εξ οὐτων in the Maccabees, and that of the same sense with εξ οὐκ οὐτων, as the Syriac translation, καὶ εξ οὐκ οὐκοειμενον, with the Latin, μη εξ οὐκοειμενον. -Nat. Auscult. lib. v. cap. 2, § 8. Where οὐκ εξ οὐκοειμενον is the same with εξ οὐκ ουκοειμενον, and μη εξ οὐκοειμενον with μη ουκοειμενον.

may be observed even in the best Greek authors; as in Aristotle: ἀν τό μεταβάλλων τεταρτοῦς ἡ γάρ εξ οὐκοειμενον εἰς ουκοειμενον, ἡ οὐκ εξ οὐκοειμενον εἰς οὐχ ουκοειμενον, ἡ μὴ εξ οὐκοειμενον εἰς οὐκοειμενον, ἡ ἐξ οὐκοειμενον εἰς μη ουκοειμενον. -Nat. Auscult. lib. v. cap. 2, § 8. Where οὐκ εξ οὐκοειμενον is the same with εξ οὐκ ουκοειμενον, and μη εξ οὐκοειμενον with μη ουκοειμενον.
with God as necessary for production of the world by way of subject, as the eternal and Almighty God by way of efficient. For if some real and material being must be presupposed by indispensable necessity, without which God could not cause any thing to be, then is not he independent in his actions, nor of infinite power and absolute activity; which is contradictory to the divine perfection. Nor can any reason be alleged why he should be dependent in his operation, who is confessed independent in his being.

And as this co-eternity of matter opposeth God's independency, the proper notion of the Deity, so doth it also contradict his all-sufficiency. For if without the production of something beside himself he cannot make a demonstration of his attributes, or cause any sensibility of his power and will for the illustration of his own glory; and if without something distinct wholly from himself he cannot produce any thing, then must he want something external: and whosoever wanteth any thing is not all-sufficient. And certainly he must have a low opinion and poor conception of the infinite and eternal God, who thinks he is no otherwise known to be omnipotent than by the benefit of another. Nor were the framers of the Creed so wise in prefixing the Almighty before maker of heaven and earth, if, out of a necessity of material concurrence, the making of them left a mark of impotency rather than omnipotency.

13.—The supposition, then, of an eternal matter is so unnecessary where God works, and so derogatory to the infinity of his power, and all-sufficiency of himself, that the later philosophers, 2 something acquainted with the truth which we profess, though rejecting Christianity, have reproved those of the school of Plato who delivered, as the doctrine of their master, an eternal companion, so injurious to the Father and Maker of all things.

Wherefore, to give an answer to that general position, that out of nothing nothing can be produced, which Aristotle pretends to be the opinion of all natural philosophers, 4 I must first observe,

1 "Nemo enim non eget co de cujus utitur; nemo non subjicitur ei cujus eget, ut possit uti: sic et nemo de alieno utendo, non minor est co de cujus utitur; et nemo qui praestat de suo uti, non in hoc superior est co cui prestat uti."—Tertul. Adv. Hermog. cap. 8.

2 "Grande revera beneficium Deo contuit, ut haberet hodie per quem Deus cognoscereetur et Omnipotens vocaretur; nisi quod jam non Omnipotens, si non hoc potens, ex nihil omnia proferre."—Tertul. Adv. Hermog. cap. 8.

3 Quomodo ab homine Divina illa vis differret, si, ut homo, sic etiam Deus ope indignat aliena? Indiget autem, si nihil moliri potest, nisi ab altero illi materia ministretur."—Lactan. lib. ii. cap. 9.

4 As Hierocles: Kαι τι καταλεγμονοι τοιουτων, οποιοι και των Πλατωνικων των ναοι αρθρη την περι του Δημαρχου Θεου διασωζουσιν ειναια; Ου γαρ ικανον αυτον ειναι φθονον, αυτοτελων υποτηλαι δυνασ-βαι κοσμων ολεθραι δυναμει και σοφων εξ αλλων ενεργουται αλλ' αγεννητων υπηρεσια θεου αναρχοντο και τη μη παρ αυτω συμποται φιλος καταχωμενον, μωρως δημιουργων δυ-νασαν.—De Prov. et Fato.

5 Ποι το γινόμενον ανάγκη γίνεσθαι γε εκ οντων η εκ μη οντων τοιων δε το μεν εκ μη
that this universal proposition was first framed out of particular considerations of the works of art and nature. For if we look upon all kinds of artificers,¹ we find they cannot give any specimen of their art without materials. Being then the beauty and uniformity of the world shows it to be a piece of art most exquisite, hence they concluded that the Maker of it was the most exact Artificer,² and, consequently, had his matter from all eternity prepared for him. Again, considering the works of nature and all parts of the world subject to generation and corruption, they also observed that nothing is ever generated but out of something pre-existent, nor is there any mutation wrought but in a subject, and with a presupposed capability of alteration.³ From hence they presently collected, that if the whole world were ever generated, it must have been produced out of some subject, and, consequently, there must be a matter eternally pre-existing.

Now, what can be more irrational than from the weakness of some creature to infer the same imbecility in the Creator, and to measure the arm of God by the finger of man? Whatsoever speaketh any kind of excellency or perfection in the artificer may be attributed unto God; whatsoever signifieth any infirmity, or involveth any imperfection, must be excluded from the notion of him. That wisdom, prescience, and preconception, that order and beauty of operation which is required in an artist, is most eminently contained in him, who hath ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight;⁴ but if the most absolute idea in the artificer's understanding be not sufficient to produce his design without hands to work, and materials to make use of, it will follow no more that God is necessarily tied unto pre-existing matter, than that he is really compounded of corporeal parts.

Again: it is as incongruous to judge of the production of the world by those parts thereof which we see subject to generation and corruption, and thence to conclude, that if it ever had a cause of the being which it hath, it must have been generated in the same manner which they are; and if that cannot be, it must never have been made at all. For nothing is more certain than that this manner of generation cannot possibly have been the first production even of those things which are now generated. We see

¹ Hierocles calls him Κοσμοποιόν καὶ Άριστοτεγον Θεόν.—In Nat. Carm.
² "Θεόν ὁ θεὸν οὐκ οὐκ ὁ ποιητής τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν τὸν ἑαυτόν."—Cicero De Nat. Deorum. Σειράκοσταν τὸ μεν Θεὸ τὸν ἀνθρώπου, τὸν δὲ ἀνθρώπου τῷ κόσμῳ.—Method. Περὶ τῶν γεννήσεων.
³ Utigitur faber cum quid adificaturus est, non ipsa facit materiam, sed ea utitur que sit parata, fictorque item cera: sic isti Providentiae Divinas materiam præsto esse oportuit, non quam ipsa faceret, red quam haberet paratum."—Cicero De Nat. Deorum. Απευκοστέων τοι μεν Θεῷ τὸν τεκνίτην, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῷ κόσμῳ.—Method. Περὶ τῶν γεννήσεων.
⁴ Wisd. xi. 20.
the plants grow from a seed; that is their ordinary way of generation: but the first plant could not be so generated, because all seed in the same course of nature is from the pre-existing plant. We see from spawn the fishes, and from eggs the fowls receive now the original of their being; but this could not at first be so, because both spawn and egg are as naturally from precedent fish and fowl. Indeed, because the seed is separable from the body of the plant, and in that separation may long contain within itself a power of germination; because the spawn and egg are sejungible from the fish and fowl, and yet still retain the prolific power of generation; therefore some might possibly conceive that these seminal bodies might be originally scattered on the earth, out of which the first of all these creatures should arise. But in viviparous animals, whose offspring is generated within themselves, whose seed by separation from them loseth all its seminal or prolific power, this is not only improbable, but inconceivable. And, therefore, being the philosophers themselves confess,\(^1\) that whereas now all animals are generated by the means of seed, and that the animals themselves must be at first before the seed proceeding from them; it followeth that there was some way of production antecedent to and differing from the common way of generation, and, consequently, what we see done in this generation can be no certain rule to understand the first production. Being then that universal maxim, that nothing can be made of nothing, is merely calculated for the meridian of natural causes, raised solely cut of observation of continuing creatures by successive generation, which could not have been so continued without a being antecedent to all such succession; it is most evident, it can have no place in the production of that antecedent or first being, which we call creation.

14.—Now, when we thus describe the nature of creation, and under the name of heaven and earth comprehend all things contained in

\(^1\) These words of Aristotle are very observable; In which he disputes against Speusippus and the Pythagoreans, who thought the rudiments of things first made, out of which they grew unto perfection: *"Οσοι δὲ υπολαμβάνουσιν, ὃσπερ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Σπευσίππος, τὸ δρατών καὶ κάλλιστον μὴ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἶναι, διὰ τὸ καὶ τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἑων ῥᾶς ἀρχὰς αὐτὰ μὲν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ καλὸν καὶ τὸ τέλειον ἐν τοῖς ἐκ τούτων, οὐχ ὄρθων οἰονταί· τὸ γὰρ σπέρμα ἐξ ἑτέρων ἐστὶ προτέρων τελείων καὶ τὸ πρῶτον οὐ σπέρμα στιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τέλειον. Οἶον πρῶτον ἀνθρώπου ἂν φαίη τις εἶναι τὸν σπέρματος, οὐ τὸν ἐκ τούτου γεννωμένον, ἀλλὰ ἑτέρων ἐξ οὗ τὸ σπέρμα.—Metaph. lib. xiv. cap. 7. By which words Aristotle hath sufficiently stroved his own argument, which we produced before out of the first of the Physics, and is excellently urged in that philosophical piece attributed unto Justin Martyr: *Εἴ πρῶτον ἐστὶ τὸ σπείρον σπέρμα, καὶ ὑπερον τὸ ἐκ σπέρματος γεγονόμενον, καὶ γεννητὰ ἀμφότερα, τῇ μὲν γενεσίᾳ τοῦ μεμεινούκ ἐκ σπέρματος γεγονόμενον ὑπόκειται τὸ σπέρμα τῇ δὲ γενεσίᾳ τοῦ σπερματος ὑποκέιται τὸ σπέρμα οὐ δυνατόν. Οὐχ ἀρα ἂν τὰ διὰ καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ἐκ σπέρματος γίνεται.—Aristot. Dein. Exer. Οὕτων οὖν εἰδείς λέγει τὸ σπερ- ματος εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπον, οὐδὲ τὸν ἱον εἶναι τὴν ἀλεκτορία. τῆς δὲ ἀλεκτροίδος τὸ ἓν εἶναι, καὶ τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λέγουσιν."—PHT. Symp. lib. ii. probl. 3.
them, we must distinguish between things created. For some were made immediately out of nothing, by a proper, some only mediately, as out of something formerly made out of nothing, by an improper kind of creation. By the first were made all immaterial substances, all the orders of angels, and the souls of men, the heavens and the simple or elemental bodies, as the earth, the water, and the air. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;\(^1\) so in the beginning, as without any pre-existing or antecedent matter: this earth, when so in the beginning made, was without form and void,\(^2\) covered with waters likewise made not out of it, but with it, the same which, when the waters were gathered together unto one place, appeared as dry land.\(^3\) By the second,\(^4\) all the hosts of the earth, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea. Let the earth, said God, bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind.\(^5\) Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth;\(^6\) and more expressly yet, Out of the ground God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air.\(^7\)

And well may we grant these plants and animals to have their origination from such principles, when we read, God formed man of the dust of the ground;\(^8\) and said unto him whom he created in his own image, Dust thou art.\(^9\)

15.—Having thus declared the notion of creation in respect of those things which were created, the next consideration is of that action in reference to the agent who created all things. Him therefore we may look upon first as moved; secondly, as free under that motion; thirdly, as determining under that freedom, and so performing of that action. In the first we may see his goodness, in the second his will, in the third his power.

16.—I do not here introduce any external impulsive cause, as moving God unto the creation of the world; for I have presupposed all those things distinct from him to have been produced out of nothing by him, and, consequently, to be posterior, not only to the motion, but the actuation of his will. Being, then, nothing can be antecedent to the creature beside God himself, neither can anything be a cause of any of his actions but what is in him; we must not look for anything extrinsical unto him, but wholly acquiesce in his infinite goodness, as the only moving and impelling cause, There is none good but one, that is God,\(^10\) saith our Saviour;\(^1\) none originally, essentially, infinitely, independently

\(^{1}\) Gen. I. 1.  
\(^{2}\) Verse 2.  
\(^{3}\) Verse 9.  
\(^{4}\) Verse 7.  
\(^{5}\) Gen iii. 19.  
\(^{6}\) Gen. i. 11.  
\(^{7}\) Verse 20.  
\(^{8}\) Gen. ii. 19.  
\(^{9}\) Matt. xix. 17.
good, but he. Whatever goodess is found in any creature is but by way of emanation from that fountain, whose very being is diffusive, whose nature consists in the communication of itself. In the end of the sixth day God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good: which shows the end of creating all things thus good was the communication of that by which the world was not made. And

1 Gen. i. 31. 2 As Plato: Αγάθων δε, δε ἦν αἰτίας γενεσιν καὶ τὸ πάν τόδε ὁ ἐκυστάς ἐκουσης τῆς ἀγάθων ἁγαθών δε, Αγαθών δε οὔδείς περὶ ὡδενος οὐδέποτε ἔγχευται δῆδονος τούτων ὧν ἐκτός ὑπο, πάντα ὥστε μᾶλλα γενεσαὶ εἰς τὸν πάντας ἐκεῖνος τὰ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἐν τοις ἀρχαῖοι κυριωσαν παρὰ ἄρθρων φορομείον, ὧδεποτε ἀποδεχότας ἀν.;—In Timæo, Aitía ἐγερε τῆς τὸν πῶς ἀνθρώπους οὐδεμιὰ ἄλλη πρόσεσιν εὐλογος, πλὴν τὴς κατ’ οὕσιαν ἐγερεττόρων.—Hieroc. In Aur. Cæs. Αἰ γὰρ παρ’ τὴν ἀγάθωτης λεγέμενα αἰτίας τῆς ἑκατομημερίας τούτης τοῦ πῶς, ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον περιηταις ἢ τὸ θεόν πρόσωπον. —Ibid. 3 Ἀνάγκη δὲ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθοτητας ὑποτος τοὺς κόσμου, αἰε τὸν τὸν Θεοῦ ἀγαθον εἶναι, καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὑπάρχειν ὠσπερ ἱλίῳ μέν καὶ πνει συνιδότατα δύος, σωματε δὲ σκια.—Salust. De Diis et Mundo, cap. 7. Εἰ γὰρ ἤμενοι μὴ ποιεῖν, πῶς εἰ τὸ ποιεῖν μεταβῆκε; εἰ δὲ τὸ ποιεῖν, τὴ μή μὲν ἀδιὸν ἔρρυσεν.—Hieroc. De Fato et Provid. Neither doth he mean any less when, in his sense, he thus describes the First Cause of all things: 'Εστ’ ἀν (so I read it, not εστ’, αν, as the printed copies, or ως αν, as Cursiterius) η τὸ πρῶτον αὐτῶν αἰτίας ἀμεταβλητον πάντα καὶ ἀπέρτον, καὶ τὴν οὕσια τῆς ἐγερασις τῆς αὐτὴς κεκτημένον, καὶ τὴν ἁγαθοτητας, οὐκ ἔπεσον ξύνω, ἀλλ’ οὐσιωμεννα καὶ αὐτὴν, καὶ δι’ αὐτὴν τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὸ εἶναι παράγων. (So I read it, not παλιόν πρὸς τὸ εύ εἶναι, as the printed).—Hieroc. In Aur. Cæs. Συγγράφησε άρα τὴ μὲν ἁγαθοτητας τοῦ παντοτος ἡ τῆς προνοιας εκτένειας ταύτη δὲ της τοῦ Διμουργου διανοικος ποίησις; ταύτη δὲ της τοῦ παντοτος κατά τὸν άπειρον αἰώνης; καὶ δ’ αὐτήν λόγουτα ταύτην το αναρέι, καὶ τὴν ἁγαθοτητας τοῦ πενευκίκτος.—Procclus In Timæum. Now, although this be the constant argumentation of the later Platonists, yet they found no such deduction or consequence in their master Plato; and I something incline to think, though it may seem very strange, that they received it from the Christians; I mean, out of the school of Ammonius at Alexandria; whom though Porphyrius would make an apostate, for the credit of his heathen gods, yet St. Jerome hath sufficiently assured us that he lived and died in the Christian faith. The reason of my conjecture is no more than this: Proclus acknowledges that Plutarch and others, though with Plato they maintained the goodness of God to be the cause of the world, yet withal denied the eternity of it: and when he quotes other expositors for his own opinion, he produceth none but Porphyrius and Iamblichus, the eldest of which was the scholar of Plotinus the disciple of Ammonius. And that he was of that opinion, I collect from him who was his scholar both in philosophy and divinity, that is, Origen, whose judgment, if it were not elsewhere apparent, is sufficiently known by the Fragment of Methodius, Περὶ γενετήτων, preserved in Photius. Οτι δ’ Ὠρεγενες, ου κανταροι καλει, ελεγε συναιδον ειναι το μονο σωφρ καὶ ἀπροσδει Θεον το παν. Being [seeing] then Porphyrius and Iamblichus, cited by Proclus, being [seeing] Hierocles, Proclus, and Salustius, were all either εκ της ἱερη γενειας, as they called it, that is, descended successively from the school of Ammonius, (the great conciliator of Plato and Aristotle, and reformer of the ancient philosophy,) or at least contemporary to them that were so; it is most probable that they might receive it from his mouth, especially considering that even Origen, a Christian confirmed the same.
thus they thought the goodness of the Creator must stand or fall with the eternity of the creature.

For the clearing of which ancient mistake, we must observe, that as God is essentially and infinitely good without any mixture of deficiency, so is he in respect of all external actions or emanations absolutely free without the least necessity. Those bodies which do act without understanding or preconception of what they do, as the sun and fire give light and heat, work always to the utmost of their power, nor are they able at any time to suspend their action. To conceive any such necessity in the divine operations, were to deny all knowledge in God, to reduce him into a condition inferior to some of the works of his own hands, and to fall under the censure contained in the Psalmist’s question, _He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall he not know?_ Those creatures which are endued with understanding, and, consequently, with a will, may not only be necessitated in their actions by a greater power, but also as necessarily be determined by the proposal of an infinite good: whereas neither of these necessities can be acknowledged in God’s actions, without supposing a power beside and above omnipotency, or a real happiness beside and above all-sufficiency. Indeed, if God were a necessary agent in the works of creation, the creatures would be of as necessary being as he is; whereas the necessity of being is the undoubted prerogative of the first cause. _He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,_ saith the apostle: and wheresoever counsel is, there is election, or else it is vain; where a will, there must be freedom, or else it is weak. We cannot imagine that the all-wise God should act or produce anything but what he determineth to produce; and all his determinations must flow from the immediate principle of his will. If, then, his determinations be free, as they must be coming from that principle, then must the actions which follow them be also free. Being then the goodness of God is absolutely perfect of itself, being he is in himself infinitely and eternally happy, and this happiness as little capable of augmentation as of diminution; he cannot be thought to look upon anything without himself as determining his will to the desire, and necessitating to the production of it. If, then, we consider God’s goodness, he was moved; if his all-sufficiency, he was not necessitated; if we look upon his will, he freely determined; if on his power, by that determination he created the world.
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Wherefore that ancient conceit of a necessary emanation of God’s goodness in the eternal creation of the world will now easily be refuted, if we make a distinction in the equivocal notion of goodness. For if we take it as it signifieth a rectitude and excellency of all virtue and holiness, with a negation of all things morally evil, vicious, or unholy; so God is absolutely and necessarily good; but if we take it in another sense, as indeed they did which made this argument, that is, rather for beneficence, or communicativeness of some good to others; then God is not necessarily, but freely good, that is to say, profitable and beneficial. For he had not been in the least degree evil or unjust, if he had never made the world or any part thereof, if he had never communicated any of his perfections by framing anything beside himself. Every proprietary therefore being accounted master of his own, and thought freely to bestow whatever he gives; much more must that one eternal and independent Being be wholly free in the communicating his own perfections without any necessity or obligation. We must then look no farther than the determination of God’s will in the creation of the world.

17.—For this is the admirable power of God, that with him to will is to effect, to determine is to perform. So the elders speak before him that sitteth upon the throne; Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure (that is, by thy will) they are and were created. Where there is no resistance in the object, where no need of preparation, application, or instrumental advantage in the agent, there the actual determination of the will is a sufficient production. Thus God did make the heavens and the earth by willing them to be. This was his first command unto the creatures, and their existence was their first obedience. Let there be light, this is the injunction; and there was light, that is the creation. Which two are so intimately and immediately the same, that though in our and other translations those words, let there be, which express the command of God, differ from the other, there was, which denote the present existence of the creature; yet in the original there is no difference at all, neither in point nor letter. And yet even in the diversity of the translation the phrase seems so

1 Rev. iv. 11.
2 So Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of God: Υελο το βουλευθαι δημιουργει, και το μονον έθελω ουτων επεται το γεγενηθαι.—Proph. 5.
3 Γενηθησον φως, και το προσταγμα εργον ἰν.—S. Basil. Οταν δε φως Θεου και φως και προσταγμα λεγωμεν, την εν το βεληματι ροπην φωναεθα εν ειδε προσταγματος σχηματιζεθαι.—Idem in Exeget. Τινος υπουργιας δειοντο α το βεληματι μονω Δη-

Greek: ἡ ἀληθινή ἀληθινος ἀλήθεια ἀλήθεια. The Hebrew text is a most expressive and significant tautology:
expressive of God's infinite power, and immediate efficacy of His will, that it hath raised some admiration of Moses in the enemies of the religion both of the Jews and Christians.\(^1\) God is in the heavens, he hath done whatsoever he pleased,\(^2\) saith David;\(^3\) yea, in the making of the heavens, he therefore created them, because he pleased; nay, more, thereby he created them, even by willing their creation.

18.—Now, although some may conceive the creature might have been produced from all eternity by the free determination of God's will, and it is so far certainly true, that there is no instant assignable before which God could not have made the world; yet as this is an article of our faith, we are bound to believe the heavens and earth are not eternal. Through faith we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God.\(^4\) And by that faith we are assured, that whatsoever possibility of an eternal existence of the creature may be imagined, actually it had a temporal beginning; and therefore all the arguments for this world's eternity are nothing but so many erroneous misconceptions. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old, saith Wisdom. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.\(^5\) And the same Wisdom of God being made man reflecteth upon the same priority, saying, Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.\(^6\) Yea in the same Christ are we blessed with all spiritual blessings, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world.\(^7\) The impossibility of the origination of a circular motion, which we are sure is either in the heaven or earth, and the impravity of the beginning of time, are so poor exceptions, that they deserve not the least labour of refutation. The actual eternity of this world is so far from being necessary, that it is of itself most improbable; and without the infallible certainty of faith, there is no single person carries more evidences of his youth, than the world of its novelty.\(^8\)

19.—It is true, indeed, some ancient accounts there are which would persuade us to imagine a strange antiquity of the world, far beyond the annals of Moses, and account of the same Spirit

---

\(^1\) As Dionysius Longinus, Peri Ὡψου, sect. 9: Ταύτη καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων δεισιδεότης, οὐκ ὁ τυχών αὐτή, ἐπειδή τῆν τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐγνώμορα μεθέδωκεν, εὑρός ἐν τῇ εἰσαβολῇ γράφως τῶν νόμων, Ἐπει' ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερ' τῇ Γενέσεως φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο. Γενέσεως γὰρ, καὶ ἐγένετο. Where observe, Longinus made use of the translation of Aquila.

\(^2\) Πάντα δεκα ἄνθρωπος ἐποίησεν εἰς τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ εἰς τῇ γῇ: ὁ συνε τὸν τῆς ζημιωργίαν τῶν εἰς τῇ γῇ μοίνῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὴν κτίσιν τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων ἥρκεσεν ἡ ἡλικίας αὐτῶν μοῖχη; S. Chrysost. Peri τοῦ ἀκαταλήπτου, ii. 3 Psalm cxv. 3.

\(^3\) Heb. xli. 3. 5 Prov. viii. 22, 23. 7 John xvii. 5. 1 Eph. i. 3.

\(^4\) As even Lucretius confesseth, and that out of the principles of Epicurus:

\(^5\) Verum, ut opinor, habet nativitatem summa, recensque Natura est mundi, neque pridem exordia cepit.—De Rer. Nat. lib. v. 333.
which made it. The Egyptian priests pretended an exact chronology for some myriads of years,¹ and the Chaldeans or Assyrians far out-reckon them,² in which they delivered not only a catalogue of their kings, but also a table of the eclipses of the sun and moon.³

But for their number of years nothing is more certain than their forgery; for the Egyptians did preserve the antiquities of other nations as well as their own, and by the evident fallacy in others have betrayed their own vanity. When Alexander entered Egypt with his victorious army, the priests could show him out of their sacred histories an account of the Persian empire, which he gained by conquest, and the Macedonian, which he received by birth, of each for 8000 years:⁴ whereas nothing can be more certain out of the best historical account, than that the Persian empire, whether begun in Cyrus or in Medus, was not then 300 years old, and the Macedonian, begun in Coranus, not 500. They then made so large additions to advance the antiquity of other nations, and were so bold as to present them to those which so easily might refute them (had they not delighted to be deceived to their own advantage, and took much pleasure in an honourable cheat), may, without any breach of charity, be suspected to have extended the account much higher for the honour of their own country. Beside, their catalogues must needs be ridiculously incredible, when the Egyptians make their first kings’ reigns above 1200 years apiece,⁵ and the Assyrians theirs above 40,000: except

¹ Plato tells us of an account which an Egyptian priest gave to Solon, in which the Athenians were nine thousand years old, and those of Saïs eight thousand. Προτέραν μὲν τὴν παρ’ ὑμῖν ἔστει χιλιῶν ἐκ Γῆς τε καὶ Πραίστου τὸ σπήρα παραλαβόντας ὑμῖν, τῆς δὲ ὑστέραν τῆς δὲ ἐνθάδε διακοσμήσεως παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν ὀκτακοῦλιον ἠτὶ ἀριθμὸς γεγραπται.—In Timæo. Pomponius Mela makes a larger account out of Herodotus: “Ipsi vetustissimi (ut prædicant) hominum trecentos et triginta reges ante Amasim, et supra tredecim millium annorum aestates certis annalibus;” where, as the Egyptians much stretch the truth, so doth Mela stretch the relation of Herodotus, which makes it not thirteen thousand, but eleven thousand three hundred and forty, years. Diodorus Siculus tells us of twenty-three thousand years from the reign of the first king of Egypt, to the expedition of Alexander; and Diogenes Laërtius, out of other authors, more than doubles that account: Αὐγούστοι μὲν γὰρ Νεῖλον γενέσθαι παλαί Πραίστου, ὥν ἄρχει φιλοσοφίας, ὡς τοῖς προεστώσις ἱερας ἐναι καὶ προφητες ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦτον εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Μακεδόνα ἦτων εἰναι μιράδας τέσσαρας, καὶ ὀκτακοῦλιον ἡ ὡκτακοῦντα τρία. 48663.

² Ἀσσυρίων δὲ, ἥσουν Ἰάμβλιχος, οἷς ἐπτὰ καὶ εἰκοσὶ μυριάδας ἦτων μὰν ἐτήρησαν, ὡς ἥσουν Ἰππάρχος: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅπερ ἀποκαταστάσεις καὶ περίοδοι τῶν ἔτη κοσμοκρατήρων μνήμη παρέδοσαν.—PROCLUS In Timæum.

³ Εν οἷς ἥλιον μὲν ἐκλέψεις γενέσθαι τρικόσια ἐβεβομήκατο τρεῖς, σελήνης δὲ ὀκτακοῦσις τριακόντα δύο.—DIOR. LAERT.

⁴ This fallacy appeared by an epistle which Alexander wrote to his mother Olympias, mentioned by Athenagoras, Minutius Felix, St. Cyprian, and St. Augustin. “Per- sarum autem et Macedonum imperium usque ad ipsum Alexandrum, cui locutus, plus quam octo millium annorum ille constituit; cum apud Graecos Macedonum usque ad mortem Alexandri quadringsenti octoginta quinque reperientur anni; Persarum vero, donec ipsius Alexandri victoria finiretur, ducenti et triginta tres computentur.”—S. AUGUST. De Civit. Del. lib. xii. cap. 10.

⁵ As Diodorus Siculus takes notice of the Egyptians, and Abdyenus of the Chaldeans, whose ten first kings reigned one hundred and twenty years! With their pænas being Basileis deka: ὥς ἡ χρόνος τῆς βασιλείας συνεχεῖ σάρος ἐκατον ἐκισος. Now this word σάρος was proper to the Babylonian or
ye take the Egyptian years for months, the Assyrians' for days; and then the account will not seem so formidable.

Again, for the calculation of eclipses, as it may be made for many thousand years to come, and be exactly true, and yet the world may end to-morrow; because the calculation must be made with this tacit condition: if the bodies of the earth and sun and moon do continue in their substance and constant motion so long: so may it also be made for many millions of years past, and all be true, if the world have been so old; which the calculating doth not prove, but suppose. He then which should in the Egyptian temples see the description of so many eclipses of the sun and moon, could not be assured that they were all taken from real observation, when they might be as well described out of pro-leptical supposition.

Beside, the motions of the sun, which they mention together and with authority equal to that of their other observations, are so incredible and palpably fabulous, that they take off all credit and esteem from the rest of their narrations. For with this wild account of years, and seemingly accurate observations of the heavens, they left it written to posterity, that the whole course of the celestial motions were four times changed: so that the sun hath twice risen in the east and set in the west, as now it does: and, on the contrary, twice risen in the west and set

Chaldean account. Hesychius: Σάρος, ἀριθμός τις παρὰ Βαβυλωνίοις: but what this number was, he tells us not. In the fragment of Abydenus, preserved by Eusebius, λόγος δὲ ἐστιν ἐξακόσια καὶ τριακόσια ἐτῶν. "Every σάρος is three thousand six hundred years;" and consequently the one hundred and twenty σάροι belonging to the reign of the ten kings, four hundred and thirty-two thousand years. Neither was this the account only of Abydenus, but also of Berosus: neither was the interpretation only of Eusebius, but also of Alexander Polyhistor, who likewise expresseth τῶν χρόνων τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν σάρων ἕκατον εἰκοσι, ἤτοι ἐτῶν μυριάδοις τεσσαράκοντα τρεῖς καὶ δύο χιλιάδας. This seemed so highly incredible, that two ancient monks, Anianus and Panodorus, interpreted those Chaldean years to be but days, so that every σάρος should consist of three thousand six hundred days, that is, nine years, ten months and a half; and the whole hundred and twenty σάροι for the ten kings, one thousand one hundred and eighty-three years, six months, and odd days. This is all which Jos. Scaliger or Jacobus Goea of late could find concerning this Chaldean computation; and the first of these complains that none but Hesychus makes mention of this account. I shall therefore supply them not only with another author, but also with a diverse and distinct interpretation. Σάρος μέτρου καὶ ἀριθμός παρὰ Χαλδαίοις: οἱ γὰρ ΡΚ σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐναπολον μικρὰς, οἱ γίνονται η ἐναπολον καὶ μήνες ἔνας. That is, according to the translation of Portus, "Sari apud Chaldeos est mensura et numerus: nam 120 sari faciant annos 2222, qui sunt anni 18 et sex menses." Well might he fix his N. Ia., or Non Licet, to these words; for as they are in the printed books, there is no sense to be made of them; but by the help of the ms. in the Vatican Library, we shall both supply the defect in Suidas, and find a third valuation of the σάροι. Thus, then, that ms. represents the words: Οἱ γὰρ ΡΚ σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐναπολον μικρὰς κατὰ τὴν Χαλδαίων ζήρον, εἰπέρ ὁ σάρος ποτε μήνας σεληνιακῶν σχῆ, διὸ γίνοται η ἐναπολον καὶ μήνες ἔνας. And so the sense is clear. Σάρος, according to the Chaldean account, comprehends two hundred and twenty-two months, which come to eighteen years and six months; therefore one hundred and twenty σάροι make two thousand two hundred and twenty years; and therefore for μικρὰς, I read, leaving out the last β, βαβ', that is, two thousand two hundred and twenty.

1 Ei de καὶ τοὺς χρόνους ἐν διήμεροι ἄλλης, ὥστε Αλεξάντιον τῶν μηνῶν ἐναπολον ἱκάλουν, οἷον ἡ τῶν πολλῶν τούτων ἐναπολον ἀπαραθημενων ἔχου τι θαυμαστών.—Proclos In Timaeum, xxl. 50.
in the east, and thus these prodigious antiquaries confute themselves.  

What then are these feigned observations and fabulous descriptions for the world's antiquity, in respect not only of the infallible annals of the Spirit of God, but even of the constant testimonies of more sober men, and the real appearances and face of things, which speak them of a far shorter date?  

If we look into the historians which give account of ancient times, nay, if we peruse the fictions of the poets, we shall find the first to have no footsteps, the last to feign no actions, of so great antiquity. If the race of men had been eternal, or as old as the Egyptians and the Chaldees fancy it; how should it come to pass that the poetical inventions should find no actions worthy their heroic verse before the Trojan or the Theban war, or that great adventure of the Argonauts? For whatsoever all the muses, the daughters of memory, could rehearse before those times, is nothing but the creation of the world, and the nativity of their gods.

If we consider the necessaries of life, the ways of freedom and commerce amongst men, and the inventions of all arts and sciences, the letters which we use, and languages which we speak; they have all known originals, and may be traced to their first authors. The first beginnings were then so known and acknow-

---

1 'Εν τούτων τούτω τοῦ χρόνου τετράκες ἑλέγον ἐξ ἑδέων τῶν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλας; ἑνά δὲ τῶν καταδύεται, ἑνέδευθε δέ ἐπανεῖλες και ἑνέδευν νῦν ἀνατέλλει, ἑνάθα δέ καταδύων.

—HEROD. Euterp. " Mandatunquæ litteris servant, dum Αἰγυπτίων sunt, quater cursus suas vertisse sidera, ac solem bis jam occidisse ubi nunc oritur."—MELA, lib. i. cap. 10. Whereas Aristotle more soberly: 'Εν ἀπαντ' γαρ τῷ παρεκληθών χρόνῳ κατά τὴν παρα
dekoméniν άλλήλων μνήμην ούδεν φαίνεται μεταβεβληκός, οὔτε καθ' ὄλον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν οὐρανῶν, οὔτε κατὰ μόριον αὐτῶν τῶν οἰκείων οὐδέν.

—De Cato, lib. i. cap. 3. Vide Simplicium.

2 As the Chaldees did affirm that they had taken observations of the celestial motions for four hundred and seventy seven years; and withal they also affirmed, that for the same space of time they had calculated the nativity of all the children which were born. Which last is certainly false. "Nam quod alius quadrimgenta et septuaginta milia annorum in periclitandis experimundisque pueris quicumque nati essent Babylonios posuisse, fallunt: si enim esset factum, non esset desitum. Neminem habebamus auctorem qui aut fieri dicit, aut factum sciat."—CICERO, lib. ii. De Divinat. And if the last be false, we have no reason to believe the first is true; but rather to deny their astronomical observations by their vain am-

3 This argument is therefore to me the stronger, because made by him who cannot be thought a favourer of our religion, because he was a countenancer of none.—Epicurus, whose mind is thus delivered by Lucrétius:—

"Præterea, si nulla fuit genitalis origo Terrarum et coelorum, semperque utraque suæ, Cur sapes bellaum Thebanum et funera Trojas, Non alia aliique res cecineris poetae? Quo tot facta virum totes cecideris? neque usquam" Eternus famae monumentalis insita florent."

—De Rer. Nat. lib. v. 325.

4 Pliny gives a large account of these, lib
ledged by all, that the inventors and authors of them were reckoned amongst their gods, and worshipped by those to whom they had been so highly beneficial: which honour and adoration they could not have obtained, but from such as were really sensible of their former want, and had experience of a present advantage by their means.

If we search into the nations themselves, we shall see none without some original: and were those authors extend which have written of the first plantations and migrations of people, the foundations and inhabiting of cities and countries, their first rudiments would appear as evident as their later growth and present condition. We know what ways within 2000 years people have made through vast and thick woods for their habitations, now as fertile, as populous as any. The Hercynian trees, in the time of the Cæsars, occupying so great a space as to take up a journey of sixty days, were thought even then coeval with the world. We read, without any show of contradiction, how this western part of the world hath been peopled from the east; and all the pretence of the Babylonian antiquity is nothing else, but that we all came from thence. Those eight persons saved in the ark, descending from the Gordiean mountains, and multiplying to a large collection in the plain of Sinaar, made their first division at that place: and that dispersion, or rather dissemination, hath peopled all other parts of the world, either never before inhabited, or dispeopled by the flood.

These arguments have always seemed so clear and undeniable, that they have put not only those who make the world eternal, but them also who confess it made (but far more ancient than we believe it), to a strange answer, to themselves uncertain, to us irrational.

For to this they replied, that this world hath suffered many alterations, by the utter destructions of nations and depopula-

vii. cap. 56, and Lucretius makes use of this argument:—

"Quare etiam quaedam nunc artes expolluntur, Nunc etiam angescunt, nunc addita naviglis sunt, Multa; modo organici melicos peperere sonores: Denique natura hae rerum ratione reperta est Nuper, et hanc primus cum primis ipse repertus Nunc ego sum in patrias qui possim vertere voces."—De Rer. Nat. lib. v. 333.

1 I mean, not only such as wrote the building of particular cities, as Apollonius Rhodius Kaunov kτίσιν, Xenophanes Kolophon kτίσιν, Crito Σφρακοισιν κτίσιν, and Philochorus Σαλαμίνος κτίσιν: but these more general, as Aristotle Κτίσεις και πολιτείας, Polemo Κτίσεις πόλεων ἐν Φοικίδι, Charon Πόλεως κτίσεις, Callimachus Κτίσεις νησίων καὶ πόλεων, Hellenicus Κτίσεις ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων, and the indefinite Κτίσεις written by Dercyllus, Dionysius, Hippys, Cistophor, Trismachus, and others.

2 "Sylvarum, Hercynia—dierum sexagrama iter occupans, ut major allis, ita et notor."—MELA, lib. iii. cap. 3, § 3.

3 "Hercynia sylve roborum vastitas, intacta avis et congenita mundo, prope immor tali sorte miracula excedit."—PLIN. lib. xvi cap. 2.
tions of countries, by which all monuments of antiquity were defaced, all arts and sciences utterly lost, all fair and stately fabrics ruined, and so mankind reduced to paucity, and the world often again returned into its infancy. This they conceived to have been done oftentimes in several ages, sometimes by a deluge of water, sometimes by a torrent of fire; and lest any of the elements might be thought not to conspire to the destruction of mankind, the air must sweep away whole empires at once with infectious plagues, and earthquakes swallow up all ancient cities, and bury even the very ruins of them. By which answer of theirs they plainly afford two great advantages to the Christian faith. First, because they manifestly show that they had an universal tradition of Noah’s flood, and the overthrow of the old world: Secondly, because it was evident to them that there was no way to save the eternity or antiquity of the world, or to answer this argument drawn from history and the appearances of things themselves, but by supposing innumerable deluges and deflagrations. Which being merely feigned in themselves, not proved (and that first by them which, say they, are not subject themselves unto them, as the Egyptians did, who by the advantage of their peculiar situation feared neither perishing by fire nor water).

1 Thus Ocellus, who maintained the world was never made, answers the argument brought from the Greek histories which began with Inachus, as the first subject, not author, of history: (as Nogarola in his Annotations mistakes Ocellus:) Δόκει τοις λέγοντι την τῆς Ἑλληνικής ἱστορίας ἀρχήν ἀπὸ Ἰνάχου εἶναι τοῦ Ἀργείου, προσεκέπτον ὤτος, οὐχ ὡς ἀπὸ τινος ἀρχῆς πρωτῆς, ἀλλὰ τῆς γενειονής μεταβολῆς κατὰ αὐτὴν. So that he will have Inachus to be the first, not absolutely, but since the last great alteration made in Greece; and then he concludes that Greece hath often been, and will often be, barbarous, and lose the memory of all their actions: Πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἑσταὶ βαρβαρος ἡ Ἑλλάς, οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπων μόνον γνωμένη μεταστάτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς αὐτῆς τῆς φύσεως οὐ νεῖζον σοι δέ μειον αὐτῆς γνωμένης, ἀλλὰ γὰρ νεωτέρας ἀιδή καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀρχήν λαμ-βανούσης. —OCELLUS De Universo, cap. 3.

2 Thus Plato, who asserted the creation of the world, but either from eternity, or such antiquity as does not much differ from it, brings in Solon, inquiring the age of the Greek histories, as of Phoroneus and Niobe, Deucalion and Pyrrha; and an Egyptian priest answering, that all the Greeks were boys, and not an old man amongst them; that is, they had no ancient monuments, or history of any antiquity, but rested contented with the knowledge of the time since the last great mutation of their own country. Πολλαι γὰρ κατὰ πολλὰ φθορὰ γεγόνας ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἔστησαν, ποτὲ μὲν καὶ ἕσται μέγιστα, μυρίων δὲ άλλως ἔτεραι βραχύτεραι. —In Timaeo. Origen of Celsus: Τὸ πολλάς ἐκ παντὸς αἰῶνὸς πυρασεῖς γεγονέναι, πολλὰς δ’ ἐπί-κλυσείς, καὶ νεώτερον εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ Δευκάλιω-νος κατακλυσμὸν ἐναχγος γεγενεμένος σαφῶς τοϊς ἀκούτοις αὐτῶν δυναμένους παρίστησι το κατ’ αὐτὸν τὸν κόσμον ἀγένετο.—Lib. I. And Lucrétius the Epicurean, who thought the world but few thousand years old, as we believe, and that it should at last be consumed, as we also are persuaded, thinks this answer of theirs so far from being a refutation of the former, that he admits it as a confirmation of the latter, part of his opinion: —

"Quod si forte fuisse antehac cadem omnium credis,
Sed perisse hominum torrenti secla vapore,
Ant eccidisse urbeis magno vexamine mundi,
Aut eximbris assiduis exsive rapaces
Per terras amnes, atque oppida cooperuisse;
Tanto quippe magis victus fateare necesse est,
Exitium quoque terrat colique futurum."


3 So that Egyptian priest in Plato’s Timæus tells Solon, that the fable of Phæthon did signify a real conflagration of the world; but
serve only for a confirmation of Noah's Flood so many ages past, and the surer expectation of St. Peter's fire, we know not how soon to come.

20.—It remaineth, then, that we stedfastly believe, not only that the heavens and earth and all the host of them were made, and so acknowledge a creation, or an actual and immediate dependence of all things on God; but also that all things were created by the hand of God, in the same manner, and at the same time, which are delivered unto us in the books of Moses by the Spirit of God, and so acknowledge a novelty, or no long existence of the creature.

Neither will the novelty of the world appear more plainly unto our conceptions than if we look upon our own successions. The vulgar accounts, which exhibit about 5600 years, though sufficiently refuting an eternity, and allaying all conceits of any great antiquity, are not yet so properly and nearly operative on the thoughts of men, as a reflection upon our own generations. The first of men was but six days younger than the being, not so many than the appearance, of the earth: and if any particular person would consider how many degrees in a direct line he probably is removed from that single person Adam, who bare together the name of man and of the earth from whence he came, he could not choose but think himself so near the original fountain of mankind, as not to conceive any great antiquity of the world. For though the ancient heathens did imagine innumerable ages and generations of men past,1 though Origen2 did fondly

so as all they which lived in mountains or dry parts of the earth were scorched and consumed, but of those who lived near the seas or rivers, in the valleys, some were preserved. 'Hīmēn òē, saith he, ὁ Νεῖλος εἰς τὰ τάλλα σωτηρίον, καὶ τότε ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἀπορίας σώζει λυόμενος. Thus the Egyptians pretend Nilen saved them from the flames of Phaethon. Nor were they only safe from conflagrations, but from inundations also. For when in Greece or other parts a deluge happened, then all their cities were swept away into the sea: Κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν χώρων, says the priest, οὔτε τότε, οὔτε ἄλλοτε, ἀπέθανεν εἰς τὰς ἀπορίας ὑπὸ ἐπιτρέπει τὸν ἐναντίον κάτωθεν ἐπανεἰσεν πέρυκον ὅθεν καὶ δι᾽ ἀεί αἰώνια τάνναθε σωζόμενα λεγέται παλαιότατα. So Egypt, receiving not their waters from above by clouds, but from below by springs filling the river Nile, was out of danger in a deluge, and thereby preserved the most ancient monuments and records." But, alas! this is a poor shift to them which believe that in the great and universal flood, "all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened." (Gen. vii. 11.)

1 So Cicero indeed speaks, innumerabilis scultra, in his book of Divination; and Socrates in Plato's Theetetus brings this argument against the pride of great and noble families, that they which mention a succession of their ancestors which have been rich and powerful, do it merely by' ἀπαθεωσίας, οὐ δυναμένων εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἀπ᾽ ἑλέσιν, σοφοὶ λογίζεσθαι, ὅτι πάντων καὶ προγόνων μνημεῖοι ἐκάστῳ γεγονότος ἀπαθεωσίας, ἐν αῖσί πλοῦσι καὶ πλούσιν, καὶ βασιλέως καὶ δοῦλου, βαρβαροῦ τέ καὶ Ἐλλήνων πολλάκις μνημεῖοι γεγονόσαρν ὑμῖνοι, as if every person were equally honourable, "having innumerable ancestors, rich and poor, servants and kings, learned and barbarous."

2 Origen did not only collect the eternity of the world from the co-existence of all God's attributes,—as, because he is Παντοκράτωρ and Δημοιουργὸς, therefore he was always so, (for how could he be Δημοιουργὸς ἄνευ δημοιουργικῆς, or Παντοκράτωρ ἄνευ τῶν κρατιουσίων;)—but also from the 90th Psalm: "From everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday:" and that at the beginning of Ecclesiastus: "Who can
seem to collect so much by some misinterpretations of the scriptures; yet if we take a sober view, and make but rational collections from the chronology of the sacred writ, we shall find no man's pedigree very exorbitant, or in his line of generation descent of many score.

When the age of man was long, in the infancy of the world, we find ten generations extend to 1656 years, according to the shortest, which is thought, because the Hebrew, therefore the best account; according to the longest, which, because the Septuagint's, is not to be contemned, 2262, or rather 2256. From the flood, brought at that time upon the earth for the sins of men which polluted it, unto the birth of Abraham, the father of the faithful, not above ten generations, if so many, took up 292 years, according to the least; 1132, according to the largest account. Since which time the ages of men have been very much alike proportionably long; and it is agreed by all that there have not passed since the birth of Abraham 3700 years. Now by the experience of our families, which for their honour and greatness have been preserved, by the genealogies delivered in the sacred scriptures, and thought necessary to be presented to us by the blessed evangelists, by the observation and concurrent judgment of former ages, three generations1 usually take up a hundred years. If then it be not yet 3700 years since the birth of Abraham, as certainly it is not; if all men which are or have been since have descended from Noah, as undoubtedly they have; if Abraham were but the tenth from Noah, as Noah from Adam, which Moses hath assured us: then is it not probable that any person now alive is above 13 centuries removed from Adam. And indeed thus admitting but the Greek account of less than 5000 years since the flood, we may easily bring all sober or probable accounts of the Egyptians,

number the sand of the sea, and the drops of the rain, and the days of eternity?" But Methodius, bishop and martyr, hath well concluded that disputation: Ταῦτα ἄρας ἐν Ὀρεινής σπουδάζων, καὶ ὡς οί παλαια. 

1 By the Greeks called γενεά, which are successions of generations from father to son; as in St. Matthew, 1. 17. Indeed sometimes they take it for other spaces of time; as Artemidorus observes, for seven years: Καὶ ἑνίους μὲν ἐπὶ ζ. Ὑδεν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ Ιατροὶ, τῶν δύο γενεών (not πρὸ τῶν, as Wallis and Portus would correct) μηδένα (not μή δεών, as Suidas) ἑλέβοτομαι τῶν τεσσαρακοσίων (not τεσσαρακοσίων as Suidas transcribing him negligently) λέγοντες. Sometimes they interpret it twenty, twenty-five, or thirty years, as appears by Hesychius: and by that last account they reckoned the years of Nestor: Καὶ ἑνίους δὲ λ. Ὑδεν καὶ τὸν Νέστορο βουλῶν ἐστι εἰς ἐνενήκοντα ἔτη ψευδώναι. so Artemidorus and the grammarians. Although I cannot imagine that to be the sense of Homer: 

Τοῦτο ἄρα δύο μὲν γενεάς μεροσπον ἀνδρῶν ἑφοίδον, οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἄμα τραφῆν ἢ ἐγένοντο.—Ili. A. 250. 

And I conceive that gloss in Hesychius, Ἐνδιαστήματος χρόνον τῶν μη κατ' αὐτό βεβηλωκότων, to be far more properly applicable to that place. But, in the sense of which now we speak, it is taken for the third part ordinarly of an hundred years; as Herodotus, mentioning the Egyptians' feigned genealogies: Καὶ τοις τριμησίοις μὲν ἀνδρῶν γενεάς διέκνασεν μήποτε ἔτεος. "Three hundred generations equalize ten thousand years." γενεὰ: γὰρ τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκάτων ἐτεῖ τρεῖς.—Eudem. 

And after him St. Clemens Alexandrinus Eįς τὰ ἑκάτων ἐτεῖ τρεῖς ἑγκαταλέγοντας γενεά.—Strum. lit. 1.
Babylonians, and Chinese, to begin since the dispersion at Babel. Thus having expressed at last the time, so far as is necessary to be known, I shall conclude this second consideration of the nature and notion of creation.

21.—Now being under the terms of heaven and earth we have proved all things beside God to be contained, and that the making of all these things was a clear production of them out of nothing; the third part of the explication must of necessity follow, that he which made all things is God. This truth is so evident in itself, and so confessed by all men, that none did ever assert the world was made, but withal affirmed that it was God who made it. There remaineth therefore nothing more in this particular, than to assert God so the creator of the world as he is described in this article.

Being then we believe in God the Father maker of heaven and earth, and by that God we expressed already a singularity of the deity; our first assertion which we must make good is, that the one God did create the world. Again, being whosoever is that God cannot be excluded from this act of creation, as being an emanation of the divinity, and we seem by these words to appropriate it to the Father, beside whom we shall hereafter show that we believe some other persons to be the same God; it will be likewise necessary to declare the reason why the creation of the world is thus signally attributed to God the Father.

The first of these deserves no explication of itself, it is so obvious to all which have any true conception of God. But because it hath been formerly denied (as there is nothing so senseless, but some kind of heretics have embraced, and may be yet taken up in times of which we have no reason to presume better than of the former), I shall briefly declare the creation of the world to have been performed by that one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

As for the first, there is no such difference between things of the world, as to infer a diversity of makers of them, nor is the least or worst of creatures in their original any way derogatory to the creator. God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good,¹ and consequently like to come from the fountain of all goodness, and fit always to be ascribed to the same. Whate’erover is evil, is not so by the creator’s action, but by the creature’s defection.

22.—In vain, then, did the heretics of old, to remove a seeming inconvenience, renounce a certain truth; and whilst they feared to make their own god evil, they made him partial, or but half the

¹ Gen. i. 31.
deity, and so a companion at least with an evil god. For dividing all things of this world into natures substantially evil, and substantially good, and apprehending a necessity of an origination conformable to so different a condition, they imagined one god essentially good, as the first principle of the one, another god essentially evil, as the original of the other. And this strange heresy began upon the first spreading of the Gospel; as if the greatest light could not appear without a shadow.

1 "Inde Manicheus, ut Deum a conditione malorum liberet, alterum malum inducit autorem."—S. Hier. In Nalum, cap. 3.

2 For we must not look upon Manes as the first author of the heresy, though they which followed him were called from him Manicheans. Nor must we be satisfied with the relation of Socrates, who allots the beginning of that heresy μετὰ τῶν Κωνσταντίνων χρόνων, "a little before Constantine," being [seeing] Epiphanius asserts the first author of it, οὓς τὰς πορείας αὐτοῦ ἔκτημνε Ἰερουσαλήμ πρὸ τοῦ χρόνου τῶν αποστόλων, "to have gone to Jerusalem even about the apostles' times." Manes then, formerly called Cubricus, (not Uribicus, as St. Augustin,) who disseminated this heresy in the days of Aurelianus or Probus the emperor, about the year 277, had a predecessor, though not a master, called first Terebinthus, after Buddas. For this Buddas left his books and estate to a widow, who, saith Epiphanius, ἕμεινε πολλά τῷ χρόνῳ αὐτοῦ, "continued with his estate and books a long time," and at last bought Cubricus for her servant. This Buddas had a former master called Scythianus, the first author of this heresy. Beside these, between Scythianus and Cubricus there was yet another teacher of the doctrine, called Zaranes. Ην δὲ πρὸ τοῦτο (Μάνιος) καὶ ἑτέρους τῆς κακίας διάδοχος τοῦτος, Ζαράνης οὖν οὗτος, ὥμοιον αὐτοῦ ἡμῶν. If then we insert this Zaranes into the Manichean pedigree, and consider the time of the widow between Buddas and Cubricus, and the age of Cubricus, who was then but seven years old, as Socrates testifies, when she resolved to buy him, and discover the heresy to him; there will be no reason to doubt of the relation of Epiphanius, that Scythianus began about the apostolic times. Nor need we any of the abatements in the animadversions of Petautis, much less that redargution of Epiphanius, who cites Origen as an assessor of the Christian faith against this heresy; for though he certainly died before Manes spread his doctrine, yet it was written in several books before him, not only in the time of Buddas, to whom Socrates and Suidas attribute them, but of Scythianus, whom St. Cyril and Epiphanius make the author of them. Neither can it be objected that they were not Manicheans before the appearance of Manes; for I conceive the name of Manes (thought by the Greeks to be a name taken up by Cubricus, and proper to him) not to be any proper or peculiar name at all, but the general title of a heretic in the Syriac tongue. For I am loath to think that Theodoret or the author in Suidas were so far mistaken, when they call Scythianus "Manes," as to conceive Cubricus and he were the same person; when we may with much better reason conclude that both Scythianus and Cubricus had the same title. For I conceive Manes at first rather a title than a name, from the Hebrew יד or מ, signifying "a heretic." And although some of the Rabbins derive their יד from Manes, yet others make it more ancient than he was, referring it to Tzadok and Bajethos, called МΑΝΙΟΣ the first or chief heretics, who lived one hundred years before Christ. Wherefore it is far more rational to assert, that he which began the heresy of the Manichees was called מ before as an heretic in the Oriental tongues, and from thence מ by the Greeks, (to comply with μαρτια, or "madness," in their language,) than that מ was first the name of a man counted an heretic by the Christians, and then made the general name for all heretics, and particularly for the Christians by the Jews. Which being granted, both Scythianus and Cubricus might well at first have the name of Manes, that is, "heretic." However, the antiquity of that heresy will appear in the Mardonites, who differed not in this particular from the Manichees. "Duos Ponticis Deos afferit, tandem duas Sympogdias quae ferebant sui: quern negare non potuit, id est, Creatorem, id est, nostrum; et quem probare non poterit, id est, summ. Passus infelix hujus praeambulationis institutum de simplici capitulo Dominica pronunciatione, in homines non in Deos disponentem exempla illa bona et malas arboris, quod neque bona malas neque mala bonas proferat fructus."—Tertul. Adv. Marcion. lib. i. cap. 2. This Marcion lived in the days of Antoninus Pius, and, as Eusebius testifieth, Justin Martyr wrote against him.—Ibid. lib. iv. cap. 11. Ireneus relates how he spake with Polycarpus, bishop of Smyrna, who was taught by the apostles, and conversed with divers which saw our Saviour.—Lib. iii. cap. 3. Neither was Marcion the first which taught it at Rome, for he received it from Cerdon. "Habuit et Cerdonem quendam informatorem scandalum hujus, quo facilis duos Deos caelestis existimavertit." This Cerdon succeeded Heraclenus, and so at
Whereas there is no nature originally sinful, no substance in itself evil, and therefore no being which may not come from the same fountain of goodness. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these things, saith he who also said, I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me. Vain then is that conceit which framed two gods, one of them called light, the other darkness; one good, the other evil; refuted in the first words of the CREED, I believe in God, maker of heaven and earth.

But as we have already proved that one God to be the Father, so must we yet farther show that one God the Father to be the maker of the world. In which there is no difficulty at all: the whole church at Jerusalem hath sufficiently declared this truth in their devotions; Lord, thou art God which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together. Jesus then was the child of that God which made the heaven and the earth, and consequently the Father of Christ is the creator of the world.

We know that Christ is the light of the Gentiles, by his own interpretation; we are assured likewise that his Father gave him, by his frequent assertion: we may then as certainly conclude that the Father of Christ is the creator of the world, by the prophet's express prediction: For thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he which spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.

And now this great facility may seem to create the greater difficulty: for being the apostles teach us that the Son made all things, and the prophets, that by the Spirit they were produced, how can we attribute that peculiarly in the CREED unto the Father, which in the scriptures is assigned indifferently to the Son and to the Spirit? Two reasons may particularly be rendered of this peculiar attributing the work of creation to the Father. First. In respect of those heresies arising in the infancy of the church,
which endeavoured to destroy this truth, and to introduce another creator of the world, distinguished from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. An error so destructive to the Christian religion, that it razeth even the foundations of the gospel, which refers itself wholly to the promises in the law, and pretends to no other God but that God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; acknowledged no other speaker by the Son, than him that spake by the prophets; and therefore whom Moses and the prophets call Lord of heaven and earth, of him our blessed Saviour signifieth himself to be the Son, rejoicing in spirit, and saying, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth. Secondly. In respect of the paternal priority in the Deity, by reason thereof that which is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be rather attributed to the Father, as the first Person in the Trinity. In which respect the apostle hath made a distinction in the phrase of emanation or production: To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. And our Saviour hath acknowledged, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; which speaketh some kind of priority in action, according to that of the person. And in this sense the church did always profess to believe in God the Father, creator of heaven and earth.

23.—The great necessity of professing our faith in this particular appeareth several ways, as indispensably tending to the illustration of God’s glory, the humiliation of mankind, the provocation to obedience, the aversion from iniquity, and all consolation in our duty.

God is of himself infinitely glorious, because his perfections are absolute, his excellencies indefective: and the splendour of this glory appeareth unto us in and through the works of his hands. The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead. For he hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion. After a long enumeration of the wonderful works of the creation, the Psalmist breaketh forth into this pious meditation: O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all. If then the glory of God be made apparent by the creation; if he have made all things for

---

1 Luke x. 21. 2 1 Cor. viii. 6. 3 John v. 19. 4 “Stabat fides semper in Creatore et Christo ejus.”—Tertul. Adv. Marcion. lib. i. cap. 21. 5 Non silla agnostenda erit traditio apostolorum, quam quae hodie apud ipsorum ecclesias editur. Nullam autem apostolici census ecclesiarum invenias, quae non in Creatore Christianizet.”—Ibid. 6 Rom. i. 20. 7 Jer. x. 12; II. 15. 8 Psalm cv 24.
himself, 1 that is, for the manifestation of his glorious attributes; if the Lord rejoiceth in his works, because his glory shall endure for ever; 2 then is it absolutely necessary we should confess him maker of heaven and earth, that we may sufficiently praise and glorify him. Let them praise the name of the Lord, saith David, for his name alone is excellent, his glory is above the earth and heaven. 3 Thus did the Levites teach the children of Israel to glorify God: Stand up, and bless the Lord your God for ever and ever: and blessed be thy glorious name, which is exalted above all blessing and praise. Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are therein. 4 And the same hath St. Paul taught us: For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen. 5 Furthermore, that we may be assured that he which made both heaven and earth will be glorified in both, the prophet calls upon all those celestial hosts to bear their part in this hymn: Praise ye him all his angels, praise ye him all his hosts. Praise ye him sun and moon, praise him all ye stars of light. Praise him ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of the Lord, for he commanded, and they were created. 6 And the twenty-four elders, in the Revelation of St. John, fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns, the emblems of their borrowed and derived glories, before the throne, the seat of infinite and eternal Majesty, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created. 7 Wherefore, if the heavens declare the glory of God, and all his works praise him; then shall his saints bless him, they shall speak of the glory of his kingdom, and talk of his power. 8 And if man be silent, God will speak; while we through ingratitude will not celebrate, he himself will declare it, and promulgate. I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power, and by my out-stretched arm. 9

Secondly. The doctrine of the world's creation is most properly effectual towards man's humiliation. As there is nothing more destructive to humanity than pride, and yet not anything to which we are more prone than that; so nothing can be more properly applied to abate the swelling of our proud conceptions, than a due consideration of the other works of God, with a sober reflection upon our own original. When I consider the heavens, the work of

1 Prov. xvi. 4. 2 Psalm civ. 31. 3 Psalm cxvil. 13. 4 Neh. ix. 5, 6. 5 Rom. xi. 36. 6 Psalm cxvil. 2-5. 7 Rev. iv. 10, 11. 8 Psalm xix. 1; cxlv. 10, 11. 9 Jer. xxvii. 5.
thine fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; 1 when I view those glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by the advantage of a glass find greater numbers, before beyond the power of my sight, and from thence judge there may be many millions more which neither eye nor instrument can reach; when I contemplate those far more glorious spirits, the inhabitants of the heavens, and attendants on thy throne; I cannot but break forth into that admiration of the prophet, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? what is that offspring of the earth, that dust and ashes? what is that son of man, that thou visitest him? what is there in the progeny of an ejected and condemned father, that thou shouldst look down from heaven, the place of thy dwelling, and take care or notice of him? But if our original ought so far to humble us, how should our fall abuse us? That of all the creatures which God made, we should comply with him who first opposed his maker, and would be equal unto him from whom he new received his being. All other works of God, which we think inferior to us, because not furnished with the light of understanding, or endued with the power of election, are in a happy impossibility of sinning, and so offending of their maker: the glorious spirits which attend upon the throne of God, once in a condition of themselves to fall, now by the grace of God preserved, and placed beyond all possibility of sinning, are entered upon the greatest happiness of which the workmanship of God is capable: but men, the sons of fallen Adam, and sinners after the similitude of him, of all the creatures are the only companions of those angels which left their own habitations, and are delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment. 2 How should a serious apprehension of our own corruption, mingled with the thoughts of our creation, humble us in the sight of him, whom we alone of all the creatures by our unrepented sins drew unto repentance! How can we look without confusion of face upon that monument of our infamy, recorded by Moses, who first penned the original of humanity, It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart? 3

Thirdly. This doctrine is properly efficacious and productive of most cheerful and universal obedience. It made the prophet call for the commandments of God, and earnestly desire to know what he should obey. Thy hands have made me and fashioned me: give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments. 4 By virtue of our first production, God hath undeniably absolute dominion over us, and consequently there must be due unto him the most

1 Psalm viii. 3. 2 Jude 6; 2 Peter ii. 4. 3 Gen. vi. 6. 4 Psalm cxix. 73.
exact and complete obedience from us. Which reason will appear more convincing, if we consider, of all the creatures which have been derived from the same fountain of God's goodness, none ever disobeyed his voice but the devil and man. *Mine hand, saith he, hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens; when I call unto them they stand up together.*¹ The most loyal and obedient servants which stand continually before the most illustrious prince, are not so ready to receive and execute the commands of their sovereign lord, as all the hosts of heaven and earth to attend upon the will of their creator. *Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth,*² but every one maketh his appearance, ready pressed to observe the designs of their commander-in-chief. Thus the Lord commanded, and *they fought from heaven, the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.*³ He commanded the ravens to feed Elias, and they brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening;⁴ and so one prophet lived merely upon the obedience of the fowls of the air. He spake to the devouring whale, and it *vomited out Jonah upon the dry land;*⁵ and so another prophet was delivered from the jaws of death by the obedience of the fishes of the sea. Do we not read of *fire and hail, snow and vapour, stormy wind fulfilling his word?*⁶ Shall there be a greater coldness in man than in the snow? more vanity in us than in a vapour? more inconstancy than in the wind? If the universal obedience of the creature to the will of the creator cannot move us to the same affection and desire to serve and please him, they will all conspire to testify against us and condemn us, when God shall call unto them, saying, *Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me.*⁷

Lastly. The creation of the world is of most necessary meditation for the consolation of the servants of God in all the variety of their conditions. *Happy is he whose hope is in the Lord his God, which made heaven and earth, the sea and all that therein is.*⁸ This happiness consisteth partly in a full assurance of his power to secure us, his ability to satisfy us. *The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.*⁹ By virtue of the first production he hath a perpetual right unto, and power to dispose of, all things: and he which can order and

¹ Isa. xlviii. 13. ² Isa. xl. 26. ³ Judges v. 20. ⁴ 1 Kings xvii. 4, 6. ⁵ Jonah ii. 10 ⁶ Psalm cxlii. 8. ⁷ Isa. i. 2. ⁸ Psalm cxvi. 5, 6. ⁹ Psalm xxiv 1, 2.
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dispose of all, must necessarily be esteemed able to secure and satisfy any creature. Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no external resistance or opposition where omnipotency worketh, no internal weakness or defection of power where the almighty is the agent; and consequently there remaineth a full and firm persuasion of his ability in all conditions to preserve us. Again, this happiness consisteth partly in a comfortable assurance, arising from this meditation, of the will of God to protect and succour us, of his desire to preserve and bless us. My help cometh from the Lord, who made heaven and earth: he will not suffer thy foot to be moved, saith the prophet David; at once expressing the foundation of his own expectancy and our security. God will not despise the work of his hands, neither will he suffer the rest of his creatures to do the least injury to his own image. Behold, saith he, I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord.

24.—Wherefore to conclude our explication of the first article, and to render a clear account of the last part thereof, that every one may understand what it is I intend, when I make confession of my faith in the maker of heaven and earth, I do truly profess, that I really believe, and am fully persuaded, that both heaven and earth and all things contained in them have not their being of themselves, but were made in the beginning; that the manner by which all things were made was by mediate or immediate creation; so that antecedently to all things beside, there was at first nothing but God, who produced most part of the world merely out of nothing, and the rest out of that which was formerly made of nothing. This I believe was done by the most free and voluntary act of the will of God, of which no reason can be alleged, no motive assigned, but his goodness; performed by the determination of his will at that time which pleased him, most probably within one hundred and thirty generations of men, most certainly within not more than six, or at farthest seven, thousand years. I acknowledge this God, creator of the world, to be the same God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: and in this full latitude, I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

1 Isa. xi. 23. 2 Psalm cxxi. 2, 3 3 Job x. 3. 4 Isa. liv. 16, 17.
ARTICLE II

And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.

THE second article of the CREED presents unto us, as the object of our faith, the second person of the blessed Trinity; that as in the Divinity there is nothing intervening between the Father and the Son, so that immediate union might be perpetually expressed by a constant conjunction in our Christian confession. And that upon no less authority than of the author and finisher of our faith, who, in the persons of the apostles, gave this command to us, Ye believe in God, believe also in me.¹ Nor speaketh he this of himself, but from the Father which sent him: for this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ.² According, therefore, to the Son's prescription, the Father's injunction, and the sacramental institution, as we are baptized, so do we believe, in the name of the Father, and the Son.³

2.—Our blessed Saviour is here represented under a threefold description: first, by his nomination, as Jesus Christ; secondly, by his generation, as the only Son of God; thirdly, by his dominion, as our Lord.

3.—But when I refer Jesus Christ to the nomination of our Saviour, because he is in the scriptures promiscuously and indifferently sometimes called Jesus, sometimes Christ, I would be understood so as not to make each of them equally, or in like propriety, his name. His name was called Jesus, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb: ⁴ who is also called Christ,⁵ not by name,⁶ but by office and title. Which observation, seemingly trivial, is necessary for the full explication of this part of the article: for by this distinction we are led unto a double notion, and so resolve our faith into these two proposi-

---

tions. I believe there was and is a man, whose name was actually, and is truly in the most high importance, Jesus, the Saviour of the world. I believe the man who bare that name to be the Christ, that is, the Messias promised of old by God, and expected by the Jews.

For the first, it is undoubtedly the proper name of our Saviour given unto him, according to the custom of the Jews, at his circumcision: and as the Baptist was called John, even so the Christ was called Jesus. Beside, as the imposition was after the vulgar manner, so was the name itself of ordinary use. We read in the scriptures of Jesus, which was called Justus, a fellow-worker with St. Paul, and of a certain sorcerer, a Jew, whose name was Bar-jeus, that is, the son of Jesus. Josephus, in his history, mentioneth one Jesus, the son of Ananus; another, the son of Saphates; a third, the son of Judas, slain in the temple: and many of the high priests, or priests, were called by that name; as the son of Damnaeus, of Gamaliel, of Onias, of Phabes, and of Thebuth. Ecclesiasticus is called the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach, and that Sirach the son of another Jesus. St. Stephen speaks of the tabernacle of witness brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles: and the apostle, in his explication of those words of David, To-day if you will hear his voice, observeth, that if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterwards have spoken of another day. Which two scriptures being undoubtedly understood of Joshua, the son of Nun, teach us as infallibly that Jesus is the same name with Joshua. Which being at the first imposition in the full extent of pronunciation Jehovah, in process of time contracted to Josuah, by the omission of the last letter, (strange and difficult to other languages) and the addition of the Greek termination, became Jesus.

Wherefore it will be necessary, for the proper interpretation of Jesus, to look back upon the first that bare that name, who was the son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim, the successor of Moses and so named by him, as it is written, And Moses called Oshea the son of Nun Jehoshua. His first name then imposed at his circumcision was Oshea, or Hoseah; the same with the name of the son

1 Col. iv. 11. 2 Acts xiii. 6. 3 "Habuit et Judaea quodam Jesus, quorum vacuis gloriarum vocabulis. Ili enim nec lucent, nec pascent, nec medentur."—BERNARD, In Cant. vers. 15. 4 Acts vii. 44, 45. 5 Heb. iv. 8. 6 First ὸσήα as generally in the Books of Moses, in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, the Kings, yea, even in Haggai and Zechariah: then contracted into ὶσηα, as in 1 Chron. xxiv. 11; 2 Chron. xxxi 15; and constantly in Ezra and Nehemiah. Next the last letter ṭ was but lightly pronounced, as appears by the Greek Translation, 1 Chron. vii. 27, where ὸσηά is rendered in the Roman and Alexandrian copies Ἰοσηά, in the Aldus and Complutensian editions Ἰοσηά, and by Eus-ebius, who expressed it truer than those copies, Ἰοσηάν. At last ṭ was totally left out, both in the pronunciation and the writing, and the whole name of Joshua contracted to ὸσηά. 7 Num. xiii. 16.
of Azariah, ruler of Ephraim, of the son of Elah, king of Israel, of the son of Beer, the prophet: 1 and the interpretation of this first Hoseah 2 is Saviour. Now we must not imagine this to be no mutation, 3 neither must we look upon it as a total alteration, 4 but observe it as a change not trivial or inconsiderable. 5 And being Hoseah was a name afterwards used by some, and Jehoshuah, as distinct, by others, it will necessarily follow, there was some difference between these two names; and it will be fit to inquire what was the addition, and in what the force of the alteration doth consist.

First, therefore, we observe that all the original letters in the name Hoseah are preserved in that of Joshua, 6 from whence it is evident that this alteration was not made by a verbal mutation, as when Jacob was called Israel, nor by any literal change, as when Sarai was named Sarah, nor yet by diminution or mutila-

---

1 1 Chron. xxvii. 20; 2 Kings xvii. 1; Hosea 1. 1.
2 * Osee in lingua nostra Salvatorum sonat, quod nomen habuit etiam Josue filius Nunu, antequam el a Deo vocabulum mutaretur."—S. Pler. In Osee, cap. i. ver. 1; et lib. i. Adv. Jo anno. I read indeed of other interpretations among the Greeks, no good expositors of the Hebrew names: as in an ancient ms. of the LXX., translation of the Prophets, now in the library of Cardinal Barberini, at the beginning of Hoseah, 'Ψηθα, λυπούμενος' and again, 'Ψηθα, σεσωμοσμένος, ή συνκλησαμένος' of which the first and last are far from the original; and the middle agreeable with the root, not with the conjugation, as being deduced from ούσαν not in Niphath, but in Hipilh;) and in another ms. of the Prophets in the King's library at St. James's, 'Ψηθα, σκιάως ή φλεῖς' and again, 'Ψηθα, ἐρωσομένος,' which is the interpretation inserted into Hosychius; in whom for Ψηθα we must read 'Ψηθα' and so I suppose Salmasius intended it, though the Holland edition hath made his emendation 'Ψηθα.' 3 As the Samaritan Pentateuch makes it the same name, which he was first named, and which he had afterwards, as if Moses had only called Oshea, Oshea.

4 So Justin Martyr speaks of Hoseah as metonominetos to Ἰσαχα του ναόματι and comparing it with that alteration of Jacob's name: Το ἐπάνωμον Ἰακωβ τῷ Ἰσαχα ἐπικληθέν ἐδοκίμασέν ἐστιν, καὶ τῷ Ἰσαχεί ὁ νομός Ἰσαχα ἐπικληθή: where, to pass by his mistake in supposing him first named Israel, and after called Jacob, he makes the alteration of "Hoseah" to "Joshua" equal to that of "Jacob" to "Israel." The reason whereof was the Greek version of the name, who for "Hoseah" translated it Λουσας "Ἐπανομάσας Μωσαὶ τον Λουσα ναών Ναώ, Ἰσαχαν. (Num. xiii. 16) "Quum successor Moyal destinareetur Auses filius Nave, transferreretur Nave de pristino nomine, et incipit vocari Jesus."—Text. Adv. Jud. cap. 9, et Adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 16. "Igitur Mouses his administratis Ausem quondam nomine praeponens populo, qui eos revocaret ad patriam terram."—S. Clemens Rom. Recognit. lib. i. "Quis enim primum Auses vocaretur, Moses, futura presentiens, jussit eum "Jesum" vocari."—Lactanc. De vera Sap. lib. iv. cap. 17. "Ου πρότερον γούν (Μωίσης) τον αὐτόν διάδοξον τῇ τοῦ Ἰσαχα κεκρυμένον προσφορίαν, ὁνόματι δὲ ἑτέρῳ τῷ Ἰσαχα, ὅπερ οἱ γεννησάντες αὐτῷ τέθειται, καλούμενοι, Ἰσαχαν αὐτοῦ ἀναγορεύει."—Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. i. cap. 3. Thus was the "Hoseah" something disguised by "Auses," and was farther estranged yet by those which frequently called him "Nauσας," as Eusebius, Dem. Evang. lib. v. cap. 17, thrice.

5 This Justin Martyr charges upon the Jews as neglected by them; and affirms the reason why they received not Jesus for the Christ, was their not observing the alteration of "Hoseah" into "Joshua" or "Jesus." Λουσαν καλοῦμενον Ἰσαχαν Μωσάς ἐκάλεσες τούτου οὖν οὐ γινέτει, οὐ̂ οἱ αἰτίαν ἐπισώζουν, οὐ̂ς ἀπορείς, οὐ̂ς φιλοποιεῖς; τιγαραν ἐλεηθέν το Χριστός, καὶ ἀναγγέλεσκων οὐ̂ς συνίης:—Did. c.iv. Triph. And whereas they spoke much of the change made in the names of Abram and Sarai, which were but of a letter, they took no notice of this total alteration of the name: so he: Τί δὲ τις ἐν ἄλφα πρώτω προσφητήτου τῷ Ἀβραάμ τον ὁνόματι Θεολογείας, καὶ διὰ τις ἐν ρώ τοῦ ζάρρας ὁνόματι, ὁμοίως κοιμοποιεῖς; διὰ τις δὲ το πατριόν ὁνόμα τῷ Ισαχα τῷ νυν Ναώ οὁν μετονομάσατο τῷ Ἰσαχα τον οὐ̂ς γινέτει:—Ibid. Where, to pass by the vulgar mistake of the Greeks, who generally deliver the addition of a in the name of Abraham, and p in the name of Sarah, when the first was an addition of Je, the second a change of Ἰ into Ἰ, he would make that of "Hoseah" into "Jesus" a far more considerable alteration than that of Abraham or of Sarah.
tion; but by addition, as when Abram was called Abraham. Secondly, it must be confessed that there is but one literal addition, and that of that letter which is most frequent in the Hebrew names: but being thus solemnly added by Moses, upon so remarkable an occasion as the viewing of the land of Canaan was, and that unto a name already known, and after used; it cannot be thought to give any less than a present designation of his person to be a saviour of the people, and future certainty of salvation included in his name unto the Israelites by his means. Thirdly, though the number of the letters be augmented actually but to one, yet it is not improbable that another may be virtually added, and in the signification understood. For being the first letter of Hoseah will not endure a duplication, and if the same letter were to be added, one of them must be absorbed; it is possible another of the same might be by Moses intended, and one of them suppressed. If then unto the name Hoseah we join one of the titles of God, which is Jah, there will result from both, by the custom of that Hebrew tongue, Jehoshua; and so not only the instrumental, but also the original cause of the Jews' deliverance will

1 For it may well be thought that is added to make the name Hosea the same with the third person of the future in Hiphil, מְאֹדָה. For although מָעַד, the characteristic letter of the conjugation Hiphil, be excluded in the future tense, and so the regular word be מְאֹדָה, frequently in use; yet sometimes it is expressed, as it is used, 1 Sam. xvii. 47: מְאֹדָה אל בְּרִיתוֹ but the Lord saveth;" (or will save") "not with sword and spear:" and Psalm cxvi. 6: מְאֹדָה עַל הַיָּם I was brought low, and he helped me." And although there be another in the future than in the name, yet being [seeing] it is also found sometimes with the lesser Chiric, and so without the latter, or without any Chiric at all, as frequently with the addition of מְאֹדָה, there is no reason but מְאֹדָה, the name of the son of Nun, may be of the same force, as consisting of the same letters, with the third person of the future in Hiphil. Again, being [seeing] is added to the future, as formative thereof, stands in the place of מְאֹדָה, (for the avoiding of confusion with מְאֹדָה conjunctive,) which is nothing else than the abbreviation of מְאֹדָה we may well assign at least this emphasis to the mutation which Moses made: that whereas before there was nothing but "salvation" barely in his name, now there is no less than "he shall save;" in which the מְאֹדָה or מְאֹדָה is a peculiar designation of the person, and the "shall," or tense, a certainty of the futurity. Thus will the design of Moses appear to be nothing else but a prediction or confirmation of that which was not before, but by way of desire or omission: and this only by changing the imperative into the future, מְאֹדָה "serva," the expectation of the people, into מְאֹדָה "servab," the ratification of Moses.

2 So did the ancients understand it: to the Greeks, Jesus;* is σωτήρ, to the Latins, "Salvator. Del." So Eusebius, Lib. Evang. lib. iv. ad finem: "Ενει δέ σωτήριον. Θεοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνήν τὸ τοῦ Ἰσθοῦ μεταλαβένην οὖνα σημαίνει. Ἰσθοῦ μὲν γὰρ παρ' Ἐβραίοις σωτηρία, νῦς δὲ Ναυα πάρα τοῦτο ίσων τοῦ ὧν οὖνα σημαίνεται. Ἰσονευ δέ ἐστιν Ἰαώ σωτηρία, τοῦτο ἐστί, Θεοῦ σωτηρίου. Where nothing can be more certain than that Iaiw is taken for the name of God, and Iaiw σωτηρία, together, "the salvation of God." And yet Theophylact has strangely mistaken it, Matt. i. 1: Τὸ Ἰσθός οὖνα ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐστιν, ἄλλα Ἐβραικοῦ, ἐρχομένου δὲ Ἑλληνίς, Ἰαώ γὰρ ἡ σωτηρία παρὰ τοῦ Ἐβραίος λέγεται which words seem plainly to signify that "Jesus" is interpreted "Saviour," because Iaiw in the Hebrew tongue signifies "salvation." I confess the words may be strained to the same sense with those of Eusebius, but not without some force, and contrary to what he seemeth to intend. Especially considering those which followed him in the same mistake, as Moschopius, Pape, “Ἰσθοῦ διὰ τοῦ Ἰαὼ γίνεται, ὁ δὲ λαοὶ παρ’ Ἐβραίοις τὴν σωτηρίαν. Whereas Iaiw in Eusebius is certainly no other than Iaiw, and Ἰσθοῦ than Ἰαώ, and so Ἰσονευ contracted of Ἰαώ Ιαώ, the salvation of God." Nor is this only the opinion of Eusebius, but of St. Hieron.
be found expressed in one word: as if Moses had said, "This is the person by whom God will save his people from their enemies."

Now being we have thus declared that Jesus is the same name with Josuah, being the name of Josuah was first imposed by divine designation, as a certain prediction of the fulfilling to the Israelites, by the person which bare the name, all which was signified by the name, being Jesus was likewise named by a more immediate imposition from heaven, even by the ministration of an angel; it followeth, that we believe he was infallibly designed by God to perform unto the sons of men whatsoever is implied in his nomination. As therefore in Hoseah there was expressed salvation, in Josuah at least was added the designation of that single person to save, with certainty of preservation, and probably even the name of God, by whose appointment and power he was made a saviour; so shall we find the same in Jesus. In the first salutation, the angel Gabriel told the blessed Virgin, she should conceive in her womb, and bring forth a son, and should call his name Jesus. In the dream of Joseph the angel of the Lord informed him not only of the nomination, but of the interpretation or etymology: Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. In which words is clearly expressed the designation of the person, He, and the futurition of salvation certain by him, he shall save. Beside, that other addition of the name of God, propounded in Josuah as probable, appeareth here in some degree above probability, and that for two reasons. First. Because it is not barely said that He, but, as the original raiseth it, He himself shall save. Josuah saved Israel not by his own power, not of himself, but God by him; neither saved he his own people, but the people of God: whereas Jesus himself, by his own power, the power of God, shall save his own people, the people of God. Well therefore may we understand the interpretation of his name to be God the Saviour. Secondly. Immediately upon the prediction of the name of Jesus, and the interpretation given by the angel, the evangelist expressly observeth, All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the

---

1 Luke i. 31.
2 "Jesus Hebraeo sermo Salvator dicitur. Etymologiam ergo nomini ejus evangelista signavit, dicens, vocabis nomen ejus Jesus, quia ipse salvum faciet populum suum."—S. Hierox.
3 Matt. i. 21.
4 Avus "Ipse."
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prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us.1 Several ways have been invented to show the fulfilling of that prophecy, notwithstanding our Saviour was not called Emmanuel; but none can certainly appear more proper, than that the sense of Emmanuel should be comprehended in the name of Jesus: and what else is God with us, than God our Saviour? Well therefore hath the evangelist conjoined the prophet and the angel,2 asserting Christ was therefore named Jesus, because it was foretold he should be called Emmanuel, the angelical God the Saviour being in the highest propriety the prophethical God with us.

However, the constant scripture-interpretation of this name is Saviour. So said the angel of the Lord to the amazed shepherds, Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.3 So St. Paul to the Jews and Gentile proselytes at Antioch, Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus.4 Which explication of this sacred name was not more new or strange unto the world, than was the name itself so often used before. For the ancient Greeks usually gave it at first as a title to their gods, whom after any remarkable preservations they styled savours, and under that notion built temples and consecrated altars to them.5 Nor did

1 Matt. i. 22, 23.
2 Βλέπεις ἵκασθίμενον εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ προφήτου ῥήσεως; μεθερμηνευομένον γὰρ τὸ μεθ' ημῶν ο Θεός, ο εστὶ σωτηρία τοῦ λαοῦ, τὸ μετὰ δουλῶν δεσπότην εὐφορομεῖν.—Andreas Cretensis In Circumcisionem.
4 Further, the chief of them, was most usually worshipped under this title. Euripides makes Amphimyro sitting by his altar, which Hercules had built:—

Βοιμὸν καθίζω τῶν Σωτῆρος Δῶς.

And Aristophanes introduces Bacchus speaking:

Νη τὸν Διὸ τὸν Σωτῆρα.—Plut. 878.

as if it were the familiar oath among the Athenians, as well it might be, he having his temple in their Pirceum, as Strabo testifieth, lib. ix., (where Demosthenes, by virtue of a decree, was to build him an altar.—Plutarch, in Vita Demost.) and his porch in the city, which was called indeed vulgarly, τοῦ Ἑλευθερίου Δῶς στᾶτο: yet it was also named, τοῦ Σωτῆρος, as Harpocration and Hesychius both observed. ’Οτι δὲ εἰπονεται τῶν Ἑλευθερίων Διὰ, τοῦτον δὲ ένοι καὶ Σωτῆρα φασι: so the latter. As in their oaths, so in their feasts, they mentioned him always at the third cup. Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου καὶ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἔλεγον, τὸν δὲ Δεινοτρόπον Ἰερών, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σωτῆρος, subintellccto Δίως, which is omitted in Hesychius, as appears out of Athenaeus, lib. ii. et cv., and especially that of Aëtius the comedian:—

—'Αλλ' ἐγγεοὺς
Αὐτῷ Δί奥斯 γε τίνιδε Σωτῆροι. θεῶν
Θεοτόκος ἀπακῶν χρυσαμαστοῦ πολύ
Ο Ζεός ο Σωτηρ.—

Pausanias, in Corinthiacis, Moseneicis, Ionicis, et Arcadianis, mentions several statues and temples anciently dedicated to Jupiter, επίληπτον Σωτήριον of which title Cornutus in his book De Natura Deorum gives this account: Κατὰ τὸν γενναῖον έστι καὶ τὸ σώζειν α γενναίοις καὶ τοῦ Διὸς ενεπεθεν Σωτῆρος είναι λεγομένου. And though this title: was so generally given to Jupiter, as Hesychius expounds Σωτῆρ, ο Zeus, yet was it likewise attributed to the other gods: as Herodotus relates how the Grecians in their naval war against the Persians made their vows Ποσεθεδυν Σωτηρίον, and that they preserved the title to Neptune in his days.—Lib. vii. And Artemidorus takes notice that Castor and Pollux are taken for the Θεοί
they rest with their mistaken piety, but made it stoop unto their baser flattery, calling those men their saviors for whom they seemed to have as great respect and honour as for their gods.¹

Nor does it always signify so much as that it may not be attributed to man: for even in the scriptures the judges of Israel were called no less than their saviors. When the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel the son of Kenaz.²

Σωτήρες, whom the poem bearing the name of Orpheus to Museaus calls
—Μεγάλοις Σωτήρας, οί διός άφριτα τέκνα—
as the Hymn of Homer, Σωτήρα σέκε παιδίς ἐπιχθώνιον ἀνδρώπων, ὕποκαρον τε νεον—— and Theocritus, in the Idyllion on them, 'Ανθρώπων Σωτήρας επί έγρυο ήδη ἑώνων. Hence Lucian in Alexander useth it as their constant title, 'Ἀλέξακα Πρόκλεις καὶ Ζευ ἀποστράτας, καὶ Διοσκουροί Σωτήρες. Neither have we mention of the title only, but of the original and occasion of it. For when Castor and Pollux thrust the sons of Theseus out of Athens, and made Menestheus king, he gave them first this name: Διά ταύτα πρώτος ο Μενεσθεύς ἀνάκτας τα καὶ σωτήρων νόμισα. Αἰκίαν. Var. Hist. lib. iv. cap. 5. Beside we read in the ancient inscriptions, 'Ασκληπιον Ἐως Σωτήρας— and again, 'Ασκληπιον καὶ Ῥύγες Σωτήροι. For as they had their female deities, so did they attribute this title to their goddesses, and that both in the masculine and the feminine gender. As to Venus, 'Αφροδίτης, Ἐως Παναγαθύ καὶ Σωτήροι τοις, 'Αρτέμιδοι Σωτήρας, as the same collection of inscriptions hath it. Thus Pherecrates, 'Ἡγουμένη τῆς πάλεως εἶνα ταύτης Σωτήρων: and Sophocles, Τύχη γέ το Σωτήρ, Thus the epigram extant in Suidas, Φιλοφόρος, ὁ Σωτήρ, ἐπί Παλλάδος ἵστατρι καλύπτων, Ἀρτέμις

Οὐδέν ἦτον κακίνου Σωτήρα καὶ ἀλέξικαν προσγρηγοροῦν.—Thedoreot. Serm. vili. 595, of Heracleus. The Bacantes, an ancient people in Peloponnesus, 'Ἀρτέμιοι οὖν ἀπόθεν Σωτείροι.—Paus. in Laconis. Her temple and statue in the city Trozen was built and named by Theseus at his safe return from Crete. The Megarenses, preserved by her from the Persians, εἰς τόδε Σωτείρας ἁγιάμα ἐπαυσάντο 'Ἀρτέμιδος: and upon the same occasion another of the same bigmus, set up at Paege.—Idem. But this title especially was given to Minerva. Σωτήρα, ἡ 'Αθηνα παρὰ τοῖς Ἐληλησιν.—Hesychius. 'Εστι γὰρ 'Αθηνής Σωτείρας λεγομενή, ἡ καὶ θυσία.—Sporo. Aristoph. in Ranas. Aristocles in his will obliged Nicanor to a dedication Δι Σωτήρι καὶ Λάρας Σωτείρα.—Laert. in Vita Arist. In general they invoked God under the notion of Σωτήρ, as Plato in Timaeus: Θεον ἥν καὶ νῦν ἐπ᾽ ἀρχῇ τῶν λεγουμένων Σωτήρας καὶ ἄρτων καὶ άθων δυνήσεως πρός τού τινος ἐκτός ἄριστα διασωμένη τήμας ἐπικαλέσαροι, τοις ἀρχαιότατοι λέγειν. This was the constant title of the first Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, given to him by the Rhodians: "ὑμᾶς μὲν δε κατα ταύτα Ἡροδειοὺς ὑψίστασιν, ἀλλὰ δε ἐπικλήσεωι ἄλλω καὶ γὰρ Φιλαδέλφου καλοῦσα, καὶ Φιλαδέλφου ἔτερον, τὸν δὲ τοῦ Λάγου Σωτηρόν, πασακείς ἀντωνόμασι τοῦ Ἄτανα. —I'Ανασιν, in Atticis. Which name, first given him by the Rhodians, was no way expressed in his usage of the Syrians, as is observed by Josephus: ὡς καὶ τὴν Συρίαν ἀπασαν ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου Σωτήρας τότε χρησιμοποιοῦτο τὰ ἐναντία παθεῖν αὐτοῦ, τῇ τι ἐπεκλήσε. This was so familiar, that Tertullian useth the title instead of the name: "Post eum (scilicet, Alexandrum) regnavit ille in Alexandrea Soter annis 53." Thus Antigonus was first called by the Greeks their Eυρεγύτης, or "Benefactor," then Σωτήρ, or "Savior." Οὐ μόνον ἐκαθή παρ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ καιροῦ Εὐρεγύτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεταλλαξας, Σωτήρ.—Poli. lib. v. Thus we read of Demetrius, who restored the Athenians to their liberty: "Ἀνεκρότηται καὶ βουντίς ἐκεῖνος ἀποβαίνειν το τὴν Δημήτηρ, Σωτήρα καὶ Εὐρεγύτην ἀναγεννηται. —Plutarch, in Vita. And not only so, but numbered Demetrius and Antigonus among their "Di Soteres," and instead of their annual archon, whose name they used in their distiction of years, they created a priest of these "Di Soteres," as the same author testifieth: Μάνω δὲ Σωτήρας ἀνεγραφαίς θεοῦ, καὶ τὸν ἐκτόνου καὶ πατριών ἀρχηγον καταπαύσαντες, ἑρεία Σωτήρων ἐχειροτόνων καὶ ἐκκατον ἐναντίον. Appian relates of Demetrius, that he received this title from the Ibabylonians: Τιμαρχον ἐπαντιστάμενοι ἄνελοι, καὶ τὰλα πονηρὰς τῆς Βαβυλωνίων ἐγείροντες, ἐφ᾽ ἣ καὶ Σωτήρ ἀρέσκειται τῶν Βαβυλωνίων ὑμνομάθη. —De Bellis Sipias. Lucian's mistake in his Salutation tells us of, 'Ἀντιγόνος ή Σωτήριν, and Appian gives us the routing of the Gauls as the cause of that title: "Ος καὶ Σωτήρ ἐπεκλήθη Γαλάτας εκ τῆς Εὐρέβης εἰς τὴν Αταν εμβαλλόντως ἔξελας.—Ibid. And in process of time this title grew so customary and familiar, that the Sicilians bestowed it upon Verres their oppressor. "Itaque illum non solum Patronum istius insulae, sed etiam Soter, inscription vidit Syracusan," says Cicero in Verrin. 2.

¹ Judges iil. 9.
And again: "When they cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised them up a deliverer, Ehud the son of Gera." Where though in our translation we call Othniel and Ehud deliverers, yet in the original they are plainly termed saviours.  

Now, what the full import and ultimate sense of the title of saviour might be, seemed not easy to the ancients: and the best of the Latins thought the Greek word so pregnant and comprehensive, that the Latin tongue had no single word able to express it.  

4.—But whatsoever notion the heathen had of their gods or men which they styled saviours, we know this name belongeth unto Christ in a more sublime and peculiar manner. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.  

It remaineth, therefore, that we should explain how and for what reasons Christ truly is, and properly is called, our Saviour.  

First, then, I conceive one sufficient cause of that appellation to consist in this, that he hath opened and declared unto us the only

---

1 Judges iii. 15.  
2 Heb.  
4 So Cicero, in the place before cited, having said he saw Verres inscribed, "Sotera," goes on: "Hoc quantum est? ita magnum, ut Latino uno verbo exprimi non possit." But though, in Cicero's time, there was no Latin word used in that sense, yet not long after it was familiar. For as in the Greek inscriptions we read often dedications Διὸ Σωτῆρα, so in the Latin we find often "Jovi Servatori," or "Conservatori," sometimes "Jovi Salvatori," or "Salutarii:" all which are nothing else but the Latin expressions of the Greek inscriptions. And without question Σωτῆρ might have been rendered "Sospitator," and even "Sospes," as it was used in the days of Eumius: "Sospes, salvus: Eumius tamen Sospitem pro Servatore posuit."—Festus. Neither indeed could the Sicilians mean any more of Verres by the word "Sotera," than Tully spake of himself, when he styled himself "Servatorem Reipublicae." At least Tacitus did conceive that "Conservator" is as much as "Soter," when, speaking of Milichus, who detected the conspiracies to Nero, he saith: *Milichus præmis diutius Conservatoris sibi nomen, Graeco ejus rei vocabulo, assumpsit." —Annales lib. xv. "He took to himself the name of Conservator, in a Greek word which signifies so much:" and without question that must be Σωτῆρ. However, the first Christians of the Latin church were some time in doubt what word to use as the constant interpretation of Σωτῆρ, so frequent and essential to Christianity. Tertullian useth "Salutificator:" or, as some books read it, "Salvificator." *" Ergo jam non unus Deus, nec unus Salutificator, si duo salutis artifices, et utique altero indigenas."—De Carne Christi, cap. 14. And shows it was so translated in Philippi. iii. 20: "Et quidem de terrâ in coelo, ubi nos trum municipalum Philippienses quaque ab apostolo discunt: Unde et Salutificatore nostro celebratustus Jesus Christum."—De Resur. Carnis, cap. 47. St. Hilary thought "Salutarius" a sufficient interpretation: "Est autem Salutaris ipso illo nomine quo Jesus nuncupatur. Jesus enim secundum Hebraicam linguam Salutaris est."—In Psalm. cviii. St. Augustin is indifferent between that and "Salvator:" *" Deus salvos faciedi Domini est Jesus, quod interpretatur Salvator, sive Salutaris:" and so Lactantius. At last they generally used the word "Salvator." First, Tertullian: "Christus in illo significatur, taurus ob utramque dispositionem: alis ferus, ut Judeus, alis manuextus, ut Salvator."—Adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 18. Which word of his was rather followed by his imitator St. Cyprian, after whom Arnobius used it, after him his disciple Lactantius: and from thence it continued the constant language of the church, till the late innovators thrust it out of the Latin translation.
true way for the obtaining eternal salvation, and by such pate-
faction can deserve no less than the name of Saviour. For if those
apostles and preachers of the gospel, who received the way of
salvation from him which they delivered unto others, may be said
to save those persons which were converted by their preaching;
in a far more eminent and excellent manner must he be said to
save them, who first revealed all those truths unto them. St. Paul
provoked to emulation them which were his flesh, that he might save
some of them; 1 and was made all things to all men, that he might by
all means save some. 2 He exhorted Timothy to take heed unto himself,
and unto the doctrine, and continue in them; for in doing this, he
should both save himself and them that heard him. 3 And St. James
speaks in more general terms: Brethren, if any of you do err from
the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which con-
verteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from
death. 4 Now if these are so expressly said to save the souls of
them which are converted by the doctrine which they deliver, with
much more reason must Christ be said to save them, whose
ministers they are, and in whose name they speak. For it was he
which came and preached peace to them which were afar off, and to
them that were nigh. 5 The will of God concerning the salvation of
man was revealed by him. No man hath seen God at any time:
the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath
declared him. 6 Being then the gospel of Christ is the power of God
unto salvation to every one that believeth, 7 being they which preach
it at the command of Christ are said to save the souls of such as
believe their word, being it was Christ alone who brought life and
immortality to light through the gospel; 8 therefore he must in a
most eminent and singular manner be acknowledged thereby to
save, and consequently must not be denied, even in this first
respect, the title of Saviour.

Secondly. This Jesus hath not only revealed, but also procured
the way of salvation; not only delivered it to us, but also wrought
it out for us; and so God sent his Son into the world, that the world
through him might be saved. 9 We were all concluded under sin,
and, being the wages of sin is death, we were obliged to eternal
punishment, from which it was impossible to be freed, except the
sin were first remitted. Now this is the constant rule, that without
shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that
Christ should appear to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. 10 And
so he did, for he shed his blood for many, for the remission of sins, 11
as himself professeth in the sacramental institution: he bare our sins in his own body on the tree, as St. Peter speaks; 1 and so in him we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. 2 And if while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us: much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath by him. 3 Again, we were all enemies unto God, and having offended him, there was no possible way of salvation, but by being reconciled to him. If then we ask the question, as once the Philistines did concerning David, Wherewith should we reconcile ourselves unto our master? 4 we have no other name to answer it but Jesus. For God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. 5 And as under the law the blood of the sin-offering was brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile within in the holy place; 6 so it pleased the Father through the Son, having made peace by the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself. And thus it comes to pass, that us, who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death. 7 And upon this reconciliation of our persons must necessarily follow the salvation of our souls. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. 8 Furthermore, we were all at first enslaved by sin, and brought into captivity by Satan, neither was there any possibility of escape but by way of redemption. Now it was the law of Moses, that if any were able he might redeem himself: 9 but this to us was impossible, because absolute obedience in all our actions is due unto God, and therefore no act of ours can make any satisfaction for the least offence. Another law gave yet more liberty, that he which was sold might be redeemed again; one of his brethren might redeem him. 10 But this in respect of all the mere sons of men was equally impossible, because they were all under the same captivity. Nor could they satisfy for others, who were wholly unable to redeem themselves. Wherefore there was no other brother, but that Son of man which is the Son of God, who was like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, which could work this redemption for us. And what he only could, that he freely did perform. For the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many: 11 and as he came to give, so he gave himself a ransom for all. 12 So that in him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins. 13 For we are bought with a price: 14 for we are redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver

1 1 Peter ii. 24.  2 Col. i. 14.  3 Rom. v. 8, 9.  4 1 Sam. xxix. 4.  5 2 Cor. v. 19.  6 Lev. vi. 30.  7 Col. i. 20–22.  8 Rom. v. 16.  9 1 Lev. xxv. 42.  10 Lev. xxv. 43.  11 N. xxv. 28.  12 1 Tim. ii. 6.  13 Eph. i. 7.  14 1 Cor. vii. 22.
and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot. He, then, which hath obtained for us remission of sins, he who through himself hath reconciled us to God, he who hath given himself as a ransom to redeem us, he who hath thus wrought out the way of salvation for us, must necessarily have a second and a far higher right unto the name of Jesus, unto the title of our Saviour.

Thirdly. Beside the promulgating and procuring, there is yet a farther act, which is, conferring of salvation on us. All which we mentioned before was wrought by virtue of his death, and his appearance in the holy of holies: but we must still believe, he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For now being set down at the right hand of God, he hath received all power both in heaven and earth; and the end of this power which he hath received is, to confer salvation upon those which believe in him. For the Father gave the Son this power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him; that he should raise our bodies out of the dust, and cause our corruptible to put on incorruption, and our mortal to put on immortality: and upon this power we are to expect salvation from him. For we must look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, from heaven, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. And unto them that thus look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation. Being, then, we are all to endeavour that our spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus; being St. Peter hath taught us, that God hath exalted Christ with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour; being the conferring of that upon us which he promised to us, and obtained for us, is the reward of what he suffered therefore we must acknowledge that the actual giving of salvation to us is the ultimate and conclusive ground of the title Saviour.

Thus by the virtue of his precious blood Christ hath obtained remission of our sins, by the power of his grace hath taken away the dominion of sin, in the life to come will free us from all possibility of sinning, and utterly abolish death the wages of sin: wherefore well said the angel of the Lord, Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins; well did Zacharias call him an horn of salvation; Simeon, the salvation of God; St. Paul, the captain and author of eternal salvation; St. Peter, a Prince

1 1 Peter i. 18, 19. 2 Heb. vii. 25. 3 John xvii. 2. 4 Phil. iii. 20, 21. 5 Heb. ix. 23. 6 1 Cor. v. 5. 7 Acts v. 31. 8 Matt. i. 21. 9 Luke i. 69. 10 Luke ii. 30. 11 Heb v. 9; ii. 10.
and a Saviour,\(^1\) correspondent to those judges of Israel, raised up by God himself to deliver his people from the hands of their enemies, and for that reason called saviours. In the time of their trouble, say the Levites, when they cried unto thee, thou hearest them from heaven, and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them saviours, who saved them out of the hands of their enemies.\(^2\)

5.—The correspondency of Jesus unto those temporal saviours will best appear, if we consider it particularly in Josuah, who bare that salvation in his name, and approved it in his actions. For, as the son of Sirach saith, Jesus the son of Nave was valiant in the wars, and was the successor of Moses in prophecies, who, according to his name, was made great for the saving of the elect of God.\(^3\) Although, therefore, Moses was truly and really a ruler and deliverer,\(^4\) which is the same with saviour;\(^5\) although the rest of the judges were also by their office rulers and deliverers, and therefore styled saviours, as expressly Othniel and Ehud are; yet Josuah, far more particularly and exactly than the rest, is represented as a type of our Jesus, and that typical singularity manifested in his name.\(^6\) For, First, he it was alone, of all which passed out of Egypt, who was designed to lead the children of Israel into Canaan, the land of promise, flowing with milk and honey. Which land as it was a type of the heaven of heavens, the inheritance of the saints, and eternal joys flowing from the right hand of God; so is the person which brought the Israelites into that place of rest\(^7\) a type of him who only can bring us into the presence of God, and there prepare our mansions for us, and assign them to us, as Josuah divided the land for an inheritance to the tribes. Besides, it is farther observable, not only what Josuah did, but what Moses could not do. The hand of Moses and Aaron brought them out of Egypt, but left them in the wilderness, and could not seat them in Canaan. Josuah, the successor, only could effect that in which Moses failed. Now nothing is more frequent in the phrase of the Holy Ghost, than to take Moses for the doctrine delivered, or the books written by him, that is, the law;\(^8\) from whence it followeth, that the

\(^{1}\) Acts v. 31.
\(^{2}\) Nch. ix. 27.
\(^{3}\) Ecles. xlvii. 1.
\(^{4}\) Acts vii. 35.
\(^{5}\) "Rústhis, σωτήρ, λυτρωτής. And again: Σωτήρ, ὁ Ζεὺς, ὁ ἐλευθερίου ἡ λυτρωτής."—Hesych.
\(^{6}\) "Quantum attinet ad propheticum apparatrum, nec geri nec dici aliquid posset insignius, quandoquidem res perducta est usque ad nominis expressionem."—S. August. Cont. Pau. lib. xvi. cap. 19.
\(^{7}\) "Οὔτοι τούτοις ἐστίνα ἔστησαν εἰς τὸν ἄγιον γῆν τὸν λαὸν, οὕτω Μωσῆς, καὶ ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἐν κληρῷ διενεμεῖν αὐτὴν τοῖς εἰσέλθοντις μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὕτω καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπιστρέψει, καὶ διαμερεῖ τὴν ἀγάθην γῆν ἐκάστης."—S. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph.
\(^{8}\) As Luke xvi. 23, 31; and xxiv. 27; John v. 45, 46; Acts vi. 11; colligated with the 15th verse; Acts xv. 21; and xxii. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 15. Μουσαι νοθεῖς τὸν Νόμον, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ὄμοιον ἐκείνον Ἰησοῦν—ὁ σώτηρ τούτων κατὰ τὴν ἐσπαραγμένην, Μουσῆς τετελευτηκότος, Ἰησοῦς τοῦ λαὸν εἰς τὴν ἐπιγγελμένην ἐστίνα ἐν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ τοῦ Νόμου τέλος ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐπιφανεῖς Ἰησοῦς ἀνέφεξε τῷ ἑπιστρεφείς λαῷ.
death of Moses and the succession of Josuah presignified the continuance of the law till Jesus came, by whom all that believe are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses. The law and the prophets were until John: since that the kingdom of God is preached. Moses must die, that Josuah may succeed. By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified (for by the law is the knowledge of sin); but the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe. Moses indeed seems to have taken Josuah with him up into the mount; but if he did, sure it was to enter the cloud which covered the mount where the glory of the Lord abode: for without Jesus, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, there is no looking into the secrets of heaven, no approaching to the presence of God. The command of circumcision was not given unto Moses, but to Josuah; nor were the Israelites circumcised in the wilderness, under the conduct of Moses and Aaron, but in the land of Canaan, under their successor. For at that time the Lord said unto Josuah, Make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time. Which speaketh Jesus to be the true circumciser, the author of another circumcision than that of the flesh commanded by the law, even the circumcision of the heart in the spirit, and not in the letter; that which is made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which is therefore called the circumcision of Christ.
On the Creed.  [Art. II.

6. — Thus if we look upon Josuah as the minister of Moses, he is even in that a type of Christ, the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God. If we look on him as the successor of Moses, in that he representeth Jesus, inasmuch as the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. If we look on him as now judge and ruler of Israel, there is scarce an action which is not clearly predictive of our Saviour. He begins his office at the banks of Jordan, where Christ is baptized, and enters upon the public exercise of his prophetic office. He chooseth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; as our Jesus thence began to choose his twelve apostles, those foundation-stones in the church of God, whose names are in the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy city, the new Jerusalem. It hath been observed, that the saving Rahab the harlot alive foretold what Jesus once should speak to the Jews, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. He said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon: and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. Which great miracle was not only wrought by the power of him whose name he bare, but did also signify that in the latter days, toward the setting of the sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darkness, the sun of righteousness should arise with healing in his wings, and, giving a check to the approaching night, become the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

But to pass by more particulars, Josuah smote the Amalekites, and subdued the Canaanites; by the first making way to enter the land, by the second giving possession of it. And Jesus our Prince and Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world, in a spiritual manner goeth in and out before us against our spiritual enemies, subduing sin and Satan, and so opening and clearing our way to heaven; destroying the last enemy, death, so giving us possession

1 Exod. xxiv. 13; Joshua i. 1; Rom. xv. 8.
2 John i. 17.
3 'Ille autem dixit istius muneris, 'Deo autem quod adiuvavit me.'
4 Josuah xii. 13, 14.
5 By the same St. Cyril: 'Ipsi cuius corporis corpus, et buonis iis, qui subirent in flagitium, et subeirunt, et extitiant in gloria.'
6 By the same St. Cyril: 'Ipsi cuius corporis corpus, et buonis iis, qui subirent in flagitium, et subeirunt, et extitiant in gloria.'
of eternal life.\textsuperscript{1} Thus do we believe the \textit{man} called \textit{Jesus} to have fulfilled, in the highest degree imaginable, all which was but typified in him who first bare the name, and in all the rest which succeeded in his office, and so to be the Saviour of the world; \textit{whom God hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David}, \textit{That we should be saved from our enemies, and the hand of all that hate us.\textsuperscript{2}}

7.—The necessity of the belief of this part of the article is not only certain, but evident: \textit{because there is no end of faith without a Saviour}, and \textit{no other name but this} by which we can be saved,\textsuperscript{3} and \textit{no way to be saved by him but by believing in him.} \textit{For this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ: and he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him.\textsuperscript{4}} \textit{From him then, and from him alone, must we expect salvation, acknowledging and confessing freely there is nothing in ourselves which can effect it or deserve it from us, nothing in any other creature which can promerit or procure it to us. For there is but one God, and one \textit{Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.\textsuperscript{5}} It is only the beloved Son, in whom God is well pleased: \textsuperscript{6} he is clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; \textsuperscript{7} he hath trod the wine-press alone. \textit{We like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.\textsuperscript{8}} By him \textit{God hath reconciled all things to himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.\textsuperscript{9}} By him alone is our salvation wrought: \textit{for his sake, then, only can we ask it, from him alone expect it.}

Secondly, this belief is necessary, that we may delight and rejoice in the name of Jesus, as that in which all our happiness is involved. At his nativity an angel from heaven thus taught the shepherds, the first witnesses of the blessed incarnation; \textit{Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.\textsuperscript{10}} And what the angel delivered at present, that the prophet \textit{Isaiah}, that old evangelist, foretold at distance. When the people which walked in darkness should see a great light; \textit{when unto us a child should be born, unto us a son should be given; then should they joy before God, according to the joy of harvest, and...}

---

\textsuperscript{1} Τί λέγει πάλιν Μωσής τῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ τοῦ Ναοῦ νῦν, ἐπέθει αὐτῷ τοῦτο ὄνομα ὡστε προφητή; \textit{Iva μόνον ἀκούσῃ πᾶς λαός, ὅτι πάντα ὁ Πατὴρ φανερός περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ [αὐτοῦ] Ἰησοῦ. \textit{[Ἑκροέ Μωσῆς] τῷ νῦν Ναοῦ καὶ ἐπέδιψε τοῦτο ὄνομα ὡστε ἐπηκύψα κατά σκοπον τῆς γῆς. [καὶ ἔλεγε] Λάβε βιβλίαν τῆς τὰς χείρας σου, καὶ γράψον ὁ λέγει Κόριος: Οὐ ἐκ βίων ἑκάτεροι πάντα τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Μαλακά ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ [Ἰησοῦς] ἐπὶ συνάθροισιν τῶν ἡμερῶν. \textit{Οἱ δὲ [Ἰσ. Ἰδα] πάλιν Ἰησοῦς φῶν ὁ νῦς αὐθάραστοι [Ναοῦ], ἀλλὰ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῷ πρὸ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς. \textit{—Barnabas Epist. cap. 12.}}

\textsuperscript{2} Luke i. 69, 71.

\textsuperscript{3} Acts iv. 12.

\textsuperscript{4} 1 John iii. 23, 24.

\textsuperscript{5} 1 Tim. ii. 5.

\textsuperscript{6} Matt. iii. 17.

\textsuperscript{7} Rev. xix. 13.

\textsuperscript{8} Col. i. 20.

\textsuperscript{9} Luke ii. 10, 11.
as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. When God shall come with recompense, when he shall come and save us; then the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Sion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads.\(^1\)

Thirdly, the belief in Jesus ought to inflame our affection, to kindle our love toward him, engaging us to hate all things in respect of him, that is, so far as they are in opposition to him, or pretend to equal share of affection with him. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me, saith our Saviour;\(^2\) so forbidding all prelation of any natural affection, because our spiritual union is far beyond all such relations. Nor is a higher degree of love only debarred us, but any equal pretension is as much forbidden. If any man come to me, saith the same Christ, and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.\(^3\) Is it not this Jesus in whom the love of God is demonstrated to us, and that in so high a degree as is not expressible by the pen of man? God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son.\(^4\) Is it not he who showed his own love to us far beyond all possibility of parallel? for greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends: but while we were yet sinners, that is, enemies, Christ died for us,\(^5\) and so became our Jesus. Shall thus the Father show his love in his Son? shall thus the Son show his love in himself? and shall we no way study a requital? or is there any proper return of love but love? The voice of the church, in the language of Solomon, is, My love:\(^6\) nor was that only the expression of a spouse, but of Ignatius,\(^7\) a man, after the apostles, most remarkable. And whosoever considereth the infinite benefits to the sons of men flowing from the actions and sufferings of their Saviour, cannot choose but conclude with St. Paul, If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha.\(^8\)

Lastly, the confession of faith in Jesus is necessary to breed in us a correspondent esteem of him, and an absolute obedience to him, that we may be raised to the true temper of St. Paul, who counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord, for whom he suffered the loss of all things, and counted them but dung, that he might win Christ.\(^9\) Nor can we pretend to any true love of Jesus, except we be sensible of the readiness of our obedience to him: as knowing what language he

---

1. Isai. ix. 6, 3; xxxv. 4, 10. 2. Matt. x. 37. 3. Luke xiv. 26. 4. John iii. 16. 5. John xv. 13; Rom. v. 8. 6. Canticles ii. 7; iii. 5; viii. 4. 7. ὃς ἐμοὶ ἐρώτες ἐσταῦρωσεν... 8. 1 Cor. xvi. 22. 9. Phil. iii. 8.
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used to his disciples, If ye love me keep my commandments; 1 and what the apostle of his bosom spake, This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments. 2 His own disciples once marvelled, and said, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him? 3 How much more should we wonder at all disobedient Christians, saying, What manner of men are these, who refuse obedience unto him whom the senseless creatures, the winds and the sea, obeyed? Was the name of Jesus at first sufficient to cast out devils; and shall man be more refractory than they? 4 Shall the exorcist say to the evil spirit, I adjure thee by the name of Jesus, 5 and the devil give place? Shall an apostle speak unto us in the same name, and we refuse? Shall they obey that name, which signifieth nothing unto them; for he took not on him the nature of angels, and so is not their Saviour? and can we deny obedience unto him, who took on him the seed of Abraham, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross, 6 for us, that he might be raised to full power and absolute dominion over us, and by that power be enabled at last to save us, and in the mean time to rule and govern us, and exact the highest veneration from us? For God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. 7

8.—Having thus declared the original of the name Jesus, the means and ways by which he which bare it expressed fully the utmost signification of it; we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian easily understand what it is he says, when he makes his confession in these words, I believe in Jesus: which may be not unfitly in this manner described. I believe not only that there is a God who made the world; but I acknowledge and profess that I am fully persuaded of this, as of a certain and infallible truth, that there was and is a man, whose name by the ministry of an angel was called Jesus, of whom, particularly Josuah, the first of that name, and all the rest of the judges and saviours of Israel, were but types. I believe that Jesus, in the highest and utmost importance of that name, to be the Saviour of the world; inasmuch as he hath revealed to the sons of men the only way for the salvation of their souls, and wrought the same way out for them by the virtue of his blood, obtaining remission for sinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives; and shall at last himself actually confer the same salvation, which he hath promulged and procured, upon all those which unfeignedly and stedfastly believe in him. I

John xlv. 15. 2 1 John v. 3. 3 Matt. viii. 27. 4 Mark ix. 38; Luke ix. 49
5 Acts xix. 13. 6 Phil. ii. 8. 7 Phil. ii. 9, 10.
acknowledge there is no other way to heaven beside that which he hath shown us, there is no other means which can procure it for us but his blood, there is no other person which shall confer it on us but himself. And with this full acknowledgment, I believe in Jesus.

CHAPTER II.

And in Jesus Christ.

HAVING thus explained the proper name of our saviour, Jesus, we come unto that title of his office usually joined with his name, which is therefore the more diligently to be examined, because the Jews, who always acknowledge him to be Jesus, ever denied him to be Christ, and agreed together, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.

2.—For the full explication of this title, it will be necessary, first, to deliver the signification of the word; secondly, to show upon what grounds the Jews always expected a Christ or Messias; thirdly, to prove that the Messias promised to the Jews is already come; fourthly, to demonstrate that our Jesus is that Messias; and fifthly, to declare in what that unction, by which Jesus is Christ, doth consist, and what are the proper effects thereof. Which five particulars being clearly discussed, I cannot see what should be wanting for a perfect understanding that Jesus is Christ.

For the first, we find in the scriptures two several names, Messias and Christ, but both of the same signification; as appeareth by the speech of the woman of Samaria, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ; and more plainly by what Andrew spake unto his brother Simon, We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ. Messias in the Hebrew tongue, Christ in the Greek. Messias, the language of Andrew and the woman of

1 *'Iouvdaioi yaf kata'deXontai to evai avton 

2 Ἰησοῦς, to de kai Χριστὸν εἶνας τοῦτον,

3 ō'κετή.—S. CRYL. Catech. 10.

4 4 John ix. 22. 3 John iv. 25. 4 John i. 41.

5 Συγγονε, Μεσσιάν σοφόν εὐρομεν, δε Θεὸς

6 Ανέγραφη Ιουδαίωσιν ἀκούεται Ἐλλάδι

8 6 From Ησούς "uxit," in the Hebrew

7 

8 "unctus," in the Syrian

9 Μεσσιάς —in the Greek by changing η into σο, by omitting ν, a guttural not fit for their pronunciation, and by adding κ, as their ordinary termination, Μεσσίας. That this was the Greek Χριστός, and the Latin "Christus," is evident; and yet the Latins living at a distance, strangers to the customs of the Jews, and the doctrine of the Christians, mistook this name, and called him Christus, from the Greek Χριστός. So Suetonius in his Life of Claudius, cap. 25: "Judaeos impulsore Christo assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit." Which was not only
Samaria, who spake in Syria; Christ, the interpretation of St. John, who wrote his gospel in the Greek, as the most general

"quod potat," but "quod potabile est?" &c. χριστόν is not that which receiveth oil, but that which is received by inunction. So then the Scholast upon Aristophanes: 'Τῶν φαρμάκων μᾶλλον έστι καταπλαστά, τὰ δὲ χριστά, τὰ δὲ ποτά. And the Scholast of Theocritus: Ι’στεν οί τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μὲν είσὶν χριστά, έγών, έπερ άραιμεθα είς θεραπείαν τὰ δὲ ποτά, έγών, έπερ πίνουμεν τὰ δὲ έπίπαστα, έγών, έπερ έπιπάτομεν.—Idyl. xi. 1. So that χριστάν in his judgment is the same with εξχρίστον in Theocritus:

Οὔδεν ποτόν έρωτα πεφύκει δάφμακον ἄλλον, Νικία, ου’ εξχριστόν, εἶμι δοκεί, οὐ’ έπιπάστορος.

In the same sense with Ἑσχύλιος did Euripides use χριστόν φαρμάκων:

Πότερα δὲ χριστόν η ποτόν το φαρμάκον;

—Hippol. 516.

And not only those ancient poets, but even the later orators; as Dion Chrysostomus: Πολὺ γάρ χειρόν καί δεινόβαρεν σώματος καί νοσουτοῦ ψυχή δεινόβαρην, μα Δι’, οὐχ ύπό φαρμάκων χριστόν ή ποτῶν.—Orat. 75. And the LXX. have used it in this sense; as when the Hebrew speaks of τὸ αὐτόν ἐγνάων τὸ χριστόν ἑαυτῷ: "Oleum unctionis," they translate it, τοῦ ἐπικεφαλέαν εἰς τὴν κεφαλὰν τοῦ έλαίου τοῦ χριστοῦ. Lev. xxii. 19; and again, verse 12: "ολέον;" "Οτι τὸ αὐτόν ἐγνάων τὸ χριστόν ἑαυτῷ. "Oleum unctionis" then is ελαίου χριστοῦ, which, in Exod. xxii. 7 and xxix. 15; and xli. 8, the same translators, εκτός της Hebrew phrase, call ἐλαίου χριστοῦ, and more frequently ἐλαιόν χριστοῦ. The place of Sophocles is something doubtful:—

Οθεν μάλα παναμέρος Τάς πειθεῖν παγχρήτω Συγκραθείς ἐπί προφάεις θηρῆ.

—Tract. 660.

For though the Scholast take it in the ordinary sense: Π α. χ. ρ. τ. ρ. λέπει τό πέπωλων, έγών τον χριστιείτω πέπωλον, συγκεκριμένος καί αρμοσμείς της πειθος τον θηρός; yet both of these words before it, and συγκραθείς after seem to incline to the former sense; p. 351; and in the next page ἀρτίχριστον is clearly attributed to the ointment:—

Τό φαρμάκον τούτ’ άπουρον, αὐτίκος τ’ άδει Θερίμης ἄδεικτον, ἐν μνησις σώζει εἰκέ.

"Εσω αν αρτίχριστον αρμοσμάτι του.

—Ibid. 685.

From whence Délainra says presentily, "ἐκχύστα μαλλό. But though it appear from hence that the first use of the word χριστόν among the Greeks was to signify the act or matter used inunction, not the subject or person anointed; yet in the vulgar accension of the LXX. it was most constantly received for the person anointed, of the same validity with χριστοὺς or κεχρισμεῖος. (Suidas, Χριστός, έ
language in those days: and the signification of them both is, the
Anointed. St. Paul and the rest of the apostles, writing in that
language, used the Greek name, which the Latinis did retain, calling
him constantly Christus; and we in English have retained the
same, as universally naming him Christ.

3.—Nor is this yet the full interpretation of the word, which is
to be understood not simply according to the action only, but as
it involved the design in the custom of anointing. For in the
law whatsoever was anointed was thereby set apart, as ordained
to some special use or office: and therefore under the notion of
unction we must understand that promotion and ordination. Jacob
poured oil on the top of a pillar,¹ and that anointing was the con
secration of it. Moses anointed the tabernacle and all the vessels,
and this anointing was their dedication. Hence the priest that is
anointed signifieth, in the phrase of Moses, the high priest, because
he was invested in that office at and by his unction.² When, there¬
fore, Jesus is called the Messias or Christ, and that so long after
the anointing oil had ceased, it signifieth no less than a person set
apart by God, anointed with most sacred oil, advanced to the
highest office, of which all those employments under the law, in
the obtaining of which oil was used, were but types and shadows.
And this may suffice for the signification of the word.

4.—That there was among the Jews an expectation of such a
Christ to come, is most evident. The woman of Samaria could
speak with confidence, I know that Messias cometh.³ And the un¬
believing Jews, who will not acknowledge that he is already come,
expect him still. Thus we find all men musing in their hearts of
John, whether he were the Christ or not.⁴ When Jesus taught in the
temple, those which doubted said, When Christ cometh, no man
knoweth whence he is: those which believed said, When Christ
cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath
done?⁵ Whether therefore they doubted, or whether they believed

¹ κεχρυσάτων ἐν ἑλαιῷ, as also with ἢλειμενός. For though Lactantius in the place fore¬
cited seem to think that word an improper version of the Hebrew מְשַׁחַת, "Unde in qui¬
busdam Graecis scripturis, quis male de Hebrews interpretata sunt, ἢλειμενός, id est, unquemto curatus, scriptum inventur, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλλεϑεσθαι," yet the LXX. have so tran¬
slated it, Num. iii. 3: Οἱ ἰερεῖς οἱ ἢλειμενοὶ. And although Athenaeus hath observed, Τῶν
μύρων τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ χρίσματα, τὰ δὲ ἀλείμματα: yet in the vulgar use of the words there is no
difference, as he himself speaks a little after: Τὸ δὲ χρίσμα ἀν συνοικίων ἀλείμματα μυρί¬
σασθαι εἰρήκεν. And Plutarch, Sympos. lib. iii. cap. 4: Πέθον παρὰ τῶν ἐτί συναιστα¬
μένων γυναικῶν ὑπὸ μύρων ἢλειμιμένων ἡ ἑλαιὸν ἀναπίπτειν τῷ αὐτῶ τοῦ χρισμο¬
tos ἐν τῷ συγκαθεδρεῖν. So Isidius: ἀλειψάτω, ἐλαῖῳ χρίσαται. Κεχρυσάτων, ἢλειμε¬
μένα. Ἀλειψή, χρίσαται. Schol. Πομ.: Χρι¬
σάμενα, ἢλειψάμενα.—Odys. Z. And Suidas,
'Ἡλαίμηδρε, ἢρωδήμεν. Hence Eustathius: 'Ηστεν καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώποιν καὶ νοῦν τὸν τὸ
τῆρον, καὶ τοῦ ἀλείφον τὸ μὲν χρίνα παρὰ
τῶν χρῶν ἀλείφον δὲ χρίται, τὸ δὲ ἀλείφο
παρὰ τὸ ἀλείφ.—Odys. Z. So Eusebius: Ὁρί¬
tον ταξίν Ἰησοῦν αὐτὸν γεγονότα ἐλαῖον, οὐ τῆς
ἐς ἀλλὰ σωμάτων, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐνθεύ τῆς ἀγίας
λαίμενος ἢλειμένον παραστάτη.—Hist. Eccles.
lib. i. cap. 3. Ἰησους οὖν, in the vulgar
sense of the LXX., is "a person anointed," and
in that sense is our Saviour called "Christ."
In Jesus, they all expected a Christ to come; and the greater their opinion was of him, the more they believed he was that Messias. Many of the people said, Of a truth this is the prophet; others said, This is the Christ.1 As soon as John began to baptize, the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, Who art thou?2 that is, whether he were the Christ, or no, as appeareth out of his answer, And he confessed and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ. For as they asked him after, What then? art thou Elias? and he said, I am not: Art thou that prophet? and he answered, No:3 So without question their first demand was,4 Art thou the Christ? and he answered, I am not. From whence it clearly appeareth that there was a general expectation among the Jews of a Messias to come; nor only so, but it was always counted among them an article of their faith,5 which all were obliged to believe who professed the law of Moses, and whosoever denied that, was thereby interpreted to deny the law and the prophets. Wherefore it will be worth our inquiry to look into the grounds upon which they built that expectation.

5.—It is most certain that the Messias was promised by God, both before and under the law. God said unto Abraham, In Isaac shall thy seed be called:6 and we know that was a promise of a Messias to come, because St. Paul hath taught us, Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, unto seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.7 The Lord said unto Moses, I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee.8 And St. Peter hath sufficiently satisfied us, that this prophet promised to Moses is Jesus the Christ.9 Many are the prophecies which concern him, many the promises which are made of him: but yet some of them very obscure; others, though plainer, yet have relation only to the person, not to the notion or the word Messias. Wheresoever he is spoken of as the Anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person; except one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold to be cut off:10 and yet even there the Greek translation hath not the Messias, but the Unction. It may therefore seem something strange, how so universal an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the Messias should be spread through the church of the Jews.

6.—But if we consider that in the space of seventy years of the Babylonish captivity the ordinary Jews had lost the exact under:

---

standing of the old Hebrew language before spoken in Judæa, and therefore when the scriptures were read unto them, they found it necessary to interpret them to the people in the Chaldee language, which they had lately learned: as when Ezra the scribe brought the book of the law of Moses before the congregation, the Levites are said to have caused the people to understand the law, because they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.\(^1\) Which constant interpretation begat at last a Chaldee translation of the Old Testament to be read every sabbath in the synagogues: and that being not exactly made word for word with the Hebrew, but with a liberty of a brief exposition by the way, took in, together with the text, the general opinion of the learned Jews. By which means it came to pass that not only the doctrine, but the name also, of the Messias was very frequent and familiar with them. Insomuch that even in the Chaldee paraphrase now extant there is express mention of the Messias in above seventy places, beside that of Daniel. The Jews then informed by the plain words of Daniel,\(^2\) instructed by a constant interpretation of the law and the prophets, read in their synagogues every sabbath-day, relying upon the infallible predictions and promises of God, did all unanimously expect out of their own nation, of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David, a Messias, or a Christ, to come.

Now this being granted, as it cannot be denied, our next consideration is of the time in which this promise was to be fulfilled: which we shall demonstrate out of the scriptures to be past, and consequently that the promised Messias is already come. The prediction of Jacob on his death-bed is clear and pregnant, The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to him shall the gathering of the people be.\(^5\) But the sceptre is departed from Judah, neither is there one lawgiver left between his feet. Therefore Shiloh, that is, the Messias, is already come. That the Jewish government hath totally failed, is not without the greatest folly to be denied: and therefore that Shiloh is already come, except we should deny the truth of divine predictions, must be granted. There remains, then, nothing to be proved, but that by Shiloh is to be understood the Messias: which is sufficiently manifest both from the consent of the ancient Jews, and from the description immediately added to the name. For all the old paraphrasts call him expressly the

---

1 Neh. viii. 8.
2 Celsus the Epicurean acknowledged that both the Jews and Christians did confess that the prophets did foretell a Saviour of the world. Οίος ἦν τῆς σημείων ἐν τῷ Και καὶ Χριστιανῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐγγίζεις:
3 Gen.lix. 10.
Messias, and the words which follow, to him shall the gathering of the people be, speak no less; as giving an explication of his person, office, or condition, who was but darkly described in the name of Shiloh. For this is the same character by which he was signified unto Abraham; In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: by which he is deciphered in Isaiah; In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious: and in Micah, The mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it. And thus the blessing of Judah is plainly intelligible: Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies, thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Thou shalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother Reuben, and by virtue thereof shalt rule over the rest of the tribes; the government shall be upon thy shoulders, and all thy brethren shall be subject unto thee. And that you may understand this blessing is not to expire until it make way for a greater, know that this government shall not fail, until there come a son out of your loins who shall be far greater than yourself: for whereas your dominion reacheth only over your brethren, and so is confined unto the tribes of Israel; his kingdom shall be universal, and all nations of the earth shall serve him. Being then this Shiloh is so described in the text, and acknowledged by the ancient Jews to be the Messias; being God had promised by Jacob the government of Israel should not fail until Shiloh came; being that government is visibly and undeniably already failed: it followeth inevitably, that the Messias is already come.

In the same manner the prophet Malachy hath given an express signification of the coming of the Messias while the temple stood. Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in. And Haggai yet more clearly; Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts.

1 For, instead of שילה ב in the Jerusalem Targum and Jonathan and the Jewish Targum and the Cabalists did generally so interpret it, because שילה הסיות KIMCHI, Onkelos renders it שילה שביתת מも多いות ויהי: And in the Talmud, Cod. Sanhedrim, Rabbi Johanan asking what was the name of the Messias, they of the school of R. Schia answerd, "His name is Shiloh according to that which is written, Until Shiloh come:" 2 Isai. xi. 10. 3 Micah iv. 1. 4 Gen. xlix. 8. 5 Mal. iii. 1.
The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the glory of the former, saith the Lord of hosts. It is then most evident from these predictions, that the Messias was to come while the second temple stood. It is as certain that the second temple is not now standing. Therefore except we contradict the veracity of God, it cannot be denied but the Messias is already come. Nothing can be objected to enervate this argument, but that these prophecies concern not the Messias; and yet the ancient Jews confessed they did, and that they do so cannot be denied. For, first, those titles, the angel of the covenant, the delight of the Israelites, the desire of all nations, are certain and known characters of the Christ to come. And secondly, it cannot be conceived how the glory of the second temple should be greater than the glory of the first, without the coming of the Messias to it. For the Jews themselves have observed that five signs of the divine glory were in the first temple, which were wanting to the second: as the Urim and Thummim, by which the high priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God; the ark of the covenant, from whence God gave his answers by a clear and audible voice; the fire upon the altar, which came down from heaven, and immediately consumed the sacrifice; the divine presence or habitation with them, represented by a visible appearance, or given, as it were, to the king and high priest by anointing with the oil of unction; and, lastly, the spirit of prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the prophetical office were indued. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure or building of it, as appeared by the tears dropped from those eyes which had beheld the former, (For many of the priests and Levites, and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice); and by those words which God commanded Haggai to speak to the people for the introducing of this prophecy, Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing? Being then the structure of the second temple was so far inferior to the first, being all those signs of the divine glory were wanting in it with which the former was adorned; the glory of it can no other way be imagined greater, than by the coming of him into it in whom all those signs of the divine glory were far more eminently contained: and this person alone is the Messias. For he was to be the glory of the people Israel, yea even of the God of Israel; he the Urim and Thummim, by whom the will of God, as by a greater oracle, was revealed; he the true ark of the covenant,

1 Haggai ii. 6, 7, 9.  
2 Ezra iii. 12.  
3 Haggai ii. 3.
the only propitiatory by his blood; he which was to baptize with
the Holy Ghost and with fire, the true fire which came down from
heaven; he which was to take up his habitation in our flesh, and
to dwell among us, that we might behold his glory; he who
received the Spirit without measure, and from whose fulness we
do all receive. In him were all those signs of the divine glory
united, which were thus divided in the first temple; in him
they were all more eminently contained than in those; therefore
his coming to the second temple was, as the sufficient, so the only
means by which the glory of it could be greater than the glory of
the first. If, then, the Messias was to come while the second
temple stood, as appeareth by God's prediction and promise;
if that temple many ages since hath ceased to be, there being not
one stone left upon a stone; if it certainly were before the
destruction of it in greater glory than ever the former was; if no
such glory could accrue unto it but by the coming of the Messias:
then is that Messias already come.

7.—Having thus demonstrated out of the promises given to the
Jews, that the Messias who was so promised unto them must be
already come, because those events which were foretold to follow
his coming are already past; we shall proceed unto the next par-
ticular, and prove that the man Jesus, in whom we believe, is that
Messias who was promised. First, it is acknowledged both by the
Jew and Gentile, that this Jesus was born in Judea, and lived and
died there, before the commonwealth of Israel was dispersed,
between the second temple was destroyed; that is, at the very time
when the prophets foretold the Messias should come. And there
was no other beside him that did with any show of probability
pretend to be, or was accepted as, the Messias. Therefore we must
confess he was, and only he could be, the Christ.

Secondly, all other prophecies belonging to the Messias were
fulfilled in Jesus, whether we look upon the family, the place, or
the manner of his birth; neither were they ever fulfilled in any
person beside him: he then is, and no other can be, the Messias.
That he was to come out of the tribe of Judah and family of David,
is everywhere manifest. The Jews, which mention Messias as a
son of Joseph or of Ephraim, do not deny, but rather dignify, the
son of David or of Judah, whom they confess to be the greater

1 The Jews have invented a double Messias: to one they attribute all those places which
mention his low estate and sufferings; to the
other, such as speak of his power and glory. The one they style
משה ובו ימי הימים: The son of Joseph
they name also the son of Ephraim, and the
Son of David the son of Judah: as the Targum,
Canticles iv. 5: "Thy two breasts are like
two young roes." ויהי ויוו ולי ימי הימים: "Two are
thy redeemers, Messias the Son of David and
Messias: the Son of Ephraim;"
Christ. There sha.\(i\) come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse,\(^1\) and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, saith the prophet Isaiah. And again, In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious.\(^2\) Now who was it but Jesus of whom the elders spake, Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David?\(^3\) who but he said, I am the root and offspring of David, and the bright and morning star?\(^4\) The Jews did all acknowledge it, as appears by the question of our Saviour, How say the scribes that Christ is the son of David? What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David:\(^5\) and that of the people, amazed at the seeing of the blind, and speaking of the dumb, Is not this the son of David? The blind cried out unto him, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on us; and the multitude cried, Hosanna to the son of David.\(^6\) The genealogy of Jesus shows his family: the first words of the gospel are, The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David.\(^7\) The prophecy therefore was certainly fulfilled in respect of his lineage; for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah.\(^8\)

Beside, if we look upon the place where the Messias was to be born, we shall find that Jesus by a particular act of providence was born there. When Herod gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea.\(^9\) The people doubted whether Jesus was the Christ, because they thought he had been born in Galilee, where Joseph and Mary lived; wherefore they said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? hath not the scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?\(^10\) That place of scripture which they meant was cited by the scribes to Herod, according to the interpretation then current among the Jews, and still preserved in the Chaldee paraphrase.\(^11\) For thus it is written in the prophet, And thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel.\(^12\) This prediction was most manifestly and remarkably fulfilled in the birth of Jesus, when by the
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1 Which the Chaldee Paraphrase thus translates:  
2 Rev. v. 5.  
3 Rev. xxii. 16.  
4 Mark xii 35; Matt. xxii. 42.  
5 Matt. xii. 23; Is. 27; xxxi. 9.  
7 Matt. ii. 1.  
8 John vii. 41, 42.  
9 Which expressly translateth it thus:  
10 Matt. ii. 5.  
11 So Rabbi Solomon and Kimchi:  
12 So Rabbi Solomon and Abartanel.
providence of God it was so ordered that Augustus should then tax the world, to which end every one should go up into his own city. Whereupon Joseph and Mary his espoused wife left Nazareth of Galilee, their habitation, and went into Bethlehem of Judæa, the city of David, there to be taxed, because they were of the house and lineage of David. And while they were there, as the days of the Virgin Mary were accomplished, so the prophecy was fulfilled; for there she brought forth her first-born Son; and so unto us was born that day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

But if we add unto the family and place the manner of his birth, also foretold, the argument must necessarily appear conclusive. The prophet Isaiah spake thus unto the house of David; The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. What nativity could be more congruous to the greatness of a Messias than that of a virgin, which is most miraculous? what name can be thought fitter for him than that of Immanuel, God with us, whose land Judæa is said to be? The Immanuel then thus born of a virgin was without question the true Messias. And we know Jesus was thus born of the blessed Virgin Mary, that it might be fulfilled which was thus spoken of the Lord by the prophet. Wherefore being all the prophecies concerning the family, place and manner of the birth of the Messias were fulfilled in Jesus, and not so much as pretended to be accomplished in any other; it is again from hence apparent that this Jesus is the Christ.

Thirdly, he which taught what the Messias was to teach, did what the Messias was to do, suffered what the Messias was to suffer, and by suffering obtained all which a Messias could obtain, must be a knowledge of necessity to be the true Messias. But all this is manifestly true of Jesus. Therefore we must confess he is the Christ. For first, it cannot be denied but the Messias was promised as a prophet and teacher of the people. So God promised him to Moses; I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee. So Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea have expressed him, as we shall hereafter have farther occasion to show. And not only so, but as a greater prophet, and more perfect doctor, than ever any was which preceded him, more universal than they all. I have put my spirit upon him, saith God: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, and the isles shall wait for his law. Now it is as evident that Jesus of Nazareth was the most perfect prophet, the Prince
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and Lord of all the prophets, doctors, and pastors, which either preceded or succeeded him. For he hath revealed unto us the most perfect will of God both in his precepts and his promises. He hath delivered the same after the most perfect manner, with the greatest authority; not like Moses and the prophets, saying, *Thus saith the Lord,* but *I say unto you;* nor like the interpreters of Moses, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes:1 with the greatest perspicuity, not, as those before him, under types and shadows, but plainly and clearly; from whence both he and his doctrine is frequently called light: with the greatest universality, as preaching that gospel which is to unite all the nations of the earth into one church, that there might be one shepherd and one flock. Whatevery then that great prophet the Messias was to teach, that Jesus taught; and whatsoever works he was to do, those Jesus did.

When John the Baptist had heard the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples with this message to him, *Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?*2 And Jesus returned this answer unto him, showing the ground of that message, the works of Christ, was a sufficient resolution of the question sent; *Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see:* The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up.3 And as Jesus alleged the works which he wrought to be a sufficient testimony that he was the Messias; so did those Jews acknowledge it, who said, *When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man doth?*4 And Nicodemus, a ruler among them, confessed little less: *Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.*5 Great and many were the miracles which Moses and the rest of the prophets wrought for the ratification of the law, and the demonstration of God’s constant presence with his people; and yet all those wrought by so many several persons, in the space of above three thousand years, are far short of those which this one Jesus did perform within the compass of three years. The ambitious diligence of the Jews hath reckoned up seventy-six miracles for Moses, and seventy-four for all the rest of the prophets: and supposing that they were so many (though indeed they were not) how few are they in respect of those which are written of our Saviour! how inconsiderable, if compared with all which he wrought! when St. John testifieth with as great certainty of truth as height of hyperbole, that there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be

1 Matt. v. often; vii. 29.  2 Matt. xi. 2, 3.  3 Matt. xi. 4, 5.  4 John vii. 31  5 John iii. 2.
written every one, he supposed that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Nor did our Saviour excel all others in the number of his miracles only, but in the power of working. Whatsoever miracle Moses wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else, consulting with God, received it by command from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as immanent or inhering in him. Whereas this power must of necessity be in Jesus, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and to whom the Father had given to have life in himself. This he sufficiently showed by working with a word, by commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, and the dead to rise: by working without a word or any intervenient sign; as when the woman which had an issue of blood twelve years touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up by the virtue which flowed out from the greater fountain of his power. And lost this example should be single, we find that the men of Gennesaret, the people out of all Judaea and Jerusalem, and from the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon, even the whole multitude sought to touch him; for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all. Once indeed Christ seemed to have prayed, before he raised Lazarus from the grave; but even that was done because of the people which stood by; not that he had not power within himself to raise up Lazarus, who was afterward to raise himself; but that they might believe the Father had sent him. The immanency and inherency of this power in Jesus is evident in this, that he was able to communicate it to whom he pleased, and actually did confer it upon his disciples: Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy. Upon the apostles: Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give. Upon the first believers: These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils. He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do. He then which did more actions divine and powerful than Moses and all the prophets ever did, he which performed them in a manner far more divine than that by which they wrought, hath done all which can be expected the Messias, foretold by them, should do.

Nor hath our Jesus only done, but suffered, all which the Messias was to suffer. For we must not with the Jews deny a suffering Christ, or fondly of our own invention make a double Messias, one to suffer, and another to reign. It is clear enough by the prophet
On the Creed.

Isaias what his condition was to be, whom he calls the servant of God:⁴ and the later Jews cannot deny but their fathers constantly understood that place of the Messias.⁵

Now the sufferings of Christ spoken of by the prophet may be reduced to two parts: one in respect of contempt, by which he was despised of men; the other in respect of his death, and all those indignities and pains which preceded and led unto it. For the first, the prophet hath punctually described his condition, saying, He hath no form or comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men.³ He seems to describe a personage no way amiable, an aspect indeed rather uncomely:⁴ and so the most ancient writers have interpreted Isaias, and confessed the fulfilling of it in the body of our Saviour.⁵ But what the aspect of

---

¹ Isai, lii. 13.
² For, first, instead of those words, “Behold, my servant shall deal prudently;” the Targum hath it plainly: Behold, my servant the Messias shall prosper. And Solomon Jarchi on the place: “Our Rabbinis understand this of the Messias.” And the reason which he renders of their interpretation is very observable. “For they say,” says he, “that the Messias is stricken, as it is written, He took our infirmities, and bare our griefs;” which are the words of the 4th verse of the 53d chapter. From whence we may perceive how the ancient Jews did join the latter part of the 52d chapter with the 53d, and expound them of the same person. Besides, he cites a certain “Midrash,” or Gloss, which attributes the same verse to the Messias, and that is to be found in “Bereschi Rabba,” upon Gen. xxvii. 10, where, falling upon that place in Zech. iv. 7. “What art thou, O great mountain, before Zemubbabel?” he answers: “That great mountain is the Messias.” Then, asking again, “Why doth he call the Messias a great mountain?” he gives this answer, because he is greater than the fathers, as it is written, “Behold, my servant shall understand;” that is, the Messias; which are the words of the verse before cited. And the same “Bereschi Rabba,” upon Gen. xxvii. 10, saith, Moses the King was in the generation of the wicked; that he gave himself to seek for mercies for Israel, and to fasting and humbling himself for them, as it is written; and so produceth the words of Isaiah lii. 5. From whence it appears again, that the author thereof interpreted both the chapters of the same Messias. And farther it is observable, that the “Midrash” upon Ruth ii. 14 expounds the same verse in the same manner. And Rabbi Moses Abshech speaks yet more fully of the consent of the ancient Jewish doctors upon this place: Behold, our doctors of happy memory conclude with one mouth, as they have received from their ancestors, that this is spoken of the Messias.” From hence it appears, that it was originally the general sense of the Jews, that all that piece of Isaiah is a description of the Messias; and consequently that the apostles cannot be blamed by them now for applying it to Christ; and that the modern Jews may well be suspected to frame their contrary expulsions out of a wilful opposition to Christianity.
³ Isai, lii. 2, 3.
⁴ The first לְאַמָּן seems to signify no less, as being from the root, לַהֲמוּן which signifies “to form, figure, fashion, or delineate:” from whence the noun, attributed to any person, signifieth the feature, complexion, shape, or composition of the body. as Rachel was לְאַמָּן הנָּפוּר “form of pulchritude,” Gen. xxix. 17; and so Joseph לְאַמָּן נַפְּשִׁים Gen. xxxix. 6. So Abigail and Esther, and in general, Deut. xxii. 11, with an addition of fair added to לְאַמָּן, whereas David is called, without such addition, לְאַמָּן נַפְּשִׁים but with the full signification, as מֵאַמָּה אֲנַגְּדוּ תָּוָא לְאַמָּן. In Judges viii. 18, לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת אִלָּכְנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת לְאַמָּת נִכְּלֶנֶת L.⁵ Ets. The Messias was to be a king, whose external form and personage spake no such majesty. As Justin Martyr: Οἱ μὲν εἰρήνης εἰς τὴν πρώτην παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἡ και ἀπόκρυπτος, καὶ κεφαλής, καὶ θυσίας καθαρισθήσωσι κεκρυμμένοις ἐστίν.—Diad. cum Tryph. § 14.
And in Jesus Christ.

his outward appearance was, because the scriptures are sacred, we cannot now know: and it is enough that we are assured the state and condition of his life was in the eye of the Jews without honour and inglorious. For though, being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: yet he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant.1 For thirty years he

1 Phil. ii. 6, 7.
lived wit: his mother Mary, and Joseph his reputed father, of a mean profession, and was subject to them. When he left his mother's house and entered on his prophetic office, he passed from place to place, sometimes received into a house, other times lodging in the fields: for while the foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, the Son of man had not where to lay his head. From this low estate of life and condition, seemingly inglorious, arose in the Jews a neglect of his works and contempt of his doctrine. Is not this the carpenter's son? nay farther, Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary? and they were offended at him. Thus was it fulfilled in him, he was despised and rejected of men, and they esteemed him not.

This contempt of his personage, condition, doctrine, and works, was by degrees raised to hatred, detestation, and persecution to a cruel and ignominious death. All which if we look upon in the gross, we must acknowledge it fulfilled in him to the highest degree imaginable, that he was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief. But if we compare the particular predictions with the historical passages of his sufferings—if we join the prophets and evangelists together—it will most manifestly appear the Messias was to suffer nothing which Christ hath not suffered. If Zachary say they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver; St. Matthew will show that Judas sold Jesus at the same rate: for the chief priests covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. If Isaiah say that he was wounded; if Zachary, they shall look upon me whom they have pierced; if the prophet David yet more particularly, they pierced my hands and my feet; the evangelist will show how he was fastened to the cross, and Jesus himself the print of the nails. If the Psalmist tell us, they should laugh him to scorn, and shake their head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him; St. Matthew will describe the same action, and the same expression: for they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him; for he said, I am the Son of God. Let David say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? and the Son of David will show in whose person the father spake it, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani. Let Isaiah foretell, he was numbered with the transgressors; and you shall find him crucified between two thieves, one on his right hand, the other on
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his left. Read in the Psalmist, In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink; and you shall find in the evangelist, Jesus, that the scripture might be fulfilled, said, I thirst: and they took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. Read farther yet. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture; and, to fulfil the prediction, the soldiers shall make good the distinction, who took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part, and also his coat: now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be. Lastly, let the prophets teach us, that he shall be brought like a lamb to the slaughter, and be cut off out of the land of the living; all the evangelists will declare how like a lamb he suffered, and the very Jews will acknowledge that he was cut off. And now may we well conclude, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer; and what it so behoved him to suffer, that he suffixed.

Neither only in his passion but after his death all things were fulfilled in Jesus which were prophesied concerning the Messias. He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, saith the prophet of the Christ to come: and as the thieves were buried with whom he was crucified, so was Jesus, but laid in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathæa, an honourable counsellor. After two days will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up, saith Hoseah of the people of Israel: in whose language they were the type of Christ; and the third day Jesus rose from the dead. The Lord said unto my Lord, saith David, Sit thou at my right hand. Now David is not ascended into the heavens, and consequently cannot be set at the right hand of God; but Jesus is already ascended, and set down at the right hand of God: and so all the house of Israel might know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom they crucified, both Lord and Christ. For, he who taught whatsoever the Messias, promised by God, foretold by the prophets, expected by the people of God, was to teach: he who did all which that Messias was by virtue of that office to do; he which suffered all those pains and indignities which that Messias was to suffer; he to whom all things happened after his death, the period of his sufferings, which were according to the divine predictions to come to pass; he, I say, must infallibly be the true Messias. But Jesus alone taught, did, suffered, and obtained all

1 Mark xv. 27.  2 Psalm lxix. 21.  3 John xix. 28; Matt. xxvii. 48.  4 Psalm xxii. 18.  5 John xix. 23, 24.  6 Isa. lili. 7 & 8 Luke xxiv. 46.  7 Hos. vi. 2.  8 Acts ii. 26.  9 Hos. xi. 2.  10 Acts ii. 1.  11 Acts ii. 34.
these things, as we have showed. Therefore we may again infallibly conclude that our Jesus is the Christ.

8.—Fourthly, if it were the proper note and character of the Messias, that all nations should come in to serve him; if the doctrine of Jesus hath been preached and received in all parts of the world, according to that character so long before delivered; if it were absolutely impossible that the doctrine revealed by Jesus should have been so propagated as it hath been, had it not been divine; then must this Jesus be the Messias: and when we have proved these three particulars, we may safely conclude he is the Christ.

That all nations were to come in to the Messias, and so the distinction between the Jew and Gentile to cease at his coming, is the most universal description in all the prophecies. God speaks to him thus, as to his Son; Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. It was one greater than Solomon of whom these words were spoken, All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him. It shall come to pass in the last days, saith Isaiah, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And again, In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek. And in general, all the prophets were but instruments to deliver the same message, which Malachy concludes, from God: From the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts. Now being the bounds of Judaea were settled, being the promise of God was to bring all nations in at the coming of the Messias, being this was it which the Jews so much opposed, as loath to part from their ancient and peculiar privilege: he which actually wrought this work must certainly be the Messias: and that Jesus did it, is most evident.

That all nations did thus come in to the doctrine preached by Jesus, cannot be denied. For although he were not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; although of those many Israelites which believed on him while he lived, very few were left immediately after his death: yet when the apostles had received their commission from him: Go go teach all nations, and were
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endued with power from on high by the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost; the first day there was an accession of three thousand souls; immediately after we find the number of the men, beside women, was about five thousand; and still believers were more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. Upon the persecution at Jerusalem, they went through the regions of Judea, Galilee and Samaria, and so the gospel spread; insomuch that St. James, the bishop of Jerusalem, spake thus unto St. Paul, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands (or rather, how many myriads, that is, ten thousands) of the Jews there are which believe. Beside, how great was the number of the believing Jews, strangers scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, and the rest of the Roman provinces, will appear out of the Epistles of St. Peter, St. James, and St. John. And yet all these are nothing to the fulness of the Gentiles which came after. First, those which were before Gentile-worshippers, acknowledging the same God with the Jews, but not receiving the law: who had before abandoned their old idolatry, and already embraced the true doctrine of one God, and did confess the deity which the Jews did worship to be that only true God; but yet refused to be circumcised, and so to oblige themselves to the keeping of the whole law. Now the apostles preaching the same God with Moses, whom they all acknowledged, and teaching that circumcision and the rest of the legal ceremonies were now abrogated, which those men would never admit, they were with the greatest facility converted to the Christian faith. For being present at the synagogues of the Jews, and understanding much of the law, they were of all the Gentiles readiest to hear, and most capable of the arguments which the apostles produced out of the scriptures to prove that Jesus was the Christ. Thus many of the Greeks which came up to worship at Jerusalem, devout men out of every nation under heaven, not men of Israel, but yet, fearing God, did first embrace the Christian faith. After them the rest of the Gentiles left the idolatrous worship of their heathen gods, and in a short time in infinite multitudes received the gospel. How much did Jesus work by one St. Paul to the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed! How did he pass from Jerusalem round about through Phœnice, Syria, and Arabia, through Asia, Achaia and Macedonia, even to Illyricum, fully preaching the gospel of Christ! How far did others pass beside St. Paul, that he should speak even of his time, that the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven! Many were the nations, innumerable the people, which received the faith in
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they apostles' days: and in not many years after, notwithstanding millions were cut off in their bloody persecutions, yet did their numbers equalize half the Roman empire: and little above two ages after the death of the last apostle, the emperors of the world gave in their names to Christ, and submitted their sceptres to his laws, that the Gentiles might come to his light, and kings to the brightness of his rising; that kings might become the nursing fathers, and queens the nursing mothers, of the church.

From hence it came to pass, that according to all the predictions of the prophets, the one God of Israel, the maker of heaven and earth, was acknowledged through the world for the only true God: that the law given to Israel was taken for the true law of God, but as given to that people, and so to cease when they ceased to be a people; except the moral part thereof, which, as an universal rule common to all people, is still acknowledged for the law of God, given unto all, and obliging every man: that all the oracles of the heathen gods, in all places where Christianity was received, did presently cease, and all the idols, or the gods themselves, were rejected and condemned as spurious. For the Lord of hosts had spoken concerning those times expressly: It shall come to pass in that day, that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered: also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land.

9.—Now being this general reception of the gospel was so anciently, so frequently, foretold, being the same was so clearly and universally performed, even this might seem sufficient to persuade that Jesus is Christ. But lest any should not yet be fully satisfied, we shall further show, that it is impossible Jesus should have been so received for the true Messias, had he not been so; or that his doctrine, which teacheth him to be the Christ, should be admitted by all nations for divine, had it not been such.


2 Isai. ix. 3. 3 Isai. xlix. 23.

4 Zech. xiii. 2.
For whether we look upon the nature of the doctrine taught, the condition of the teachers of it, or the manner in which it was taught, it can no way seem probable that it should have had any such success, without the immediate working of the hand of God, acknowledging Jesus for his Son, the doctrine for his own, and the fulfilling by the hands of the apostles what he had foretold by the prophets.

As for the nature of the doctrine, it was no way likely to have any such success. For, first, it absolutely condemned all other religions, settled and corroborated by a constant succession of many ages, under which many nations and kingdoms, and especially at that time the Roman, had signally flourished. Secondly, it contained precepts far more ungrateful and troublesome to flesh and blood, and contrariant to the general inclination of mankind; as the abnegation of ourselves, the mortifying of the flesh, the love of our enemies, and the bearing of the cross. Thirdly, it enforced those precepts seemingly unreasonable, by such promises as were as seemingly incredible and unperceivable. For they were not of the good things of this world, or such as afford any complacency to our sense; but of such as cannot be obtained till after this life, and necessarily presuppose that which then seemed as absolutely impossible, the resurrection. Fourthly, it delivered certain predictions which were to be fulfilled in the persons of such as should embrace it, which seem sufficient to have kept most part of the world from listening to it, as dangers, losses, afflictions, tribulations, and, in sum, All that would live godly in Christ Jesus should suffer persecution.\(^1\)

If we look upon the teachers of this doctrine, there appeared nothing in them which could promise any success. The first revealer and promulger bred in the house of a carpenter, brought up at the feet of no professor, despised by the high priests, the scribes and Pharisees, and all the learned in the religion of his nation; in the time of his preaching apprehended, bound, buffeted, spit upon, condemned, crucified; betrayed in his life by one disciple, denied by another; at his death distrusted by all. What advantage can we perceive toward the propagation of the gospel in this author of it, Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness?\(^2\) What in those which followed him, sent by him, and thence called apostles, men by birth obscure, by education illiterate, by profession low and inglorious? How can we conceive that all the schools and universities of the world should give way to them, and the kingdoms and empires should at last come in to them, except their doctrine were indeed divine,

\(^1\) 2 Tim. iii. 12,  
\(^2\) 1 Cor. i. 23.
except that Jesus, whom they testified to be the Christ, were truly so?

If we consider the manner in which they delivered this doctrine to the world, it will add no advantage to their persons, or advance the probability of success. For in their delivery they used no such rhetorical expressions, or ornaments of eloquence, to allure or entice the world; they affected no such subtilty of wit, or strength of argumentation, as thereby to persuade and convince men; they made use of no force or violence to compel, no corporal menaces to affright mankind unto a compliance. But in a plain simplicity of words they nakedly delivered what they had seen and heard, preaching, not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit.¹ It is not then rationally imaginable, that so many nations should forsake their own religions, so many ages professed, and brand them all as damnable, only that they might embrace such precepts as were most unacceptable to their natural inclinations, and that upon such promises as seemed not probable to their reason, nor could have any influence on their sense, and notwithstanding those predictions which did assure them, upon the receiving of that doctrine, to be exposed to all kind of misery: that they should do this upon the authority of him who for the same was condemned and crucified, and by the persuasion of them who were both illiterate and obscure: that they should be enticed with words without eloquence, convinced without the least subtilty, constrained without any force. I say, it is no way imaginable how this should come to pass, had not the doctrine of the gospel, which did thus prevail, been certainly divine; had not the light of the Word, which thus dispelled the clouds of all former religions, come from heaven; had not that Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, been the true Messias.

10.—To conclude this discourse. He who was in the world at the time when the Messias was to come, and no other at that time or since pretended; he who was born of the same family, in the same place, after the same manner, which the prophets foretold of the birth of the Messias; he which taught all those truths, wrought all those miracles, suffered all those indignities, received all that glory, which the Messias was to teach, do, suffer, and receive; he whose doctrine was received in all nations, according to the character of the Messias; he was certainly the true Messias. But we have already sufficiently showed that all these things are exactly fulfilled in Jesus, and in him alone. We must therefore acknowledge and profess that this Jesus is the promised Messias, that is, the Christ.

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 4.
11.—Having thus manifested the truth of this proposition, Jesus is the Christ, and showed the interpretation of the word Christ to be anointed; we find it yet necessary, for the explication of this article, to inquire what was the end or immediate effect of his unction, and how or in what manner he was anointed to that end.¹

12.—For the first, as the Messias was foretold, so was he typified: nor were the actions prescribed under the law less predictive than the words of the prophets. Nay, whosoever were then anointed, were therefore so, because he was to be anointed.² Now it is evident that among the Jews they were wont to anoint those which were appointed as kings over them:³ so Samuel said unto Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel.⁴ When Saul was rejected, and David produced before Samuel, the Lord said, Arise, anoint him, for this is he.⁵ And some may have contented themselves with this, that the Messias was to be a king.⁶ But not only the kings, but beside, and long before them, the high priests were also anointed; insomuch as the anointed,⁷ in their common language, signified their high priest. And because these two were most constantly anointed, therefore divers have thought it sufficient to assert that the Messies was to be a king and a priest.⁸ But being not only the high priests and kings were actually anointed (though they principally and most frequently;) for the Lord said unto Elias, Go anoint Hazael to be king over Syria,

¹ "In Christi nomine subauditur qui unxit, et ipse qui unctus est, et ipsa unction in qua unctus est."—Iren. lib. iii. cap. 20.
² "Oii pales et eis rnestos ato too niu metisoson kai pales kai kalliason rnestos."—Justin. Martyr. Dial. cum Trad. § 86.
³ "Christus a christate dicitur: quia sicut antiqui reges a sacerdotibus oleo sacro profanebantur, sic Christus Spiritus Sancti infusione repetebatur."—Author Serm. 131 De Trin. ¹ Sam. xv. 1.
⁴ "Sicut nunc Romanis indumentum purpureum insigni est regiae dignitatis assumptum: sic illa unctio sacri unguenti nomen ac potestatem regiam conferebat."—Lactan. lib. iv. cap. 7.
⁵ For though at the first the sons of Aaron were anointed as well as Aaron, as appears, Exod. xli. 15: "Thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they may administer to me in the priest’s office:" yet they were not after anointed, but the successors of Aaron only: "For," saith the text, "their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations:" and therefore after this first anointing they shall need no more; only the successors in the high-priesthood shall reiterate the unction: from whence "the priest that is anointed" afterwards signified the high priest, as Lev. iv. 3, "the priest that is anointed."—LXX. "O ἀρχιερεύος ὁ κεκρυθησομενος," by way of explanation; whereas, verses 5 and 16 of the same chapter, and vi. 22, they render it by a bare translation, "Ὁ ἀρχιερεύος ὁ χριστός:" which by the Vulgar Latin is translated, "Sacerdos qui juravit patri succedere," because no other but the son which succeeded the father in the office of the high priest was afterwards anointed: as the Arabic, "Et simulifer sacerdos successor de filiis suis." For in the anointing of Aaron and his sons we see no other word than "unxit," though they be called "Messias" and "Christus" in the Vulgar Latin, "Αννίται αυτοι λαοι ἀυτοι αυτοι λαβοντες αυτους ἐν μιᾷ ουδεντι νοησεως."—Levi Ben Gerson, 1 Kings 1.
⁶ As Lactantius: "Erat Judæis ante preceptum ut sacram conficerent unguentum, quod perumeri possunt illi, qui vocabantur ad sacerdotium vel ad regnum."—Lib. iv. cap. 7.
and Jehu the son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel, and Elisha the son of Shaphat shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room: therefore hence it hath been concluded that the three offices of prophet, priest, and king, belonged to Jesus as the Christ, and that upon good reason. For the commonwealth of Israel was totally ordered and disposed, both in the constitution and administration of it, for, and with respect unto, the Messias. The constitution of that people was made by a seclusion and separation of them from all other nations on the earth: and this began in Abraham, with a peculiar promise of a seed in whom all the nations should be blessed, and be united into one religion. That promised seed was the Messias, the type of whom was Isaac. This separation was continued by the administration of that commonwealth, which was a royal priesthood: and that administration of the people did consist in three functions, prophetical, regal, sacerdotal: all which had respect unto the Messias, as the scope of all the prophets, and the complement of their prophecies, as the Lord of the temple, and the end of all the sacrifices for which the temple was erected, as the heir of an eternal priesthood after the order of Melchizedec, and of the throne of David, or an everlasting kingdom. Being then the separation was to cease at the coming of the Messias, being that could not cease so long as the administration of that people stood, being that administration did consist in those three functions; it followeth that those three were to be united in the person of the Messias, who was to make them all one, and consequently that the Christ was to be prophet, priest, and king.

13.—Again, the redemption or salvation which the Messias was to bring, consisteth in the freeing of a sinner from the state of sin and eternal death into a state of righteousness and eternal life. Now a freedom from sin in respect of the guilt could not be wrought without a sacrifice propitiatory, and therefore there was

1 1 Kings xix. 15, 16.
2 Οὐ μόνοις δὲ ἄρα τοῖς ἀρχιερεῖσιν τετιμημένοις—τὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ κατεκόσμει παρά Εβραίοις οὐμοί, ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς βασιλεῖσιν· οὐκ καὶ αὐτοῖς Πιστεύσαι θεία προφητεία κρινεῖσθαι, εἰκονικοὶ τινας χριστοὺς ἀπειργάζοντο· οὗτος δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς, τῆς τοῦ μόνου καὶ ἀληθοῦς Χριστοῦ, τοῦ κατὰ πάντων βασιλείων Θείον Δίον, βασιλικῆς καὶ ἀρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τοὺς τύπους δὲ εἰσενέκουσαν ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν προφητῶν τινὰς διὰ χρίσματος χριστοῦς ἐν τῷ γεγονοτέρῳ παρελθόντες.
3 2 Οὐ μόνοις δὲ ἄρα τοῖς ἀρχιερεῖσιν τετιμημένοις—τὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ κατεκόσμει παρά Εβραίοις οὐμοί, ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς βασιλεῖσιν· οὐκ καὶ αὐτοῖς Πιστεύσαι θεία προφητεία κρινεῖσθαι, εἰκονικοὶ τινας χριστοὺς ἀπειργάζοντο· οὗτος δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς, τῆς τοῦ μόνου καὶ ἀληθοῦς Χριστοῦ, τοῦ κατὰ πάντων βασιλείων Θείον Δίον, βασιλικῆς καὶ ἀρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τοὺς τύπους δὲ εἰσενέκουσαν ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν προφητῶν τινὰς διὰ χρίσματος χριστοῦς ἐν τῷ γεγονοτέρῳ παρελθόντες.
a necessity of a priest; a freedom from sin in respect of the
dominion could not be obtained without a revelation of the will of
God, and of his wrath against all ungodliness, therefore there was
also need of a prophet; a translation from the state of death into
eternal life is not to be effected without absolute authority and
irresistible power, therefore a king was also necessary. The
Messias then, the Redeemer of Israel, was certainly anointed for
that end, that he might become prophet, priest, and king. And
if we believe him whom we call Jesus, that is, our Saviour and
Redeemer, to be Christ, we must assert him by his unction sent to
perform all these three offices.

14.—That Jesus was anointed to the prophetical office, though we
need no more to prove it than the prediction of Isaiah, The Spirit
of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the
gospel to the poor; the explication of our Saviour, This day is this
scripture fulfilled in your ears; and the confession of the syna-
gogue at Nazareth, who all bare him witness, and wondered at the
gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth: yet we are
furnished with more ample and plentiful demonstrations: for
whether we consider his preparation, his mission, or his adminis-
tration, all of them speak him fully to have performed it. To
Jeremiah indeed God said, Before thou camest forth out of the womb,
I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations;
and of John the Baptist, He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even
from his mother's womb. And if these became singular prophets
by their preparative sanctification, how much more eminent must
his prophetical preparation be, to whose mother it is said, The
Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall
overshadow thee? If the Levites must be thirty years old, every
one that came to do the service of the ministry; Jesus will not enter
upon the public administration of this office till he begin to be about
thirty years of age. Then doth the Holy Ghost descend in a bodily
shape like a dove upon him; then must a voice come from heaven,
saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased. Never
such preparations, never such an inauguration of a prophet.

As for his mission, never any was confirmed with such letters of
credence, such irrefragable testimonials, as the formal testimony of
John the Baptist, and the more virtual testimony of his
miracles. Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the
coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord, saith God by
Malachy. And John went before him in the spirit of Elias, saith
another Malachy, even an angel from heaven. This John, or Elias,
saw the Spirit descend on Jesus, and bare record that this is the Son of God. The Jews took notice of this testimony, who said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him; and Jesus himself puts them in mind of it, Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth; nay, they themselves confessed his testimony to be undeniable, John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true. But though the witness of John were thus cogent, yet the testimony of miracles was far more irrefragable. I have greater witness than that of John, saith our Saviour; for the works which my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. Notwithstanding the precedent record of John, Jesus requireth not an absolute assent unto his doctrine without his miracles: If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But upon them he challengeth belief: But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him. If then Moses and other prophets, to whom God gave the power of miracles, did assert their mission to be from God by the divine works which they wrought; much more efficacious to this purpose must the miracles of Jesus appear, who wrought more wonders than they all. Never therefore was there so manifest a mission of a prophet.

Now the prophetical function consisteth in the promulgation, confirmation, and perpetuation of the doctrine containing the will of God for the salvation of man. And the perfect administration of the office must be attributed unto Jesus. For no man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. He gave unto the apostles the words which his Father gave him. Therefore he hath revealed the perfect will of God. The confirmation of this doctrine cannot be denied him, who lived a most innocent and holy life to persuade it, for he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who wrought most powerful and divine works to confirm it, and was thereby known to be a teacher from God; who died a most painful and shameful death to ratify it, witnessing a good profession before Pontius Pilate; which in itself unto that purpose efficacious, was made more evidently operative in the raising of himself from death. The propagation and perpetual succession of this doctrine must likewise be attributed unto Jesus, as to no temporary or accidental prophet, but as to him who instituted and instructed
all who have any relation to that function. For the Spirit of Christ was in the prophets; 1 and when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men. For he gave some, apostles, and some, prophets, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. 2 It is then most apparent that Jesus was so far the Christ, as that he was anointed to the prophetical office, because his preparation for that office was most remarkable, his mission unto that office was undeniable, his administration of that office was infallible.

15.—Now as Jesus was anointed with the unction of Elizeus to the prophetical, so was he also with the unction of Aaron to the sacerdotal office. Not that he was called after the order of Aaron; for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood; 3 but after a more ancient order, according to the prediction of the Psalmist, The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. 4 But though he were of another order, yet whatsoever Aaron did as a priest was wholly typical, and consequently to be fulfilled by the Messias, as he was a priest. For the priesthood did not begin in Aaron, but was translated and conferred upon his family before his consecration. We read of the priests which came near the Lord; 5 of young men of the children of Israel which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord: 6 which without question were no other than the first-born, to whom the priesthood did belong. 7 Jesus therefore, as the first-begotten of God, was by right a priest, and being anointed unto that office, performed every function, by way of oblation, intercession, and benediction. Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man, Jesus, if he be an high priest, have somewhat also to offer. 8 Not that he had anything beside himself, or that there was any peculiar sacrifice allowed to this priest; to whom, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: 9 and, by the offering of this body of Jesus Christ are we sanctified. 10 For he who is our priest hath given himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour. 11

Now when Jesus had thus given himself a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, he ascended up on high, and entered into the holy of holies not made with hands, and there appeared before God as an

1 1 Peter i. 11. 2 Eph. iv. 8, 11, 12. 3 Heb. vii. 14, 21. 4 Psalm ex. 4. 5 Exod. xix. 22. 6 Exod. xxiv. 5. 7 For the Hebrew יִנְעָי signifying "juvenes," by all the Targums is rendered יְנִיב that is "primogeniti:" and so the Arabic and Persian translations. 8 Heb. viii. 3. 9 Heb. x. 5. 10 Verse 10 11 "Unus ipse erat qui offerebat et quod offerebat." — S. August. "Unum cum illo manebat cui offerebat, unum in se fecit pro quibus offerebat; unus ipse erat qui offerebat et quod offerebat." — [den, de Trin. Eph. v. 3.]
atoned for our sins. Nor is he prevalent only in his own oblation once offered, but in his constant intercession. Who is he that condemneth? saith the apostle: it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God; who also maketh intercession for us. Upon this foundation he buildeth our persuasion, that he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to intercede for them. Nor must we look upon this as a servile or precarious, but rather as an efficacious and glorious, intercession, as of him to whom all power is given both in heaven and earth. Beside these offerings and intercedings, there was something more required of the priest, and that is blessing. Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his sons for ever, to burn incense before the Lord, to minister unto him, and to bless in his name for ever. We read of no other sacerdotal act performed by Melchizedek the priest of the most High God, but only that of blessing, and that in respect both of God and man: First, he blessed man, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most High God, possessor of heaven and earth; then, blessed be the most High God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand. Now it is observable what the rabbins have delivered, that at the morning-sacrifice the priests under the law did bless the people with the solemn form of benediction, but at the evening-sacrifice they blessed them not; to show that in the evening of the world, the last days, which are the days of the Messias, the benediction of the law should cease, and the blessing of the Christ take place. When Zachariah the priest, the father of John Baptist the forerunner of our Saviour, executed his office before God in the order of his course, and the whole multitude of the people waited for him, to receive his benediction, he could not speak unto them, for he was dumb; showing the power of benediction was now passing to another and far greater priest, even to Jesus, whose doctrine in the mount begins with blessed; who, when he left his disciples, lift up his hands, and blessed them. And yet this function is principally performed after his resurrection, as it is written, Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities. It cannot then be denied that Jesus, who offered up himself a most perfect sacrifice and oblation for sin, who still maketh continual intercession for us, who was raised from the

dead, that he might bless us with an everlasting benediction, is a most true and most perfect priest.

16.—The third office belonging to the Messias was the regal, as appeareth by the most ancient tradition of the Jews, and by the express predictions of the prophets. Yet have I set my King, saith the Psalmist, upon my holy hill of Sion. Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder, saith the prophet Isaiah, who called him the Prince of peace, showing the perpetuity of his power, and particularity of his seat. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. All which most certainly belongs unto our Jesus, by the unerring interpretation of the angel Gabriel, who promised the blessed Virgin that the Lord God should give unto her son the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. He acknowledgeth himself this office, though by a strange and unlikely representation of it, the riding on an ass: but by that it was fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting on an ass. He made as strange a confession of it unto Pilate; for when he said unto him, Art thou a King then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. The solemn inauguration into this office was at his ascension into heaven, and his session at the right hand of God: not but that he was by right a King before, but the full and public execution was deferred till then, when God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion. Then he, whose name is called the Word of God, had on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords.

17.—This regal office of our Saviour consisteth partly in the ruling, protecting, and rewarding of his people; partly in the coercing, condemning, and destroying of his enemies. First, he ruleth in his own people, by delivering them a law, by which they walk; by furnishing them with his grace, by which they are enabled to walk in it. Secondly, he protecteth the same, by helping them to subdue their lusts, which reign in their mortal

---

1 For the Chaldee Paraphrase, in the most places where it mentioneth the Messias, doth it with the addition of "King:"
2 Psalm ii. 6.
3 Isa. ix. 7.
4 Matt. xxii. 4, 5.
5 Eph. i. 20, 21.
6 Luke i. 32, 33.
7 John xviii. 37.
8 Rev. xix. 13, 16.
bodies; by preserving them from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil; by supporting them in all their afflictions; by delivering them from all their enemies. Thirdly, whom he thus rules and protects here, he rewards hereafter in a most royal manner, making them kings and priests unto God and his Father.¹ On the contrary, he showeth his regal dominion in the destruction of his enemies, whether they were temporal or spiritual enemies. Temporal, as the Jews and Romans, who joined together in his crucifixion. While he was on earth he told his disciples, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom:² and in that kingdom he was then seen to come, when he brought utter destruction on the Jews by the Roman armies, not long after to be destroyed themselves. But beside these visible enemies, there are other spiritual, those which hinder the bringing in of his own people into his Father's kingdom, those which refuse to be subject unto him, and consequently deny him to be their King; as all wicked and ungodly men, of whom he hath said, These mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.³ Thus, sin, Satan, and death, being the enemies to his kingdom, shall all be destroyed in their order. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet: and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.⁴ Thus is our Jesus become the Prince of the Kings of the earth: thus is the Lamb acknowledged to be Lord of lords, and King of kings.⁵

18.—Wherefore seeing we have already showed that the prophetical, sacerdotal, and regal offices were to belong unto the promised Messias, as the proper end and immediate effect of his anunciation; seeing we have likewise declared how Jesus was anointed to these offices, and hath and doth actually perform the same in all the functions belonging to them: there remaineth nothing for the full explication of this particular concerning the Christ, but only to show the manner of this anunciation, which is very necessary to be explained. For how they were anointed under the law who were the types of the Messias is plain and evident, because the manner was prescribed, and the materials were visible: God appointed an oil to be made, and appropriated it to that use; and the pouring that oil upon the body of any person was his anointing to that office for which he was designed. But being that oil so appropriated to this use was lost many hundred years before our Saviour's birth, being the custom of anointing in this manner had a long time ceased, being howsoever we never read that Jesus was

¹ Rev. i. 6. ⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 28  ² Rev. i. 5; xvii. 14. ³ Luke xix. 27. ⁴ 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26.
at all anointed with oil; it remaineth still worthy our inquiry; how he was anointed, so as to answer to the former unctions; and what it was which answered to that oil, which then was lost, and was at the first but as a type of this which now we search for.

19.—The Jews\(^1\) tell us that the anointing oil was hid in the days of Josiah, and that it shall be found and produced again when the Messiah comes, that he may be anointed with it, and the kings and high priests of his days. But though the loss of that oil bespake the destruction of that nation, yet the Christ which was to come needed no such unction for his consecration; there being as great a difference between the typical and correspondent oil as between the representing and represented Christ. The prophet David calleth it not by the vulgar name of oil of unction, but the oil of gladness.\(^2\) For though that place may in the first sense be understood of Solomon, whom when Zadoc the priest anointed they blew the trumpet, and all the people said, God save king Solomon. And all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them; \(^3\) though from thence it might be said of him, Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows: \(^4\) yet being those words are spoken unto God, as well as of God (therefore God, thy God)\(^5\) the oil with which that God is anointed must in the ultimate and highest sense signify a far greater gladness than that at Solomon's coronation was, even the fountain of all joy and felicity in the church of God.

20.—The ancients\(^6\) tell us that this oil is the divinity itself, and in the language of the scriptures it is the Holy Ghost.\(^9\) St. Peter

---

\(^1\) Psalm xlv. 7.
\(^2\) 1 Kings i. 39, 40.
\(^3\) Psalm xlv. 7.
\(^4\) "Duas personas, ejus qui unctus est Dei et qui unxit, intellige. Unde et Aquila Elohims.
\(^5\) verbum Hebraicum non nominativo casu, sed vocativo, interpretatur, diceus Θεός et nos propter intelligentiam Dei possimus, quod Latina lingua non accipit, ne quis perverso putet Deum dilecti et amantissimi et regis bis Patrem nominari."—S. Hieron. Epist. 104. "Quod sequitur, Lexit he, Deus, Deus tuus, primum nomen Dei vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo; quod satis miror cur Aquila non, ut corperat in primo versiculo, vocativo casu interpretatus sit, sed nominativo, bis nominans Deum, quod supradicturn unuxerit Deum."—Ibid.
\(^6\) So Gregory Nazianzenus expounds the place: "Ον εξέστην ελαίῳ ἀγαλλασσες παρά τούς μετόχος αὐτοῦ, χρίσας τὴν ἄνθρωποτητά τῇ Θεότητα, ὅπετε ποιήσῃ τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν. And again: Χριστὸς δὲ, διὰ τὴν Θεότητα (not that his Divinity was anointed, or Chris
teacheth us how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power. Now, though there can be no question but the Spirit is the oil, yet there is some doubt, when Jesus was anointed with it. For we know the angel said unto the blessed Virgin, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. From whence it appeareth that from the conception, or at the incarnation, Jesus was sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and the power of the Highest; and so consequently, as St. Peter spake, he was anointed then with the Holy Ghost and with power. Again, being we read that after he was thirty years of age, the Spirit like a dove descended and lighted upon him, and he, descending in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, said unto them of Nazareth, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears, meaning that of Isaiah, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel; hence hath it been also collected, that his unction was performed at his baptism. Nor need we to contend which of these two was the true time of our Saviour's unction, since neither is destructive of the other, and consequently both may well consist together. David, the most undoubted type of the Messiah, was anointed at Bethlehem; for there Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward. Of which unction those words of God must necessarily be understood, I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him. And yet he was again anointed at Hebron; first over the house of Judah, then over all the tribes of Israel. As therefore David at his first unction received the Spirit of God, and a full right unto the throne of

anointed in respect of his Divinity; but that he was anointed in his humanity by his Divinity:) χρίσαι γὰρ αὐτὴ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, σὺν εἰρήνῃ κατὰ τὸν δίκων χριστοῦ εγκαθίστων; παρθένοις ἐτὸς θόλου τοῦ κηρύσσον: ἔργον, ἀνθρωπον ἀκούσαι τὸ χρίσμα, καὶ ποιῆσαι Θεον τὸ χρίσμενον.—Orat. 2, De Filio.

1 Acts x. 38. 2 Luke i. 35.

3 Χριστὸς εὐφράσθη ως Βασιλεὺς καὶ Ιερεὺς τοῦ χρίσματι τῆς σαρκός τεως.—GERMANUS CONSTANT. Κεχρίσθη δὲ οὐκ έτέρως φαμέν τον Υἱόν, ἢ ὅτι κατὰ σάρκα γενόμενον, δηλοῦστι καθ ἡμᾶς, καὶ ενανθρώπισιν. —Titus BOSTRENSIS. “Deus est qui unigit, et Deus secundum carbem unigitur Dei Filium, Denique quos habet unionem sua Christus nisi in carne participes? Vides igitur quia Deus a Deo unctus, sed in assumptione nature unctus humane, Dei Filius designatur.”—S. AMBROS. De Fide, lib. i. cap. 3. “Hec omnia carni conveniunt, cui plissimum et gloriosissimum Verbum unimatum est pro salute cunctorum.”—CASSIODORUS in Psal. ziv.

4 Matt. iii. 16. 5 Luke iv. 14, 18, 21. 6 St. Jerome, mentioning that place of the Psalm: “Quando consortes nominantur, naturam carnis intellegis; quia Deus consortes substantiae suae non habet. Et qua erat unctio spiritualis et nequaquam humani corporis, (ut fuit in sacerdotibus Judæorum,) idcirco pro consortibus, id est, cæteris sanctis, unctus esse memorat. Cujus unctio illo expleta est tempore quando baptizatus est in Jordanæ, et Spiritus Sanctus in specie columbae descendit super eum, et mansit in illo.”—Comment. in Esiain, cap. 61. “In ilia colubra quæ super Dominum post baptismam descendit, ipse cum sacrament baptismatis et veri sacerditi juris suscipit, fuso videlicet super eum oleo exultationis, de quo Psalmista cantit: Unigitis, inquit, Deus, Deus tuus, oleo latitio pro consortibus tuis.”—PETRUS DAMIANUS, Opusc. vi. cap. 4. 7 1 Sam. xvi. 13. 8 Psalm Ixxxix. 20. 9 2 Sam. ii. 4; v. 3.
Israel, which yet he was not to exercise till the death of Saul and acceptance of the tribes; and therefore when the time was come that he should actually enter upon his regal office, he was again anointed: so our Jesus, the Son of David, was first sanctified and anointed with the Holy Ghost at his conception, and thereby received a right unto, and was prepared for, all those offices which belonged to the Redeemer of the world; but when he was to enter upon the actual and full performance of all those functions which belonged to him, then doth the same Spirit which had sanctified him at his conception visibly descend upon him at his inauguration. And that most properly upon his baptism, because, according to the customs of those ancient nations, washing was wont to precede theirunctions:1 wherefore Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove.2 As David sent Solomon to be anointed at Gihon: from whence arose that ancient observation of the rabbins, that kings were not to be anointed but by a fountain.3

Now as we have showed that Jesus was anointed with the Holy

---

1 As appears by those entertainments so frequently mentioned by Homer in his Odysseys, as when Telemachus is entertained by Nestor:—

2 Τάφρα δὲ Τηλέμαχον λούσαν καλὴν Πολυκάστην, Ἔστορος ὀπλότατος θυγατρὶ Νεόλαδας, Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λούσεν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίθν ἐλαίῳ. —Od. Τ. 461.

And Telemachus and Písistratns are invited to the court of Menelaus:—

3 Ἑσ ἀσεμίνθως βάντες ἐξήγετα συνταγματικόν. Τοὺς ἐπί οὐν ἐμαυλοὶ λούσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαίῳ. —Od. Δ. 48.

Thus Ulysses is entertained, i.α. Θ. Thus Pyrrus and Telemachus, Od. Ρ. And Venus, returning to Paphus, is so ordered by the "Charites":—

4 Εὐθα δὲ μιν Χώριτες λούσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαίῳ Αμπρότο, οἱ θεοὶ ἐπενήδοθεν αἰων ἐκτόσον.

—Od. Θ. 361.

So Helena speaks of her entertaining Ulysses in a disguise:—

5 Ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ μιν ἔγνων ἐλέουν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαιόν.

—Od. Δ. 252.

It is apparent that this was the custom of the ancient Greeks; of which Euthusath gives this reason: Εὖλαιον ἔχρισαν οἱ λοιπαρενοὶ ἐμπλατοῦντες τοὺς συμμαχικοὺς πόρους, ὡς ἐν μὴ δοιρεῖν στέψαν τὴν ἅγραπτα. This custom was so ancient and general, that the Greeks had one word to express this anointing with oil after washing with water, which they called χύταια and χυτλόσαρα. Χυτλόσαρα, όπις ἀπόλοις τὸ ἀλείφα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐπὶ λοιπῷ ἀλειφάσαται.—Εὐτυμολ. Χύταλα δὲ κυριώς, τὸ ἱγνοῦ ἐπὶ ὑδάτος ὑπός τοῦ σωμάτος ἀλείφασαν. —Schol. Aristoph. Χύταλα, τὸ ἐπὶ ὑδάτος ἔλαιον καὶ, χυτλόσαρα, τὸ ἀλείφα μετὰ τὸ λοιπῆν. —Paus. Hence, when Nausicaa went unto the pools to wash, her mother gave her a box of oil:—

6 Δῶκε δὲ χρυσαρέτιν ἐν λυχνίῳ ἔλαιον, Εἰς τὸν χυτλόσαρα σὺν ἀμφίπολοις γνώμαις.

—Od. Ζ. 79.

Where the old Scholiast, Χυτλόσαρα, λουσαμενη ἀλείψατοι: and Euthusath, Εἰς χυτλόσαρα, ἀντί τοῦ ὕδατος μετὰ λοιπῆν χυτλόσαρα ἀλειφάσατοι: which exposition is warranted by the performance after mentioned:—

7 Αἱ δὲ λουσαμέναι καὶ ἀλείψαμεναι λίθν ἐλαιών. —Ibid. 96.

And as this was the ancient custom of the Greeks, so was it also the common custom of the Jews, as appears by the words of Naomi to Ruth: "Wash thyself, therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee." (Ruth iii. 3.)

8 Matt. iii. 16.

3 They say in the Gemara, that this is a maxim of the doctors, which is generally understood.

—Abarranel In Exod. xxviii. 39. The end of which ceremony was to show the prolonging of his kingdom who was so anointed; and the original is referred to the anointing of Solomons. (1 Kings i. 39.) For so it followeth in the Talmud, after the ceremony was concluded:—

—Abarranel, 2d.
Secondly, therefore Matt. xi. from eAe for the effusion, or action of the Spirit, eminently containeth whatsoever the Jews have imagined to be performed or signified by those legal anointings. Two very good reasons they render why God did command the use of such anointing oil, as in respect of the action. First, that it might signify the divine election of that person, and designation to that office: from whence it was necessary that it should be performed by a prophet, who understood the will of God. Secondly, that by it the person anointed might be made fit to receive the divine influx. For the first, it is evident there could be no such infallible sign of the divine designation of Jesus to his offices, as the visible descent of the Spirit, attended with a voice from heaven, instead of the hand of a prophet, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. For the second, this spiritual union was so far from giving less than an aptitude to receive the divine influx, that it was that divine influx, nay, the divinity itself, the Godhead dwelling in him bodily.

21.—In respect of them, they give two causes why it was oil, and not any other liquor. First, because of all other it signifies the greatest glory and excellency. The olive was the first of trees mentioned as fit for sovereignty, in regard of its fatness, wherewith they honour God and man. Therefore it was fit that those persons which were called to a greater dignity than the rest of the Jews should be consecrated by oil, as the best sign of election to honour. And can there be a greater honour than to be the Son of God, the beloved Son, as Jesus was proclaimed at this union, by which he was consecrated to such an office as will obtain him a name far above all names? Secondly, they tell us that oil continueth uncorrupted longer than any other liquor. And indeed it hath been observed to preserve not only itself, but other things, from corruption. Hence they conclude it fit, their kings and priests, whose succession was to continue for ever, should be anointed with oil, the most proper emblem of eternity. But even by this reason of their own their union is ceased, being the succession of their kings and priests is long since cut off, and their eternal and eternizing oil lost long before.

And only that one Jesus, who was

1 Matt. iii. 17.
2 Judges ix. 9.
3 "Unguenta optime servabantur in alabastris, odores in oleo."—Plinius Hist. lib. xiii. cap. 2. "Existimatur et ebori vindicando a carie utile esse. Certe simulacrum Saturni Romae intus oleo repletum est."—Idem, lib. xv. cap. 7. And whosoever made that statue at Rome, seems to have had his art out of Greece, from that famous ivory statue made by Phidias. Οὕτω γὰρ μετὰ τὸ κατασκευάσαι τὸ Πισταίον εἰδώλιον, (ἐξ ἐλέφαντος δὲ τούτο ἤρων) ἔλαιον ἐκχειρίας προστάτεαι ἀμφὶ τῶν πόλεως ἐμπροσθῆνε τοῦ ἀγάλματος, ἀθάνατον εἰς δύναμιν φυλάσσον ἀυτό.—Procclus apud Epiphanius, Hær. 64, § 18.
anointed with the most spiritual oil, continueth for ever; and therefore hath an unchangeable priesthood, as being made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.\(^1\)

Beside, they observe, that simple oil without any mixture was sufficient for the candlesticke; but that which was designed for unction must be compounded with principal spices, which signify a good name, always to be acquired by those in places of greatest dignity by the most laudable and honourable actions. And certainly never was such an admixture of spieces as in the unction of our Saviour, by which he was endued with all variety of the graces of God, by which he was enabled to offer himself a sacrifice for a sweet-smelling savour.\(^2\) For as he was full of grace and truth; so of his fulness have we all received, grace for grace:\(^3\) and as we have received anointing of him;\(^4\) so we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ.\(^5\)

Again, it was sufficient to anoint the vessels of the sanctuary in any part; but it was particularly commanded that the oil should be poured upon the head of the kings and priests, as the seat of all the animal faculties, the fountain of all dignity, and original of all the members of the body.\(^6\) This was more eminently fulfilled in Jesus, who by his unction, or as Christ, became the head of the Church;\(^7\) nay, the head of all principality and power, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.\(^8\)

Lastly, they observe, that though in the vessels nothing but a single unction was required; yet in the kings and priests there was commanded, or at least practised, both unction and effusion (as it is written, He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron’s head, and anointed him to sanctify him);\(^9\) the first to signify their separation, the second to assure them of the falling of the Spirit upon them. Now what more clear than that our Christ was anointed by effusion, whether we look upon his conception, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee;\(^10\) or his inauguration, the Spirit descended and lighted upon him?\(^11\) And thus, according unto all particulars required by the Jews themselves to complete their legal unctions, we have sufficiently shown that Jesus was, as most eminently, so most properly, anointed with the Spirit of God.

22.—Wherefore being we have shown that a Messias was to come into the world; being we have proved that he is already

---

\(^1\) Heb. vii. 24, 16. \(^2\) Eph. v. 2. \(^3\) John i. 14, 16. \(^4\) 1 John ii. 27. \(^5\) 2 Cor. ii. 15. \(^6\) According to the etymology in the Hebrew language, of which Abarbanel here takes notice. \(^7\) Col. i. 18. \(^8\) ii. 10, 19. \(^9\) Lev. viii. 12. \(^10\) Luke i. \(^11\) Matt. iii. 16.
come, by the same predictions by which we believe he was to come; being we have demonstrated that Jesus, born in the days of Herod, was and is that promised Messias; being we have farther declared that he was anointed to those offices which belonged to the Messias, and actually did and doth still perform them all; and that his anointing was by the immediate effusion of the Spirit, which answereth fully to all things required in the legal and typical unction: I cannot see what farther can be expected for explication or confirmation of this truth, that Jesus is the Christ.

23.—The necessity of believing this part of the article is most apparent, because it were impossible he should be our Jesus, except he were the Christ. For he could not reveal the way of salvation, except he were a prophet; he could not work out that salvation revealed, except he were a priest; he could not confer that salvation upon us, except he were a king; he could not be prophet, priest, and king, except he were the Christ. This was the fundamental doctrine which the apostles not only testified, as they did that of the resurrection, but argued, proved, and demonstrated out of the law and the prophets. We find St. Paul at Thessalonica three sabbath-days reasoning with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead: and that this Jesus whom I preach unto you, is Christ. 1 We find him again at Corinth pressed in spirit, and testifying to the Jews, that Jesus was Christ. 2 Thus Apollos, by birth a Jew, but instructed in the Christian faith by Aquila and Priscilla, mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the scriptures, that Jesus was Christ. 3 This was the touchstone by which all men at first were tried whether they were Christian or anti-Christian. For whosoever believeth, saith St. John, that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God. 4 What greater commendation of the assertion of this truth? Who is a liar, saith the same apostle, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This man is the antichrist, as denying the Father and the Son. 5 What higher condemnation of the negation of it?

24.—Secondly, as it is necessary to be believed as a most fundamental truth, so it hath as necessary an influence upon our conversations; because, except it hath so, it cannot clearly be maintained. Nothing can be more absurd in a disputant than to pretend to demonstrate a truth as infallible, and at the same time to show it impossible. And yet so doth every one who professeth faith in Christ already come, and liveth not according to that profession: for thereby he proveth, as far as he is able, that the true

1 Acts xvii. 2, 3.  2 Acts xviii. 5.  3 Verse 23.  4 1 John v. 1.  5 ii. 22.
Christ is not yet come, at least that Jesus is not he. We sufficiently demonstrate to the Jews that our Saviour, who did and suffered so much, is the true Messias; but by our lives we recall our arguments, and strengthen their wilful opposition. For there was certainly a promise, that when Christ should come, the wolf should dwell with the lamb, and the leopard should lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child should lead them;¹ that is, there should be so much love, unanimity and brotherly kindness in the kingdom of Christ, that all ferity and inhumanity being laid aside, the most different natures and inclinations should come to the sweetest harmony and agreement. Whereas if we look upon ourselves, we must confess there was never more bitterness of spirit, more rancour of malice, more heat of contention, more manifest symptoms of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, than in those which make profession of the Christian faith. It was infallibly foretold, that when the law should go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, they should beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation should not lift up sword against nation, neither should they learn war any more.² Whereas there is no other art so much studied, so much applauded, so violently asserted, not only as lawful, but as necessary. Look upon the face of Christendom divided into several kingdoms and principalities; what are all these but so many public enemies, either exercising or designing war? The Church was not more famous, or did more increase, by the first blood which was shed in the primitive times through the external violence of ten persecutions, than now it is infamous, and declines, through constant violence, fraud and rapine, through public engagements of the greatest empires in arms, through civil and intestine wars, and, lest any way of shedding Christian blood should be unassayed, even by massacres. It was likewise prophesied of the days of the Messias,³ that all idolatry should totally cease, that all false teachers should be cut off, and unclean spirits restrained. And can we think that the Jews, who really abhor the thoughts of worshipping an image, can ever be persuaded there is no idolatry committed in the Christian church? Or can we excuse ourselves in the least degree from the plague of the locusts of Egypt, the false teachers? Can so many schisms and sects arise, and spread, can so many heresies be acknowledged and countenanced, without false prophets and unclean spirits? If then we would return to the bond of true Christian love and charity, if we would appear true lovers of peace and tranquillity, if we would truly hate the abominations

¹ Isa. ii. 3.
² Isa. ii. 3, 4.
³ Zech. xiii. 2.
nations of idolatry, false doctrine and heresy, let us often remember what we ever profess in our Creed, that Jesus is the Christ, that the kingdom of the Messias cannot consist with these impieties.

25.—Thirdly, the necessity of this belief appeareth in respect of those offices which belong to Jesus as he is the Christ. We must look upon him as upon the prophet anointed by God to preach the gospel, that we may be incited to hear and embrace his doctrine. Though Moses and Elias be together with him in the mount, yet the voice from heaven speaketh of none but Jesus, Hear ye him,1 He is that Wisdom, the delight of God, crying in the Proverbs Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors.2 There is one thing needful, saith our Saviour; and Mary chose that good part, who sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word.3 Which devout posture teacheth us, as a willingness to hear, so a readiness to obey: and the proper effect which the belief of this prophetic office worketh in us, is our obedience of faith.4 We must farther consider him as our high priest, that we may thereby add confidence to that obedience. For we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus; yea, having an high priest over the house of God, we may draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.5 And as this breedeth an adherence and assurance in us, so it requireth a resignation of us. For if Christ have redeemed us, we are his; if he died for us, it was that we should live to him: if we be bought with a price, we are no longer our own; but we must glorify God in our body and in our spirit, which are God's.6 Again, an apprehension of him as a king is necessary for the performance of our true and entire allegiance to him. Send the lamb to the ruler of the earth,7 do him homage, acknowledge him your king, show yourselves faithful and obedient subjects. We can pretend, and he hath required, no less. As soon as he let the apostles understand that all power was given unto him in heaven and in earth, he charged them to teach all nations, to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them.8 Can we imagine he should so strictly enjoin subjection to higher powers,9 the highest of whom are here below, and that he doth not expect exact obedience to him who is exalted far above all principalities and powers, and is set down at the right hand of God?10 It is observable, that in the description of the coming of the Son of man, it is said, The King shall say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you:11 which title as it secures hope, in respect of his power; as it

1 Matt. xvii. 5  2 Prov. viii. 31.  3 Luke x. 42, 39.  4 Rom. xvi. 26.  5 Heb. x. 19, 21, 22.  6 1 Cor. vi. 20.  7 Isai. xvi. 1.  8 Matt. xxviii. 18, 20  9 Rom. xiii. 1.  10 Eph. i. 20, 21.  11 Matt. xxv. 34.
magnifies our reward by the excellency of our inheritance; so also it teacheth us the indispensable condition of obedience.

26.—Fourthly, the belief of Jesus the Christ is necessary to instruct us what it is to be a Christian, and how far we stand clied by obtaining that name. Those who did first embrace the faith were styled disciples (as when the number of disciples was multiplied), or believers, or brethren, or men of the church, or callers upon the name of Christ, or men of the way; or by their enemies, Nazarenes, and Galileans. But in a short time they gained a name derived from their Saviour, though not from that name of his which signifieth salvation; for from Christ they were called Christians. A title so honourable, and of so much concernment, that St. Luke hath thought fit to mention the city in which that name first was heard. And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch, as the scriptures assure us; so named by Euodius, the

1 For when our Saviour gave that command to his apostles, Πάντας γὰρ ἀνθρώπους ἔφη, "Go make all nations disciples," they which delivered the gospel were μαθητεύοντες, they which were taught it and received it and were at that time μαθητεύοντες, and after, by a name habitual, μαθητας, translated by Tertullian, "disciples," ordinarily, "disciples." Μαθητής ὁν ἐστιν, ὡς μανθάνομεν παρὰ αὐτοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ, πᾶς ὁ τῷ Κυρίῳ προσερχόμενος, ὥστε ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ, τουτεκτόνες, ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, πιστεύειν τε καὶ πεπίστευκιν αὐτῷ ὡς Δεσπότης, καὶ Βασιλεῖ, καὶ Αἱρέ, καὶ Διδασκάλων ἀληθείας, εὗραν τὰ δύο ὄνειρα αἰωνίων. Thus, then, in the language of the scriptures, μαθητεύοντες, is to "make a disciple;" as, μαθητεύεσθε Ἰκανον. (Acts xiv. 21.) Μαθητεύετε τινα, "to be a disciple;" as, Joseph of Arimathea ἰμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ. (Matt. xxvii. 57.) Μαθητεύεται the same; as, Τραμαμάτες μαθητεύεις εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. (Matt. xiii. 52.) Thus μαθητεύεται τῷ Κυρίῳ, is often used by St. Basil De Barbis- mante, whose title is, Ὑπὸ δε πρώτως μαθητευθήσεται τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταχωρῆσεται τοῦ ἀγίου βαπτισματος, according to our Sa- viour's method. Hence those which were first converted to the faith were called μαθητα- ται, as "the disciples" of Christ their Doctor and Master.

2 Acts vi. 1, 7.

3 Οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς ἐκκλησίας as when Herod stretched forth his hand, κακῶσαν τινας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, "to mischlef some of those which were of the church." 4 As when Saul went down to Damascus Vth of his conversion, "Οἱ δὲ τοὺς εὐφράτεται τῆς ἡμέρας ὄντας διώκοντες καὶ γνωσάεις ἠγάγον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ." (Acts ix. 2.) 5 We translate it, "any of this way," when there was no way mentioned to which the pronoun this should have relation; nor is ἡ ὁδὸς in the Greek any more than "the way." So when St. Paul went to the synagogue at Corinth, divers were hardened and believed not, κακολογούμεντες τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους. (Acts xix. 9.) Here we translate it, "speak evil of that way:" but Beza has left his "Articulus pronominis vice fungitur," which he had from Erasmus, and hath otherwise supplied it, "stoffare locantes de vivi Dei:" and the old translation, which in the former had "hujus vive," in this hath simply "maledicentes viae;" and certainly ἡ ὁδὸς is nothing but "the way." Again, at Ephesus, Ἐγένετο δὲ κατά τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνου τάραχος ὑπὸ δικαίων περὶ τῆς ὁδού. (Acts xix. 23.) Let. Transil. "de viá:" Beza, again, "ob viam Dei:" but it is nothing but "the way." Thus Felix put off St. Paul, ἀκρίβεστερον εἰδοὺς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδού, "till he had a more exact know-ledge of the way." Tert. Transt. "ad sectam istam:" Beza, "de viá hac." Whereas, then, the phrase is so simply and so frequently the same, it can be nothing else but the word then in use to signify the religion which the Chris- tians professed. And so some also of the ancients seem to have spoken, as appears by the language of the Melchizedecians: Χριστὸς ἔξελεν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καλέσῃ ἐκ πολλῶν ὁδών εἰς μίαν ταύτην τὴν γνώσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἀπέστεψεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ εἰδωλων, καὶ ἡπείδη ἦμεν τὴν τῆς ὁδόν καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ καθορίζωμεν τὴν ὁδόν. — EUSEB. Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. 1.

5 St. Luke noteth the place, but neither the time when, nor person by whom, this name was given. Tertullian seems to make it as ancient as the reign of Tiberius; "Tiberinus ergo, calus temporum nonem Christianum in seculum introvit." — Apolog. cap. 5. But I conceive, indeed, he speaks not of the name, but of the religion: for so he may well be thought to expound himself, saying soon after "Census istius disciplinæ, ut jam edidimus, a Tiberio est." — Cap. 7. However, the name
On the Great.
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bishop of that place, as ecclesiastical history informs us. A name no sooner invented but embraced by all believers, as bearing the most proper signification of their profession, and relation to the author and master whom they served. In which the primitive Christians so much delighted, that before the face of their enemies they would acknowledge no other title but that, though hated, reviled, tormented, martyred for it.¹ Nor is this name of greater honour to us than obligation. There are two parts of the seal of the foundation of God, and one of them is this, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.² It was a common answer of the ancient martyrs, I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done.³ The very name was thought to speak something of emendation;⁴ and whosoever put it on, became the better man. Except such reformation accompany our profession, there is no advantage in the appellation;⁵ nor can we be honoured by that title while we dishonour him that gives it. If he be therefore called Christ, because anointed; as we derive the name of Christian, so do we receive our unction from him.⁶ For as the precious oint-

of Christian is not so ancient as Tiberinus, nor, as I think, as Cainus. Some ancient author in Suidas assures us, that it was first named in the reign of Claudius, when St. Peter had ordained Euodius bishop of Antioch: "Istóen de quod est usum Christianorum non alio modo quam etiam jussisse dicitur Euodion, nequequam uero ille tale legómenis Naxapati et Gallapati, Christapati.—Suidas in Naxapati, and in Christapati. And Johannes Antiochenus confirms not only the time, but tells us that Euodius the bishop was the author of the name: "Kai eti autou (Klaudiou) Christapati uosomasthun, tou autou episkopou Evudion prophylilasthun autou kai etiasthun autou to onoma toun to repwn gar Naxapati kai Gallapati eko-

Lucani. Thus the name of Christian was first brought into use at Antioch, by Euodius the bishop of the place, and hath ever since been continued as the most proper appellation which could be given unto our profession, being derived from "the Author and Finisher of our faith." "At enim secta dictur in omnem utique sui Autoris. Quid novi, si aliqua disciplina de magistro cog-


¹ As we read of Sanctus, a deacon at Vienna, in a hot persecution of the French church; who, being in the midst of tortures, was troubled with several questions, which the Gentiles usually then asked, to try if they could extort any confession of any wicked actions practised secretly by the Christians; yet would not give any other answer to any question, than that he was a Christian. "Theaúphtai parastrapasei ἀντιπαρατατά ἄτους ὡς ἦν μή τὸ ἱδον κατεηπεί όνομα, μήτε ἔθνους, μήτε πόλεως οὗδεν ἦν, μήτε οὐδολος ἢ εἰλισθερος εἰς ἐλλα πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐπερα-

tomina ἀπεκρινατι τῇ Ταυραίης φωνῃ, Χρισ-

³ So Blandina, in the French persecution: "Πιν αὐτῆς ἀνάληψις καὶ ἁπάντως καὶ ἁπαλ-

ησία τῶν συμβαίνοντων, το λέγειν ὅτι Χρισ-
tapati εἰμί, καὶ παρ' ἧμαν οὐδὲν φαίνει γινεῖται.—Euseb. Historia Eccles. lib. v. cap. 1.

⁴ "Alli quos ante hoc nomen vagos, viles, improbos noverant, ex ipso denotator quod ualde ascendit, cecitacit odii in sufragium impin-

And in Jesus Christ.

ment upon the head ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his garments: \(^1\) so the Spirit, which without measure was poured upon Christ our head, is by him diffused through all the members of his body. \(^2\) For God hath established and anointed us in Christ: \(^3\) We have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which we have received from him abideth in us. \(^4\) Necessary then it cannot choose but be, that we should know Jesus to be the Christ: because as he is Jesus, that is, our Saviour, by being Christ, that is, anointed; so we can have no share in him as Jesus, except we become truly Christians, and so be in him as Christ, anointed with that unction from the Holy One. \(^5\)

27.—Thus having run through all the particulars at first designed for the explication of the title Christ, we may at last clearly express, and every Christian easily understand, what it is we say when we make our confession in these words, I believe in Jesus Christ. I do assent unto this as a certain truth, that there was a man promised by God, foretold by the prophets to be the Messias, the Redeemer of Israel, and the expectation of the nations. I am fully assured by all those predictions that the Messias so promised is already come. I am as certainly persuaded, that the man born in the days of Herod of the Virgin Mary, by an angel from heaven called Jesus, is that true Messias, so long, so often promised: that, as the Messias, he was anointed to three special offices, belonging to him as the Mediator between God and man: that he was a prophet, revealing unto us the whole will of God for the salvation of man; that he was a priest, and hath given himself a sacrifice for sin, and so hath made an atonement for us; that he is a king, set down at the right hand of God, far above all principalities and powers, whereby, when he hath subdued all our enemies, he will confer actual, perfect, and eternal happiness upon us. I believe this unction by which he became the true Messias was not performed by any material oil, but by the Spirit of God, which he received as the head, and conveyeth to his members. And in this full acknowledgment, I believe in Jesus Christ.

---

\(^1\) Psalm cxviii. 2.
\(^2\) *In Psalmum xxvi.
\(^3\) 2 Cor. i. 21.
\(^4\) I John ii. 20, 27.
\(^5\) *Theophr. A.D. Ma. v. lib. i.
CHAPTER III.

His only Son.

After our Saviour’s nomination immediately followeth his filiation: and justly, after we have acknowledged him to be the Christ, do we confess him to be the Son of God; because these two were ever inseparable, and even by the Jews themselves accounted equivalent. Thus Nathanael, that true Israelite, maketh his confession of the Messias: ‘Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.’ Thus Martha makes expression of her faith: ‘I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.’ Thus the high priest maketh his inquisition; ‘I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.’ This was the famous confession of St. Peter: ‘We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.’ And the Gospel of St. John was therefore written, that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Certain then it is that all the Jews, as they looked for a Messias to come, so they believed that Messias to be the Son of God: (although since the coming of our Saviour they have denied it) and that by reason of a constant interpretation of the second Psalm, as appropriated unto him. And the primitive Christians did at the very beginning include this filial title of our Saviour together with his names into the compass of one word. Well therefore, after we have expressed our faith in Jesus Christ, is added that which had so great affinity with it, the only Son of God.

2.—In these words there is little variety to be observed, except that what we translate the only Son, that in the phrase of the

1 John i. 49. John xii. 27.
2 Matt. xxvi. 63. John vi. 69.
3 John xx. 31.
4 For when Celsus, in the person of a Jew, had spoken these words: ‘Αλλ’ είπεν ο ζημιος προφήτης ἐν Ἰεροσολύμαις ποτε, ὅτι ήξει Θεον Υιός, τῶν όσιων Κριτῆς, και τῶν ἀδίκων Κολλαστῆς.’ Origen says they were most improperly attributed to a Jew, who did look indeed for a Messias, but not for the Son of God; that is, not under the notion of a Son: ‘Ιουδαίος δέ ουκ ἀν ἡμολογήσαι ότι προφήτης τις εἶπεν ἥξεν Θεον Υιόν ηγάρ λέγοντιν εστών, ὅτι ήξει ο Χριστός τοῦ Θεοῦ· και πολλακις δή ζητούσι πρὸς ἦμας εὐθέως περὶ Υιοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ουδείς οὕτως τοιούτῳ, οὐδὲ προφητευτευτός.—Conf. i. Cels. lib. i.

5 That is, ΙΧΘΥΣ. “Nos pisciculi secundum ίχθυν nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur.”—Ter. vel. De Bap. cap. 1. Which is thus interpreted by Optatus: “Cujus πισείς nomen secumund appelationem Greca cum in uno nomine per singulas litteras turbam sanctorum nominum continet, ίχθυς, quod est Latinè, Jesus Christus Dei Filius Salvator.”—Lib. iii.

6 The Latins indeed generally use the word “unicum.” So Ruffinus: “Et in Unico Filio ejus;” which is so far from being, in his apprehension, the same with unigenitus, that he refers it as well to “Lord” as “Son:” “Hic ergo Jesus Christus, Filius Unieris i.e. qui est et Dominus noster Unicus, et ad Filium referri et ad Dominum pertulit.” So
scripture and the Greek church is, the Only-begotten. It is then sufficient for the explanation of these words, to show how Christ is the Son of God, and what is the peculiarity of his generation; that when others are also the sons of God, he alone should be his Son, as no other is or can be so; and therefore he alone should have the name of the Only-begotten.

3.—First, then, it cannot be denied that Christ is the Son of God, for that reason, because he was by the Spirit of God born of the Virgin Mary: for that which is conceived (or begotten) in her, by the testimony of an angel, is of the Holy Ghost; and because of him, therefore the Son of God. For so spake the angel to the Virgin; The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee (or, which is begotten of thee) shall be called the Son of God. And the reason is clear, because that the Holy

St. Augustin in Enchiridion, cap. 34, and Leo, Epist. 10. Which is therefore to be observed, because, in the ancient copies of those Epistles, the word “unicum” was not to be found, as appareth by the discourse of Vigilius, who in the fourth book against Eutyches hath these words: “illa primitus uno diluens volume, quae Leonis objiciuntur Epistole, cujos hoc sibi primo capitulum iste, nescio quis, proponit: Fidelium universitas propter cridere se in Deum Patrem omni- potentem, et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum.” That which he aims at is the tenth Epistle of Leo, in which those words are found, but with the addition of unicum, which, as it seems, was not there; as appears yet farther by the words which follow: “Miro tamen quomodo hunc locum iste notavit, et illum praetermissit, ubi Unici Filii commemorationem Idem beatus Leo factit, dicens, Idem vero Semiterni Genitori Unigenitus Semipternus, natus de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virginis,” which words are not to be found in the same Epistle. Howsoever it was in the first copies of Leo; both Rufinus and St. Augustin, who were before him, and Maximus of Turinensis, Chrysogonus, Etherius, and Beatus, who were later, read it, “Et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus Unicum.” But the word used in the scriptures, and kept constantly by the Greeks, is Moruneyn, the “Only-begotten.”

For the original is, το ευγενηθη, and it is the observation of St. Basil, ὁι εὑρέωνται το ευγενηθη, ἄλλα το γεννηθη. Indeed the vulgar translation renders it, “quod in ea natura est,” and in St. Luke, “quod nascetur sanctum;” and it must be confessed this was the most ancient translation. For so Terstullian read it: “Per virginem dictis naturam, non ex virgine, et in vulto, non ex vulte, quia et angelus in somnis ad Joseph, Nam quod in ea natura est, inquit, de Spiritu Sancto est.”—De Carne Christi, cap. 18. And of that in St. Luke: “Hic est angelo ex ceperat secundum nostrum evangelium, Propitiera, quod in te nascetur vocabitur sanctum, Filius Dei.”—Adv. Marcion. lib. iv. cap. 7. Yet “quod in ea natura est” cannot be proper, while it is yet in the womb; nor can the child first be said to be born, and then that the mother shall bring it forth. It is true, indeed, γεννηθη signifies not always “to beget,” but sometimes “to bear or bring forth;” as, “Η γεννηθη σου Ἑλισαβετ γεννηθη, νικοσ σου, Luke i. 13; and verse 57, Καὶ γεννηθηνυ δοσο. So, Τοῦ δὲ ἑαυτοῦ γεννηθηνυ τοῦ Βοδῆλου, Matt. ii. 1, must necessarily be understood of Christ’s nativity; for it is most certain, that he was not begotten or conceived at Bethlehem. And this wondrous question must be the meaning of Herod’s inquisition, Ποῦ ἐν Χριστός γεννηθη, “Where the Messias was to be born.” But though γεννηθη have sometime the signification of “bearing or bringing forth,” yet το ευγενηθη cannot be so interpreted, because it speaks of something as past, when as yet Christ was not born; and though the conception was already past, and we translate it so “which is conceived;” yet St. Basil rejects that interpretation; γεννηθη is one thing, συλλομβαινεις another. Seeing then the nativity was not yet come, and γεννηθη speaks of something already past, therefore the old translation is not good, “quod in ea natura est.” Seeing, though the conception indeed was past, yet γεννηθη signifies not “to conceive,” and so is not properly to be interpreted, “that which is conceived;” seeing γεννηθη is most properly “to beget,” as γεννηθη, “the generative faculty;” therefore I conceive the fittest interpretation of those words, το ευγενηθη, “that which is begotten in her.” And because the angel in St. Luke speaks of the same thing, there fore I interpret το γεννηθηνυ εκ σου, in the same manner, “that which is begotten of thee.”

* Luke i. 35.
Ghost is God. For were he any creature, and not God himself, by whom our Saviour was thus born of the Virgin, he must have been the son of a creature, not of God.

Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the same Christ, thus born of the Virgin by the Spirit of God, was designed to so high an office by the special and immediate will of God, that by virtue thereof he must be acknowledged the Son of God. He urgeth this argument himself against the Jews; Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are Gods? Are not these the very words of the eighty-second Psalm? If he called them Gods, if God himself so spake, or the Psalmist from him, if this be the language of the scripture, if they be called Gods unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken, nor the authority thereof in any particular denied); Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, whom he hath consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary office, say ye of him, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?

Thirdly, Christ must therefore be acknowledged the Son of God because he is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life. For God hath fulfilled the promise unto us; in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. The grave is as the womb of the earth; Christ, who is raised from thence, is as it were begotten to another life; and God, who raised him, is his Father. So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Thus was he defined, or constituted, and appointed the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead; neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, the first-born from the dead.

Fourthly, Christ, after his resurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his Father's house, and Lord of all the spirits which minister unto him, from whence he also hath the title of the Son of God. He is set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? From all which testimonies of the scriptures it is evident, that Christ hath this fourfold right unto the title of the Son of God: by generation, as begotten of God; by commission, as sent by him; by resurrection, as the first-born; by actual possession, as heir of all.

1 John x. 34-36 2 Acts xiii. 33. 3 Luke xx. 36. 4 Col. i. 18. 5 Rom. i. 4. 6 Heb. i. 3-5.
4.—But beside these four, we must find yet a more peculiar ground of our Saviour's filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the sons of God, that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the Only-begotten Son. For although to be born of a Virgin be in itself miraculous, and justly entitles Christ unto the Son of God: yet it is not so far above the production of all mankind, as to place him in that singular eminence which must be attributed to the only-begotten. We read of Adam the son of God, as well as Seth the son of Adam; and surely the framing Christ out of a woman cannot so far transcend the making Adam out of the earth, as to cause so great a distance as we must believe between the first and second Adam. Beside, there were many while our Saviour preached on earth who did believe his doctrine, and did confess him to be the Son of God, who in all probability understood nothing of his being born of a Virgin; much less did they foresee his rising from the dead, or inheriting all things. Wherefore supposing all these ways by which Christ is represented to us as the Son of God, we shall find out one more yet, far more proper in itself, and more peculiar unto him, in which no other son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which we must confess him the Only-begotten.

5.—To which purpose I observe, that the actual possession of his inheritance, which was our fourth title to his Sonship, presupposeth his resurrection, which was the third: and his commission to his office, which was the second, presupposeth his generation of a Virgin, as the first. But I shall now endeavour to find another generation, by which the same Christ was begotten, and consequently a Son, before he was conceived in the Virgin's womb. Which that I may be able to evince, I shall proceed in this following method, as not only most facile and perspicuous, but also most convincing and conclusive. First, I will clearly prove out of the holy scriptures, that Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, had an actual being or subsistence before the Holy Ghost did come upon the Virgin, or the power of the highest did overshadow her. Secondly, I will demonstrate from the same scriptures, that the being which he had antecedently to his conception in the Virgin's womb was not any created being but essentially divine. Thirdly, we will show that the divine essence which he had, he received as communicated to him by the Father. Fourthly, we will declare this communication of the divine nature to be a proper generation, by which he which communicateth is a proper Father, and he to whom it is communicated, a proper Son.

1 Luke iii. 38.
Lastly, we will manifest that the divine essence was never communicated in that manner to any person but to him, that never any was so begotten besides himself, and consequently, in respect of that divine generation, he is most properly and perfectly the Only-begotten Son of the Father.

6.—As for the first, that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence, by which he truly was, before he was conceived of the Virgin Mary, I thus demonstrate. He which was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven or went unto the Father, he had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. This is most clear and evident, upon these three suppositions not to be denied. First, that Christ did receive no other being or nature after his conception before his ascension, than what was begotten of the Virgin. Secondly, that what was begotten of the Virgin had its first being here on earth, and therefore could not really be in heaven till it ascended thither. Thirdly, that what was really in heaven, really was; because nothing can be present in any place, which is not. Upon these suppositions, certainly true, the first proposition cannot be denied. Wherefore I assume; Jesus Christ was really in heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into heaven, or went unto the Father; as I shall particularly prove by the express words of the scripture. Therefore, I conclude, that Jesus Christ had a real being or existence before he was conceived in the Virgin, and distinct from that being which was conceived in her. Now that he was really in heaven before he ascended thither appeareth by his own words to his disciples: What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? 1 For he speaketh of a real ascension, such as was to be seen or looked upon, such as they might view as spectators. The place to which that ascension tended was truly and really the heaven of heavens. The verb substantive, 2 not otherwise used, sufficiently testifieth, not a figurative, but a real, being, especially considering the opposition in the word before. Whether we look upon the time of speaking, then present, or the time of his ascension, then to come, his being or existing in heaven was before. Nor is this now at last denied, that he was in heaven before the ascension mentioned in these words, but that he was there before he ascended at all. We shall therefore farther show that this ascension was the first;

1 Θεωρήτε as it came to pass: ἐλευθερίαν αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη. (Acts 1:9.) John vi. 62. 2 ἐστήν ἡμ.
that what was born of the Virgin was never in heaven before this
time of which he speaks: and being in heaven before this ascen-
sion, he must be acknowledged to have been there before he
ascended at all. If Christ had ascended into heaven before his
death, and descended from thence, it had been the most remark-
able action in all his life, and the proof thereof of the greatest
efficacy toward the disseminating of the gospel. And can we
imagine so divine an action of so high concernment could have
passed, and none of the evangelists ever make mention of it?
Those which are so diligent in the description of his nativity and
circumcision, his oblation in the temple, his reception by Simeon,
his adoration by the wise men; those which have described his
descent into Egypt; would they have omitted his ascent into
heaven? Do they tell us of the wisdom which he showed when
he disputed with the doctors? and were it not worthy our know-
ledge whether it were before he was in heaven or after.

7.—The diligent seeking of Joseph and Mary, and her words
when they found him, Son, why hast thou dealt so with us? show
that he had not been missing from them till then, and conse-
quently not ascended into heaven. After that he went down to
Nazareth, and was subject unto them:1 and I understand not how
he should ascend into heaven, and at the same time be subject to
them; or there receive his commission and instructions as the
great legate of God, or ambassador from heaven, and return again
unto his old subjection; and afterwards to go to John to be
baptized of him, and to expect the descent of the Spirit for his
inauguration. Immediately from Jordan he is carried into the
wilderness to be tempted of the devil: and it were strange if any
time could then be found for his ascension: for he was forty days
in the wilderness, and certainly heaven is no such kind of place;
he was all that time with the beasts, who undoubtedly are none of
the celestial hierarchy; and tempted of Satan, whose dominion
reacheth no higher than the air. Wherefore in those forty days
Christ ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended
unto him; for the angels ministered unto him.2 After this he
returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee,3 and there exercised
his prophetical office: after which there is not the least pretence
of any reason for his ascension. Beside, the whole frame of this
antecedent or preparatory ascension of Christ is not only raised
without any written testimony of the word, or unwritten testimony
of tradition, but is without any reason in itself, and contrary to
the revealed way of our redemption. For what reason should
Christ ascend into heaven to know the will of God, and not be

known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in heaven. And if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son?

8.—Nor is this only asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by Christ as he was anointed to the sacerdotal office. For the holy of holies made with hands was the figure of the true (that is, heaven itself), into which the high priest alone went once every year: and Christ as our high priest entered in once into the holy place.\(^1\) If then they deny Christ was a priest before he preached the gospel, then did he not enter into heaven, because the high priest alone went into the type thereof, the holy of holies. If they confess he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but once. and that not without blood. Wherefore being Christ ascended not into heaven till after his death, being he certainly was in heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our argument, that Jesus Christ was in heaven before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither. Now that which followeth will both illustrate and confirm it: for as he was there, so he descended from thence before he ascended thither. This he often testifieth and inculcateth of himself; The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven; and, I am the living bread which came down from heaven.\(^2\) He opposeth himself unto the manna in the wilderness, which never was really in heaven, or had its original from thence. Moses gave you not that bread from heaven: \(^3\) but the Father gave Christ really from thence. Wherefore he saith, I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.\(^4\) Now never any person upon any occasion is said to descend from heaven, but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the angels; but no man, however born, however sanctified, sent, or dignified, is said thereby to descend from thence; but rather when any is opposed to Christ, the opposition is placed in this very origination. John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb; \(^5\) born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God: and yet he distinguisheth himself from Christ in this; He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all.\(^6\)

9.—Adam was framed immediately by God, without the inter-

---

1 Heo. ix. 24, 7, 12.  
2 John vi. 33, 51.  
3 Verse 32.  
4 Verse 33.  
5 Luke i. 15.  
6 John iii. 31.
vention of man or woman; and yet he is so far from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is distinguished from the second Adam. For the first man is of the earth earthly, the second man is the Lord from heaven. Wherefore the descent of Christ from heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and that antecedently to any ascent thither. For that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first? So St. Paul, asserting a descent as necessarily preceding his ascension, teacheth us never to imagine an ascent of Christ as his first motion between heaven and earth; and consequently, that the first being or existence which Christ had, was not what he received by his conception here on earth, but what he had before in heaven, in respect whereof he was with the Father, from whom he came. His disciples believed that he came out from God; and he commended that faith, and confirmed the object of it by this assertion: I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world and go to the Father. Thus having, by undoubted testimonies, made good the latter part of the argument, I may safely conclude, that being Christ was really in heaven, and descended from thence, and came forth from the Father, before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither; it cannot with any show of reason be denied, that Christ had a real being and existence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and distinct from the being which he received here.

10.—Secondly, we shall prove not only a bare priority of existence, but a pre-existence of some certain and acknowledged space of duration. For whosoever was before John the Baptist and before Abraham, was some space of time before Christ was man. This no man can deny, because all must confess the blessed Virgin was first saluted by the angel six months after Elisabeth conceived, and many hundred years after Abraham died. But Jesus Christ was really existent before John the Baptist, and before Abraham, as we shall make good by the testimony of the scriptures. Therefore it cannot be denied but Christ had a real being and existence some space of time before he was made man. For the first, it is the express testimony of John himself: This is he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me. In which words, first, he taketh to himself a priority of time, speaking of Christ, he that cometh after me: for so he came after him into the womb, at his conception: into the world, at his nativity; unto his office, at his baptism; always after John, and at the same distance. Secondly, he attributeth unto Christ a priority of dignity, saying, he is preferred before me; as

1 Cor. xvi. 47. 2 Eph. iv. 9. 3 John xvi. 27, 23. 4 John i. 15.
appeareth by the re\:\:eration of these words; He it is who, coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.\(^1\) The addition of which expression of his own unworthiness showeth, that to be preferred before him is the same with being worthier than he, to which the same expression is constantly added by all the other three evangelists. Thirdly, he rendereth the reason or cause of that great dignity which belonged to Christ, saying, for, or rather, because he was before me. And being the cause must be supposed different and distinct from the effect, therefore the priority last mentioned cannot be that of dignity. For to assign anything as the cause or reason of itself, is a great absurdity, and the expression of it a vain tautology. Wherefore that priority must have relation to time or duration (as the very tense, he was before me, sufficiently signifieth), and so be placed in opposition to his coming after him. As if John the Baptist had thus spoke at large: This man Christ Jesus, who came into the world, and entered on his prophetic\:\:al office six months after me, is notwithstanding of far more worth and greater dignity than I am; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge myself unworthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes: and the reason of this transcendent dignity is from the excellency of that nature which he had before I was; for though he cometh after me, yet he was before me.

11.—Now as Christ was before John, which speaks a small, so was he also before Abraham, which speaks a larger time. Jesus himself hath asserted this pre\:\:istence to the Jews; Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was I am.\(^2\) Which words, plainly and literally expounded, must evidently contain this truth. For first, Abraham, in all the scriptures, never hath any other signification than such as denotes the person called by that name; and the question to which these words are directed by way of answer, without controversy spake of the same person. Beside, Abraham must be the subject of that proposition, Abraham was; because a proposition cannot be without a subject, and if Abraham be the predicate, there is none. Again, as we translate Abraham was, in a tense signifying the time past; so it is most certainly to be understood, because that which he speaks unto is the pre\:\:istence of Abraham, and that of long duration; so that whatsoever had concerned his present estate or future condition had been wholly impertinent to the precedent question. Lastly, the expression, I am, seeming something unusual or improper to signify a priority in respect of anything past, because no present instant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth:

\(^1\) John i. 27.\(^2\) John viii. 58.
yet the use of it sufficiently maintaineth, and the nature of the place absolutely requireth, that it should not here denote a present being, but a priority of existence, together with a continuation of it till the present time. 1 And then the words will plainly signify thus much: Do you question how I could see Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old? Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before ever Abraham, the person whom you speak of, was born, I had a real being and existence (by which I was capable of the sight of him), in which I have continued until now. 2 In this sense certainly the Jews understood our Saviour’s answer, as pertinent to their question, but in their opinion blasphemous; and therefore they took up stones to cast at him. 3

12.—This literal and plain explication is yet farther necessary; because those which once recede from it, do not only wrest and pervert the place, but also invent and suggest an answer unworthy of and wholly misbecoming him that spake it. For (setting aside the addition, of the light of the world, which there can be no show or reason to admit;) 4 whether they interpret the former part

1 So Nonnus here more briefly and plainly than usual:—

'Αβραάμ πριν γένος ἐσχεν, ἔγω πέλον—
So John xiv. 9: Τοσότον ἱπον μεθ’ ὦμῶν εἶμι, καὶ οὐκ ἐγρακάς με; "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me?" And John xv. 27: 'Οτα ἂν ἀρχίζης μετ’ έμων ἐστέ, "Because ye have been (or continued) with me from the beginning." Thus Nonnus:

'Εξ ἀρχῆς γεγονότες ἔλον θηρήτορες ἐργάων.

John vi. 24: "Ὅτε οὖν εἶδον ὁ ὄχλος ὅτε Ἰησοῦς οὖκ ἐστίν ἐκεῖ, "When the people saw that Jesus was not there." Nor only didth St. John use thus the present tense for that which is past, but as frequently for that which is to come. For as before, Τοσότον ἱπον μεθ’ ὦμῶν εἶμι, so on the contrary, Ἐπὶ μικρῶν ἱπον μεθ’ ὦμῶν εἶμι (John vii. 23;) and, Ὅποιον εἰμί ἐγώ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἐσται. (John xiii. 26; xiv. 3; xvii. 24.) Wherefore It is very indifferent whether (John vii. 31) we read, Ὅποιον εἰμι ἐγώ, or ὅποιον εἰμί. For Nonnus seems to have read εἰμί by his translation:—

Εἰς ἀπαραγὸν ἦν περ ὀδέωσιν

and the Jews’ question, Ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει παρεῖναι; shows they understood it so: for this εἰμι, though of a present form, is of a future signification. Hesychius: Εἰμί, παρεῖνομαι. And so It agreeth with that which follows, John viii. 21: "Ὅτον εἶχον ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς σὺ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν. If we read εἰμί, as the old translation, "Ubi ego sum," it will have the force of εἰσέλθει, and agree with the other. Ἡμι οὗτον εἰμί ἐγώ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστε. However, it is clear, St. John useth the present εἰμί either in relation to what is past, or what is to come, and is therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand required. And certainly the place now under our consideration can admit no other relation but to the time already past, in which Abraham lived. And we find the present tense in the same manner joined with the aorist elsewhere; as Psalm xc. 2: Πρὸ τοῦ ὅρη γεννηθήσαι, καὶ πλασθήσαι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν οἰκομενήν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, ἐως τοῦ αἰῶνος, σὺ εἰ. What can be more parallel than, πρὸ τοῦ ὅρη γεννηθήσαι, το πρίν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι, and σὺ εἰ, to ἐγώ εἰμι; In the same manner, though by another word, Πρὸ τοῦ ὅρη δεσμοθητηθήσῃ, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννήσαι, (John xvi. 25.)

2 So the Ethiopic version: "Amen dico vobis, Prinsequam Abraham nascetur, fu et ego;" and the Persian: "Verē, verē vobis dico, quod nondum Abraham factus erat, cum ego eram."

3 Verse 59.

4 This is the shift of the Socinians, who make this speech of Christ elliptical, and then supply it from the twelfth verse, "I am the light of the world."

"Quod vero ea verba, Εγν σεµ, sint ad emum modum suppleenda, ac ipsa subjacentes. Εγν σεµ ται μωμεται, superius e principio eis ortas otratias, (ver. 12,) et hinc quod Christus bis sempiternum isdem, Εγν σεµ, luceb muu M uniat voeavet, (ver. 24 et 25,) reprehendi potest."—Catech. Racov.

There is no ground for any such connexion. That discourse of the light of the world was in the treasury; (verse 20;) that which followeth was not, at least appearance not to be so. Therefore the ellipse of the 24th and 25th verses is not to be supplied by the 12th, but the 24th from the 23d: "Εγν ει τοις αποθεθεται eimuc" and the 25th, either from the same or, that which is most general,
(before Abraham was) of something to come, as the calling of the Gentiles, or the latter (I am) of a pre-existence in the divine foreknowledge and appointment; they represent Christ with a great asseveration highly and strongly asserting that which is nothing to the purpose to which he speaks, nothing to any other purpose at all: and they propound the Jews senselessly offended and foolishly exasperated with those words, which any of them might have spoken as well as he. For the first interpretation makes our Saviour thus to speak: Do ye so much wonder how I should have seen Abraham, who am not yet fifty years old? do ye imagine so great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye most assured that what I speak unto you at this time is most certainly and infallibly true, and most worthy of your observation, which moves me not to deliver it without this solemn asseveration (Verily, verily, I say unto you) Before Abraham shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, the father of many nations, before the Gentiles shall come in, I am. Nor be ye troubled at this answer, or think in this I magnify myself: for what I speak is as true of you as it is of me: before Abraham be thus made Abraham, ye are. Doubt ye not therefore, as ye did, nor ever make that question again, whether I have seen Abraham. The second explication makes a sense of another nature, but with the same impertinency. Do ye continue still to question, and that with so much admiration? do ye look upon my age, and ask, Hast thou seen Abraham? I confess it is more than eighteen hundred years since that patriarch died, and less than forty since I was born at Bethlehem: but look not on this computation, for before Abraham was born, I was. But mistake me not, I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnify myself in this, for ye were so. How either of these answers should give any reasonable satisfaction to the question, or the least occasion of the Jews' exasperation, is not to be understood. And that our Saviour should speak any such impertinencies as these interpretations bring forth, is not by a Christian to be conceived. Wherefore being the plain and most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving Jews; being those strained explications render the words of Christ, not only impertinent to the occasion, but vain and useless to the hearers of them; being our Saviour gave this answer in words of another language, most probably incapable of any such interpretations: we must adhere unto that literal sense already delivered, by which

his office, Ἐγώ είμι ὁ Χριστός. Again, verse 31, it is very probable that a new discourse is again begun; and therefore if there were an ellipsis in the words alleged, it would have no relation to either of the former supplies, or, if to either, to the latter; but indeed it hath to neither,
it appeareth Christ had a being as before John, so also before Abraham (not only before Abram became Abraham, but before Abraham was Abram) and consequently that he did exist two thousand years before he was born, or conceived by the Virgin.

13.—Thirdly, we shall extend this pre-existence to a far longer space of time, to the end of the first world, nay to the beginning of it. For he which was before the flood, and at the creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin. But Christ was really before the flood, for he preached to them that lived before it; and at the creation of the world, for he created it. That he preached to those before the flood is evident by the words of St. Peter, who saith, that Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing. 1 From which words it appeareth, that Christ preached by the same Spirit by the virtue of which he was raised from the dead: but that Spirit was not his soul, but something of a greater power. Secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient. Thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood, while the ark was preparing. It is certain, then, that Christ did preach unto those persons which in the days of Noah were disobedient all that time the long-suffering of God waited, and, consequently, so long as repentance was offered. 2 And it is as certain that he never preached to them after they died; which I shall not need here to prove, because those against whom I bring this argument deny it not. It followeth, therefore, that he preached to them while they lived, and were disobedient; for in the refusing of that mercy which was offered to them by the preaching of Christ, did their disobedience principally consist. In vain, then, are we taught to understand St. Peter of the promulgation of the gospel to the Gentiles after the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles, when the words themselves refuse all relation to any such times or persons. For all those of whom St. Peter speaks were disobedient in the days of Noah. But none of those to whom the apostles preached were ever disobedient in the days of Noah. Therefore none of those to which the apostles preached were any of those of which St. Peter speaks. It remaineth, therefore, that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true, that Christ did preach unto those men which lived before the flood, even while they lived, and consequently that he was before it. For though

1 Peter iii. 18-20: Ἀπεθύνσατι ποιε, ὅτε ἀπαν ἐζεδύετο ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ μακροβυμία ἐκ ἡμέρας Νοέ.  
3 Ibid.
this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world: but by the ministry of a prophet, 1 by the sending of Noah, the eighth preacher of righteousness: 2 yet to do anything by another not to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument.

14.—The second part of the argument, that Christ made this world, and consequently had a real being at the beginning of it, the scriptures manifestly and plentifully assure us. For the same Son, by whom in these last days God spake unto us, is he by whom also he made the worlds. 3 So that, as through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, 4 so must we also believe that they were made by the Son of God. 5 Which the apostle doth not only in the entrance of his epistle deliver, but in the sequel prove. For showing greater things have been spoken

1 “Prophete ab ipso habentes donum in illum prophetaverunt.”—Barnab. Epist.
2 I have thus translated this place of St. Peter, because it may add some advantage to the argument: for if Noah were the eighth preacher of righteousness, and he were sent by the Son of God; no man, I conceive, will deny that the seven before him were sent by the same Son: and so by this we have gained the pre-existence of another thousand years. However, those words, ‘Αλλ’ άγγελον Ναός δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα εφύλαξε, may be better interpreted than they are when we translate them, “But saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness.” For, First, if we look upon the Greek phrase, άγγελον Ναός may be, not the eighth person, but one of eight, or Noah with seven more; in which it signifieth not the order in which he was in respect to the rest, but only consignifieth the number which were with him. As when we read in the Sulpices of Aschylus, 715,

Τὸ γάρ τεκότων σέβας, Τρίτον τὸν ἐν θεσμοῖς 
Δίκαια γέγραπται μεγιστότερον,

we must not understand it as if honour due to parents was the third commandment at Athens, but one of the three remarkable laws left at Eleusis by Triptolemus. So Porphyrius. Φασί δὲ καὶ Τριπτόλεμον Ἀθηναίοις νομοθέτησαν, καὶ τῶν νύμων αὐτοῦ τρεῖς ἐπὶ Ευνομολόγητος ὁ ἀληθῆςλος λέγει διαμένειν Ἐλευσίνη τοισδε Γονεῖς τιμῶν Θεός καρποῖς ἀγάλλων Ζωά μη σύνεσθαι.—De Athlit.

The words are thus translated by St. Jerome, who hath made use of most part of that fourth book of Porphyrius:

Xenocrates philosophus de Triptolemi legibus apud Atheniensis tria tantum praecipita in templi Eleusiniae resideri scribit: Hono-

rando parentibus, Venerandos deos, Carnibus et Vegetclis:—Ado. Joeniam. lib. II.

Where we see honour due to parents the first precept, though by Aschylus called the third, not in respect of the order, but the number. Thus Dinarchus the orator: Καί τὰς σεμιών θεᾶς αἰς ἔκεινοι ἱεροποιοί καταστάσας δίκαιοι αὐτοῖς. From whence we must not collect that the person of whom he speaks was the tenth in order of that office, so that nine were necessarily before or above him, and many more might be after or below him; but from hence it is inferred, that there were ten ιεροποιοὶ waiting on the σεμιῶν θεᾶς, and no more, of which number that man was one. After this manner speak the Attic writers, especially Thucyldides. And so we may understand St. Peter, that God preserved Noah, “a preacher of righteousness,” with seven more, of which he deserveth to be named the first, rather than the last or eighth. But, Secondly, the ordinal άγγέλον may possibly not belong to the name or person of Noah, but to his title or office; and then we must translate άγγελον Ναός δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, “Noah the eighth preacher of righteousness.” For we read at the birth of Enos, that “men began to call upon the name of the Lord;” (Gen. iv. 26;) which the ancients understood peculiarly of his person; as the LXX.: Οὔτος ἠλπίσαν ἐπικαλεσθαι τὸ όνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ and the Vulgar Latin: “Iste ceptit invocare nomen Domini.” The Jews have a tradition, that God sent in the sea upon mankind in the days of Enos, and destroyed many. From whence it seems Enos was a preacher or prophet, and so the rest that followed; and then Noah is the eighth. 2 Peter ii. 5.

3 Heb. i. 2. 4 Heb. xi. 3
5 It being in both places expressed in the same phrase by the same author: Δι' αὐτὸ καὶ τῶν αἰώνων ἔποιησαν. (Heb. i. 2.) Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσασθαι τοὺς αἰώνας ῥήματος Θεοῦ. (Heb. xi. 3.)
of him than ever were attributed to any of the angels, the most glorious of all the creatures of God; amongst the rest he saith, the scripture spake unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. And not only so, but also, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail! Now whatsoever the person be to whom these words were spoken, it cannot be denied but he was the creator of the world. For he must be acknowledged the maker of the earth, who laid the foundation of it; and he may justly challenge to himself the making of the heavens, who can say, they are the work of his hands. But these words were spoken to the Son of God, as the apostle himself acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the order and series of the chapter; the design of which is to declare the supereminent excellency of our Saviour Christ. Nay, the conjunction and refers this place of the Psalmist plainly to the former, of which he had said expressly, but unto the Son, he saith. As sure then as thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, was said unto the Son; so certain it is, Thou, Lord, hast laid the foundation of the earth, was said unto the same. Nor is it possible to avoid the apostle's connexion by attributing the destruction of the heavens, out of the last words, to the Son, and denying the creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident that there is but one person spoken to, and that the destruction and the creation of the heavens are both attributed to the same. Whosoever therefore shall grant that the apostle produced this scripture to show that the Son of God shall destroy the heavens, must withal acknowledge that he created them: whosoever denieth him to be here spoken of as the creator, must also deny him to be understood as the destroyer.

15.—Wherefore being the words of the Psalmist were undoubtedly spoken of and to our Saviour (or else the apostle hath attributed that unto him which never belonged to him, and consequently the spirit of St. Paul mistook the spirit of David); being to whomsoever any part of them belongs, the whole is applicable, because they are delivered unto one; being the literal exposition is so clear that no man hath ever pretended to a

1 Heb. i. 8, 10-12.

2 The answer of Socinus to this conjunction is very weak, relying only upon the want of a comma after καί in the Greek and “et” in the Latin. And whereas it is evident that there are distinctions in the Latin and Greek copies after that conjunction, he flies to the ancientest copies, which all men know were most careless of distinctions, and urgeth that there is no addition of “rursum,” or the like, after “et,” whereas in the Syriac translation we find expressly that addition, בִּלְחָד.
metaphorical: it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profession of the Psalmist, and the interpretation of an apostle, that the Son of God created the world. Nor needed we so long to have insisted upon this testimony, because there are so many which testify as much, but only that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the rest. For they do deny this truth of the creation of the world by the Son of God, notwithstanding all those scriptures produced to confirm it, have found two ways to avoid or decline the force of them. If they speak so plainly and literally of the work of creation, that they will not endure any figurative interpretation, then they endeavour to show that they are not spoken of the Son of God. If they speak so expressly of our Saviour Christ, as that by no machination they can be applied to any other person, then their whole design is to make the creation attributed unto him appear to be merely metaphorical. The place before alleged is of the first kind, which speaketh so clearly of the creation or real production of the world, that they never denied it: and I have so manifestly shown it spoken to the Son of God, that it is beyond all possibility of gain-saying.

Thus having asserted the creation acknowledged real unto Christ, we shall the easier persuade that likewise to be such which is pretended to be metaphorical. In the epistle to the Colossians we read of the Son of God, in whom we have redemption through his blood;¹ and we are sure those words can be spoken of none other than Jesus Christ. He therefore it must be who was thus described by the apostle: Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.² In which words our Saviour is expressly styled the first-born of every creature,³ that is, begotten by God, as the Son of his love,⁴ antecedently to all other emanations, before anything proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that precedency is presently proved by this undeniable argument, that all other emanations or productions came from him, and whatsoever received its being by creation was by him

¹ Col. i. 14. ² Col. i. 15-17. ³ "The first-born of every creature" is taken by Origen for an expression declaring the Divinity of Christ, and used by him as a phrase in opposition to his humanity to express the same. Ἐλέγομεν δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω, ὅτι αἱ μὲν πνεῦς εἰσὶ φωναί τοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἡσοῦ Πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως, ὡς ἡ, Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὅδε, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ ἡ ζωή, καὶ αἱ τούτων παραπλησία: αἱ δὲ τούτων αὐτῶν παραπλησίαι, ὡς ἡ, Νῦν δὲ μὲ ἡ ἐπιτεῖτα ἀποκτείναι, ἀνθρωπον οὐ τὴν ἀλήθειαν μιαν καταλαμβάνει.—Contr. Celsum, lib. ii.

⁴ In relation to the precedent words, ὃς ὁ Υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, for that Υἱὸς ἀγαθός τός was the Υἱὸς Πρωτότοκος.
created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper, full, and pregnant expressions imaginable. First, in the vulgar phrase of Moses, as most consonant to his description; for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth; signifying thereby, that he speaketh of the same creation. Secondly, by a division which Moses never used, as describing the production only of corporeal substances: lest therefore those immaterial beings might seem exempted from the Son’s creation, because omitted in Moses’s description, he addeth visible and invisible; and lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestial hierarchy, any order might seem exempted from an essential dependence upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, and under them comprehendeth all the rest. Nor doth it yet suffice, thus to extend the object of his power by asserting all things to be made by him, except it be so understood as to acknowledge the sovereignty of his person and the authority of his action. For lest we should conceive the Son of God framing the world as a mere instrumental cause which worketh by and for another, he showeth him as well the final as the efficient cause; for all things were created by him, and for him.

16.—Lastly, whereas all things first receive their being by creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by virtue of God’s conservation, in whom we live, and move, and have our being; lest in anything we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the conserver, as well as the creator; for he is before all things, and by him all things consist. If then we consider the two last cited verses by themselves, we cannot deny but they are a most complete description of the creator of the world; and if they were spoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his majesty, who is nowhere more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the maker of the world.

17.—Now although this were sufficient to persuade us to interpret this place of the making of the world; yet it will not be unfit to make use of another reason, which will compel us so to understand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of creation in the language of the scriptures, the one literal, the other metaphorical; one old, the other new; one by way of formation, the other by way of reformation. If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, saith St. Paul; and again, In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. Instead of which words he had before, faith working by love. For we are

1 2 Cor. v. 17. 2 Gal. vi. 15 v. 6.
the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. From whence it is evident that a new creature is such a person as truly believeth in Christ, and manifesteth that faith by the exercise of good works; and the new creation is the reforming or bringing man into this new condition, which by nature or his first creation he was not in.

18.—And therefore he which is so created is called a new man, in opposition to the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts: from whence the apostle chargeth us to be renewed in the spirit of our mind, and to put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness; and which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him. The new creation then is described to us as consisting wholly in renovation, or a translation from a worse unto a better condition by way of reformation; by which those which have lost the image of God, in which the first man was created, are restored to the image of the same God again, by a real change, though not substantial, wrought within them. Now this being the notion of the new creation in all those places which undoubtedly and confessedly speak of it, it will be necessary to apply it unto such scriptures as are pretended to require the same interpretation. Thus therefore I proceed. If the second or new creation cannot be meant by the apostle in the place produced out of the epistle to the Colossians, then it must be interpreted of the first. For there are but two kinds of creation mentioned in the scriptures, and one of them is there expressly named. But the place of the apostle can no way admit an interpretation by the new creation, as will thus appear: The object of the creation mentioned in this place is of as great latitude and universality as the object of the first creation, not only expressed, but implied, by Moses. But the object of the new creation is not of the same latitude with that of the old. Therefore that which is mentioned here cannot be the new creation. For certainly if we reflect upon the true notion of the new creation, it necessarily and essentially includes an opposition to a former worse condition, as the new man is always opposed to the old: and if Adam had continued still in innocency, there could have been no such distinction between the old man and the new, or the old

1 Eph. ii. 10. 2 Eph. iv. 22-21.
and new creation. Being then all men become not new, being there is no new creature but such whose faith worketh by love, being so many millions of men have neither faith nor love; it cannot be said that by Christ all things were created anew that are in heaven and that are in earth, when the greatest part of mankind have no share in the new creation. Again, we cannot imagine that the apostle should speak of the creation in a general word, intending thereby only the new, and while he doth so, express particularly and especially those parts of the old creation which are incapable of the new, or at least have no relation to it.

19.—The angels are all either good or bad: but whether they be bad, they can never be good again, nor did Christ come to redeem the devils; or whether they be good, they were always such, nor were they so by the virtue of Christ's incarnation, for he took not on him the nature of angels.1 We acknowledge in mankind a new creation, because an old man becomes a new; but there is no such notion in the celestial hierarchy, because no old and new angels: they which fell, are fallen for eternity; they which stand, always stood, and shall stand for ever. Where, then, are the regenerated thrones and dominions? where are the recreated principalities and powers? All those angels, of whatsoever degrees, were created by the Son of God, as the apostle expressly affirms. But they were never created by a new creation unto true holiness and righteousness, because they always were truly righteous and holy ever since their first creation. Therefore except we could yet invent another creation, which were neither the old nor the new, we must conclude that all the angels were at first created by the Son of God; and as they, so all things else, especially man, whose creation2 all the first writers of the church of God expressly attribute unto the Son, asserting that those words, Let us make man, were spoken as by the Father unto him.

20.—Nor need we doubt of this interpretation, or the doctrine arising from it, seeing it is so clearly delivered by St. John: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God, All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made.3 Whereas we have proved Christ had a being before he

1 Heb. ii. 16.
2 "Ad hoc Dominus sustinuit pati pro anima nostra, cum sit orbis terrarum Dominus, cui dixit die ante constitutionem seculi, Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram."—BARNABE Epist. cap. 4. And again: Λέγει γάρ ἡ γραφή περὶ ἡμῶν ὡς Λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Ποιήσωμεν κατ' εἰκόνα, δε.—Carp. 5. 'Εγκαλοῦμεν οὖν Ἰουδαίως τούτων μὴ νομίσαι Θεόν ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν πολ.-
3 John i. 1-3.
was conceived by the Virgin Mary, because he was at the beginning of the world; and have also proved that he was at the beginning of the world, because he made it; this place of St. John gives a sufficient testimony to the truth of both the last together. In the beginning was the Word; and that Word made flesh is Christ: therefore Christ was in the beginning. All things were made by him: therefore he created the world. Indeed nothing can be more clearly penned, to give full satisfaction in this point, than these words of St. John, which seem with a strange brevity designed to take off all objections, and remove all prejudice, before they teach so strange a truth. Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, and his age was known to them for whom this gospel was penned.

21.—St. John would teach that this Christ did make the world, which was created at least four thousand years before his birth. The name of Jesus was given him since at his circumcision, the title of Christ belonged unto his office, which he exercised not till thirty years after. Neither of these with any show of probability will reach to the creation of the world. Wherefore he produces a name of his, as yet unknown to the world, or rather not taken notice of, though in frequent use among the Jews, which belonged unto him who was made man, but before he was so. Under this name he shows at first that he had a being in the beginning; 1 when all things were to be created, and consequently were not yet, then, in the beginning was the Word, and so not created. This is the first step, the Word was not created when the world was made. The next is, that the same Word which then was, and was not made, at the same time was with God, 2 when he made all things: and therefore well may we conceive it is he to whom God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; 3 and of whom those words may be understood, Behold, the man is become as one of us. 4 After this, lest any should conceive the creation of the world too great and divine a work to be attributed to the Word; lest any should object that none can produce anything out of nothing but God himself; he addeth, that the Word, as he was with God, so was he also God. Again, lest any should divide the Deity, or

1 '\En ἀρχὴ,' the first word of Moses; whence the Syriac translation, תֵּמָא, So Solomon, יֵשֶׁנְא בַּמְּלֹאכָּם. 'En ἀρχή πρὸ τοῦ τῆς γῆς φυσιάς. (Prov. viii. 23,) "In principio erat Sermo; in quo principio scilicet Deus fecit coelum et terram."—TERTULLIAN. Adv. HEBR. cap. 20.

2 Πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, that is, παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, that is, ‘of God.” As Nomus:—

Πατρὸς ἐνι ἀμέριστος ἀτέρμοιον σύνθρονος ἐγερ.

As Wisdom speaketh, Prov. viii. 30: “Then I was by him,” ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ "Et eram in latere ejus." Moschopulus, Peri Schédon—Πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, τοντεῦχος, μετὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ας Ματτ. xiii. 6: Α λαλοῦσα ἀντοῦ εὐνῖ πάσαν πρὸς ημᾶς εἰς Μαρκ. xiv. 49: Καθ’ ἀμέριστον, ημῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 1 Cor. xvi. 6: Πρὸς ἤμας δὲ τινὶ παραμείνω. Πεπιστευμένω διακοινών Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὦ πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ Πατρί ἕν, καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφαίνην.—S. Ignat. Ad Magnes.
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frame a false conception of different gods, he returns unto the second assertion, and joins it with the first; The same was in the beginning with God: and then delivers that which at the first seemed strange, but now, after those three propositions, may easily be accepted; All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made. For now this is no new doctrine, but only an interpretation of those scriptures which told us, God made all things by his word before. For God said, Let there be light; and there was light.1

22.—And so, By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth.2 From whence we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.3 Neither was it a new interpretation, but that which was most familiar to the Jews, who in their synagogues, by the reading of the paraphrase4 or the interpretation of the Hebrew text in the

1 Gen. i. 3. 2 Psalm xxxii. 6. 3 I conceive this Chaldee Paraphrase to represent the sense of the Jews of that age, as being their public interpretation of the scripture. Wherefore what we find common and frequent in it, we cannot but think the vulgar and general opinion of that nation. Now, it is certain that this paraphrase doth often use " " the Word of God," for "God" himself, and that especially with relation to the creation of the world. As, Isai. xlv. 12: "I made the earth, and created man upon it, saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel;" which the Chaldee translates: "I made the earth, and created man upon it." In the same manner, Jer. xxxvii. 5: "I made the earth, and men and beasts on the face of the earth:" the Targum אנד בם יערית רחמן And Isai. xlviii. 13: "My hand also founded the earth:" the Chaldee אנד בם יערית רחמן

2 Etiam in Verbo meo fundavisti terram. And most clearly, Gen. i. 27, we read, "Et creavit Deus hominem:"
3 the Jerusalem Targum, " Verbum Domini creavit hominem." And, Gen. ii. 8: "Audierunt vocem Domini Dei:" the Chaldee Paraphrase אנד בם יערית רחמן

4 Et audierunt vocem Verbi Domini Dei. Now this which the Chaldee Paraphrase called אנד בם יערית רחמן the Hellenists named Δόγος as appearreth by Philo the Jew, who wrote before St. John, and reckon in his divinity, εις, Πατέρα των διων, then δευτερον Θεον ὃς ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνον Δόγον.—Quæst. et Solut. Whom he calls δόξαν Θεον δοξάζων & δοξάζων Υἱόν.—De Agricult. He attributes the creation of the world to this Δόγος, whom he terms, Ὅργανον Θεον, δι' οὗ (ὁ κόσμος) κα-

τεστεφασται.—De flammeo Gladio. Σαλὰ δὲ Θεον ὁ Δόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν, οὗ κατάτερ ὄργανον προσχρήσαντον έκκοσμοποιεῖ.—Idem, Alle-

goy, lib. ii. Where we must observe, though Philo makes the Δόγος, of whom he speaks, as instrumental in the creation of the world; yet he taketh it not for a bare expression of the will of God, but for a God, though in the second degree, and expressly for the son of God. Nor ought we to look on Philo Judaeus in this as a Platonist, but merely as a Jew, who refers his whole doctrine of this Δόγος to the first chapter of Genesis. And the rest of the Jews before him, who had no such knowledge out of Plato's School, used the same notion. For as, Isai. xviii. 13, "the hand of God" is by the Chaldee paraphrase translated "the Word of God;" so in the book of Wisdom, 'H παντοδύναμος σου κείραι και κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον.' (Sept. xi. 17,) is changed into Ο Παντοδύναμος του Θεον αὐτοῦ ὅσπον οὐρανον, xviii. 15; and Sirachle xili. 26: 'Εν Δόγος αὐτοῦ συγκέται πάντα. Nay, the Septuagint hath changed "Shaddai," the undoubted name of the omnipotent God, into Δόγος, "the Word," Ezek. i. 21: ὁμπολύσιων Θεον, quod Hebraice appellatur πολύν et juxta LXX. φωτὸν τοῦ Δόγον, id est, nos Verbi, ut universa quae predicabimus in mundo vocem Filii Dei esse dicamus."—S. Hieron. And therefore Celsus, writing in the person of a Jew, acknowledged that the Word is the Son of God. Ei γε ὁ Δόγος ἐστὶν γύνιν Υἱόν του Θεον, και ἡμεῖς ἐπνοούμεν.—Orat. Contra Celsum, lib. ii. And although Origen object that in this Celsus makes the Jew speak improperly, because the Jews which he had conversed with did never acknowledge that the Son of God was the Word; yet Celsus's Jew did speak the language of Philo; but between the time of Celsus and that of Origen, (I guess, about three-score years,) the Jews had learned "that notion of Δόγος, that they might
Chaldee language, were constantly taught that the Word of God was the same with God, and that by that Word all things were made. Which undoubtedly was the cause why St. John delivered so great a mystery in so few words, as speaking unto them who at the first apprehension understood him. Only that which as yet they knew not was, that this Word was made flesh, and that this Word made flesh was Jesus Christ. Wherefore this exposition being so literally clear in itself, so consonant to the notion of the Word, and the apprehension of the Jews; it is infinitely to be preferred before any such interpretation as shall restrain the most universals to a few particulars, change the plainest expressions into figurative phrases, and make of a sublime truth a weak, useless, false discourse. For who will grant that in the beginning must be the same with that in St. John’s epistle, from the beginning, especially when the very interpretation involves in itself a contradiction? For the beginning in St. John’s epistle is that in which the apostles saw, and heard, and touched the Word: the beginning in his gospel was that in which the Word was with God, that is, not seen nor heard by the apostles, but known as yet to God alone, as the new exposition will have it. Who will conceive it worthy of the apostle’s assertion, to teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the gospel, at what time John the Baptist began to preach, when we know the Baptist taught as much, who therefore came baptizing with water, that he might be made manifest unto Israel? when we are sure that St. Matthew and St. Luke, who wrote before him, taught us more than this, that he had a being thirty years before? when we are assured it was as true of any other then living as of the Word, even of Judas who betrayed him, even of Pilate who condemned him? Again, who can imagine the apostle should assert that the Word was, that is, had an actual being, when as yet he was not actually the Word? For if the beginning be when John the Baptist began to preach, and the Word, as they say, be nothing else but he which speaketh, and so revealeth the will of God; Christ had not then revealed the will of God, and consequently was not then actually the Word, but only potentially or by designation. Secondly, it is a strange figurative speech, the Word was with God, that is, was known to God, especially in this apostle’s method. In the beginning was the Word; there was must signify an actual existence: and if so, why in the next sentence

*with more colour reject St. John. If, then, all the Jews, both they which understood the Chaldee exposition, and those which only used the Greek translation, had such a notion of the Word of God if all things by their confession were made by the Word; we have no reason to believe St. John should make use of any other notion than what they before had, and that by means whereof he might be so easily understood.
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(the Word was with God) shall the same verb signify an objective being only? Certainly though to be in the beginning be one thing, and to be with God another; yet to be in either of them is the same. But if we should imagine this being understood of the knowledge of God, why we should grant that thereby is signified he was known to God alone, I cannot conceive. For the proposition of itself is plainly affirmative, and the exclusive particle only added to the exposition maketh it clearly negative. Nay more, the affirmative sense is certainly true, the negative as certainly false. For except Gabriel be God, who came to the Virgin; except every one of the heavenly host which appeared to the shepherds be God; except Zachary and Elizabeth, except Simeon and Anna, except Joseph and Mary be God; it cannot be true that he was known to God only, for to all these he was certainly known. Thirdly, to pass by the third attribute, and the Word was God, as having occasion suddenly after to handle it; seeing the apostle hath again repeated the circumstance of time as most material, the same was in the beginning with God, and immediately subjoined those words, all things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made:1 how can we receive any exposition which referreth not the making of all these things to him in the beginning? But if we understand the latter part of the apostles, who after the ascension of our Saviour did nothing but what they were commanded and empowered to do by Christ, it will bear no relation to the beginning. If we interpret the former, of all which Jesus said and did in the promulgation of the gospel, we cannot yet reach to the beginning assigned by the new expositors: for while John the Baptist only preached, while in their sense the Word was with God, they will not affirm that Jesus did any of these things that here are spoken of. And consequently, according to their grounds, it will be true to say, In the beginning was the Word, and that Word in the beginning was with God, insomuch as in the beginning nothing was done by him, but without him were all things done which were done in the beginning. Wherefore in all reason we should stick to the known interpretation, in which every word receiveth its own proper signification without any figurative distortion, and is preserved in its due latitude and extension without any curtailing restriction.

23.—And therefore I conclude from the undeniable testimony of St. John, that in the beginning, when the heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them were created, all things were made by the Word, who is Christ Jesus being made flesh; and consequently, by the method of argument, as the apostle antecedently by the

1 John 1:3.
method of nature, that in the beginning *Christ* was. He then who
was in heaven and descended from thence before that which was
begotten of the Virgin ascended thither, he who was before John
the Baptist and before Abraham, he who was at the end of the first
world, and at the beginning of the same; he had a real being and
existence before *Christ* was conceived by the Virgin Mary.

But all these we have already shown belong to the *Son* of God.
Therefore we must acknowledge that *Jesus Christ* had a real being
and existence before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost: Which
is our first assertion, properly opposed to the Photiniasts.1

1 The Photiniasts were heretics, so called
from Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, but born in Gallicia, and scholar to Marcellus,
bishop of Anicia. "Photinus de Gallograciâ, Marcilii discipulis, Sirmii episcopis ordi-
Sirmiensis episcopus fuit a Marcello imbutus. Nam et diaconus sub eo aliquandui fuit."—
S. Hilari. Frag. Wherefore, when Epipha-
nius speaketh thus of him, *ódios ómra ἁτ ἵνα Χιλαρίος, it hath no relation to the
original of his person, but his heresy; of which St. Hilary: "Postfârie, naturum Jesus Christum
ex Marili, Pannonia defendit,"—De Trin. He
was a man of singular parts and abilities; *Φωτε- λ'εως ἐγὼς εὐ λέγων, und πεῖδεως ἱκαρός,
† says Sozomen, lib. iv. cap. 6. *Σεγόνε ή δό τος ἵ
να Φωτείνος λαλῶ τον τρόπων, und ω θέμματος
την γλώσσαν, πολλοὺς δὲ δυνάμεων ἀπατᾷ
τῆς λόγου προφορά και έτυμολογίαν.—S. Eμί-
ρι. Hesper. 71. "Erat et ingenio viribus
valens, et doctrinæ opibus excellens, et elo-
quio præstans, quippe qui utroque sermone
copiose et graviter disputaret et scriberet."—
Vincen. Libri. Adc. Hesper. cap. 16. He is
said by some to follow the heresy of Ebon.
  
"Hebonius hæresin instaurare conatus est,"
says St. Jerome; and St. Hilary ordinarily
understands him by the name of Hebon, and
sometimes expounds himself, "Hebon, qui est
Photinus." But there is no similitude in
their doctrines, Hebon being more Jew than
Christian, and teaching Christ as much be-
gotten by Joseph, as born of Mary. Philaster
will have him agree wholly with Paulus Sa-
massatens, "in omnibus;" Epiphanius, with
an ἀπὸ μέρεσι, and *τεκέως* Socrates and
Sozomen, with him and with Sabellius;
whereas he differed much from them both,
especially from Sabellius, as being far from a
Patripian. "Marcellus Sabelliane hæresis
assertor extiterat: Photinus vor novam
hæresin jam ante protulerat, a Sabellio quidem
in unionе dissentientis, sed initium Christi ex
Mariali predicabatur."—Sévèn Myst. Sacr.
Wherefore it will not be unnecessary to col-
clect out of antiquity what did properly be-
long to Photinus, because I think it not
yet done, and we find his heresy, in the pro-
nerty of it, to begin and spread again. "Pho-

tinus, mentis cæcitate deceptus, in Christo
verum et substantia nostra confessus est
hominem, sed eundem Deum de Deo ante
omnia secula protulit esse non credidit."—
Lucif. De Nativ. Christi, Serm. iv. "Ecce,
Photinus hominem tamum profitteretur Dei
Filium; dictit illum nonuisse ante beatam
Mariam,"—Luciferi Catari. "Si quis it
Christo se veritatem predicat animae et
carnis, ut veritatem in eo nolit accipere Dei-
tatis, id est, qui sic dict Christum hominem,
Ut Deum negat, non est Christianus Catho-
licus, sed Photiniacos hereticus,"—Fulgent.
Ad Donat. "Φωτείνος φιλῶν ἄνθρωπον λέγει
τον γεγεννημένον, Θεοί μη λέγων εἶναι τῶν
Τόκων, καὶ τῶν ἐκ μῆρας προδοτου, ἄνθρω-
πον ὑπαισθέναι διομημένοις Θεοί, τινὲς
"Anathematizamus Photini, qui, Hebonios
hæresin instaurans, Dominum Jesum Chris-
tum tantum ex Maria Virgine confiteretur,"—
Damas. Profess. Fidei. "Φακεί δέ ὀό τος, ἀπ'
ἀρχῆς τον Χριστόν μη λέγαν, ἀπὸ δὲ Μαρίας
καὶ δευρὸ αὐτῶν υπάρχειν, ἐξείς, ἡγείται, ἂν
εἰς τῇ Ἀγίῳ τοῦ Ἰσχυροῦ· τῶν ἄνθρωπων
ὁ ἱερος χάριτος, τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔμπνευσαν ἐπὶ
άνθρωπον, καὶ ἐνενοθήκα ὡς Ἑννοοῦτος Αἰω-
νοκράτων εἰς, ὃ τὸ ἱερὸν τὰ πάντα δημι-
ουργηθέν: τὴν δὲ πρὸ τῶν αἰωνίων γένεσιν τῷ
καὶ υπάρχοντι τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὄντο προτέρῳ, ἀλλ' ἐκ
Μαρίας γενεθλίων τοῦ Ἰσχυροῦ εἰς εἰκόνα.
"Sozomen, ib. iv. cap. 6. "Photini ergo secta
hæc est. Dictit Deum singulum esse et soli-
tarium, et more Judaeo confitendum. Triu-
tatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei
Verbi aut ullam Spiritus Sacri putat esse
personam. Christum vero hominem tantum-
modo solitarium asservit, cui principium
ascribit ex Maria; et hoc omnibus modis
dogmatizat: solum nos persam Dei Patris
et solum Christum hominem colere debere.
the disputation framed by Vigilius out of the
seventh book of St. Hilary, as I conceive,
Photinus, rejecting the opinion of Sabellius
(whom Socrates and Sozomen said he fol-
lowed) as impious, thus declares his own:
"Unde magis ego dico, Deum Patrem Filium
habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex Mariâ
Virgine initium sumentem, qui, per sancte
conversaciones excelso Divino, atque im-
itable beatitudinis merits, a Dóce Patré in
Filium adoptatus et eximio Divinitatis honore
donatus." And again: "Ego Domino nostro
Jesus Christo initium tribuo, pi rumque be-
24.—The second assertion, next to be made good, is that the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin was not only created, but the divine essence, by which he always was truly, really and properly God. This will evidently and necessarily follow from the last demonstration of the first assertion, the creating all things by the Son of God: from whence we inferred his pre-existence in the beginning assuring us as much that he was God, as that he was. For he that built all things is God.1 And the same apostle which assures us All things were made by him, at the same time tells us, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. Where In the beginning must not be denied unto the third proposition, because it cannot be denied unto the second. Therefore in the beginning, or over the


— Fulgent. Ad Thrasym. lib. i. Gregory Nazianzen, according to his custom, gives a very brief but remarkable expression: "Photius volunt atque Christus et ad Mariae argo-

menum.—Oriat. 26. But the opinion of Pho-
ticus cannot be better understood than by the condemnation of it in the council of Sirmium; which, having set out the confession of their faith in brief, addeth many and various anathemas, according to the several heresies then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of these the fifth aims clearly at Photinus: "Si quis secondum præclau-

sitionem vel praedestinationem ex Marià dictit Filium esse, et non ante secula ex Patre natum apud Deum esse, et per eum facta esse omnia; anathema sit." The thirteenth, four-

teenth, and fifteenth, also, were particulars directed against him, as St. Hilary hath ob-
served; but the last of all is most material: "Si quis Christum Deum, Filium Dei, ante secula subsistentem, et ministeram Patri

et omnium perfectionem, non dicat; sed ex quo de Maria natus est, ex eo et Christum et Filium nominatum esse, et initium acceptissi

et sit Deus, dicat; anathema sit." Upon which the observation of St. Hilary is this: "Conclaudi damnatio ejus hheresit, propter quam conventum erat," (that is, the Pho-
tinian,) "expositione totius fidei cui advers

sabatur, opportune, quod initium Dei Filii ex

partu Virginis mentiebat." — St. Hilarius De Syn. Contra Arianos. Thus was Photinus, bi

shop of Sirmium, condemned by a council held in the same city. They all agreed sud-

denly in the condemnation of him.—Arians, Semi-Arians, and Catholics: "Kathelion evdous,

Sedes Socrateis, kai tou μεν, ὡς καλῶς καὶ
dikeav̕s gev̕omesen, πάντες ἐπίσκεψαν καὶ τότε καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.—Lib. ii. cap. 29. And be-

cause his history is very obscure and intricate, take this brief catalogue of his con-
demnations. We read that he was condemned at the council of Nice, and at the same time by a council at Rome under Sylvester; but this is delivered only in a forg'd "Epilogus Concilii Romani." He was then first con-
demned with Marcellus his master, as Sul-
pitius Severus relates, probably by the synod at Constantinople; for in that Marcellus was deprived.—Sozomen. lib. ii. cap. 33. Sozom.

lib. i. cap. 36. Secondly. His heresy is re-
nounced in the second synod at Antioch.—


Thirdly. He was condemned in the council of Sardeis.—St. Epiphan. et Sulpit. Seven.

Fourthly. By a council at Milan.—St. Hilar.

Frag. Fifthly. In a synod at Sirmium he was deposed by the Western bishops; but by reason of the great opinion and affection of the people he could not be removed.—Idem, ibid. Sixthly. He was again condemned and deposed at Sirmium by the Eastern bishops, and, being convicted by Basil, bishop of Au-
cyra, was banished from thence.—St. Hilar.,

St. Epip., Sozom., Sozomen., Vigil. Indeed, he was so generally condemned, not only then, but afterwards under Valentinian, as St. Jerome testifies, and the synodic epistle of the Aquileian council, that his opinion was soon worn out of the world. "H'ny gar kai diexekédsen eis elagyn hronon η τοιου του θητημησαν α骡εσις, says Epiphanius, who lived not long after him. So suddenly was this opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the heretic, who railed at St. John for making Christ God, and commended Photinus for denying it; as appears by an epistle written by Julian unto him, as it is (though in a mean translation) delivered by Facundus: "Tu quidem, O Photine, verisimilis videris, et proximus sal-
vare, bene faciens nequaquam in ubido indu-
cere, quem credidisti Deum."—Facund. Ad

Justinian. Lib. iv. 1 Heb. iii. 4.
earth was, the Word was God,1 the same God with whom he was. For we cannot with any show of reason either imagine that he was with one God, and was another, because there can be no more supreme Gods than one: or conceive that the apostle should speak of one kind of God in the second, and of another in the third proposition; in the second, of a God eternal and independent, in the third, of a made and depending God.2 Especially, first considering that the eternal God was so constantly among the Jews called the Word, the only reason which we can conceive why the

1 Prov. viii. 23.
2 And that upon so poor a ground as the want of an article, because in the first place it is, ἦν ὁ Λόγος, not ὁ Θεὸς: from hence to conclude, ὁ Θεὸς is one God, that is, καὶ ἐξ ὁμοί, the supreme God; Θεὸς another, not the supreme, but one made God by him. Indeed they are beholden to Epiphanius for this observation, whose words are these: 'Εάν εἶπομεν, Θεὸς, αἷνε τοῦ ἄρθρου, τοῦ τιγύτα ἐπάμεν Θεὸς τῶν ἑτῶν, ἢ Θεὸς τοῦ ὑστα (or rather, οὐκ ὑστα): εἴρν ἐς εἴπομεν, ὁ Θεὸς, δήλων ὡς ἴνα τοῦ ὁ ἄρθρου τῶν ὑστα σημανημέναι ἀλήθε τε και γινωσκομέναι. —Samarit. Hist. But when ever shall apply this rule to the sacred scriptures, will find it most falacious. "In the beginning" ἐπόσχοντος ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανον καὶ τῆν γῆν, undoubtedly belongs to the true and supreme God; but it does not thence follow, that Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπέφερεν ἐπάνω τοῦ ὡδατος, should be understood of the spirit of another or inferior God. Certainly St. John, when he speaks of the Baptist, "Εγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ, meant, he had his commission from heaven: and when it is spoken of Christ, "Εὼέκεν αὐτός ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γεννητα, and again, "Ἐν Θεοῦ ἐγεννητα, it must be understood of the true God the Father. In the like manner, Θεοῦ οὐδεὶς εἴρακε τὸ πάτρα, if it were taken τυχώνως of any ever called God, nay, even of Christ Jesus as man, it were certainly false. How can then any dey the Word to be the supreme God, because he is called simply Θεὸς, when St. John in the four next places, in which he speaketh of the supreme God, mentioneth him without an article? This criticism of theirs was first the observation of Asterius the Arian: Οὐκ εἶτεν ὁ μακάριος Παύλου Χριστὸν κηρύσσεις τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν, ἢ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ δίκα τῆς προσθήκης, δύναμιν Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ σοφίαν ἀλλὰ μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν τῆς ἐμφάντον αὐτῷ καὶ συν- υπάρχουσαν ἁγιωτάτης κηρύσσων. These are the words of Asterius recorded by Athanasius, Oratio 2, Contra Arianos. In which place, notwithstanding, none can deny but Θεοῦ is twice taken without an article for the true and supreme God. Thus Didymus of Alexandria, De Spiritu Sancto, would distinguish between the person and the gift of the Holy Ghost, by the addition or defect of the article: "Apostoli quando intelligi volunt personam Spiritus Sancti addunt articulum, τὸ Πνεῦμα, sine quo Spiritus Sancti doma notantium." And Athanasius objects against his adversaries denying the Holy Ghost to be God, that they produced places out of the prophets to prove him a creature, where πνεῦμα had not so much as an article prefixed, which might give some colour to interpret it of the Holy Spirit. Οὐδε γὰρ ὁ άρθρον ἐχρὸ τὸ παρά τοῦ προφητῶν λεγομένον νῦν πνεῦμα, ἐνα καὶ προφητῶν ἐχρό. —Epist. ad Seraphin. Whereas we find, in the same place of St. John, the same Spirit in the same sense mentioned with and without an article: Εἰν μὴ τὶς γενεθητ τὸ ὡδατος καὶ Πνεῦματος. (St. John iii. 5.) and, Τὸ γεγεννητόν εκ τοῦ Πνευματος. (Verse 6.) So I John iv. 1: Μὴ παντι πνευματι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνευματα, And again: "Εν τούτῳ γινώσκετε τὸ Πνεῦμα του Θεου παπ πνευμα, της. And beside, according to that distinction, τὸ πνευμα certainly stands for the gift of the Spirit, I Thess. v. 19: Τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ σβείντε; In the like manner, it is so far from truth, that the scriptures observe so much the articles, as to use ὁ Θεὸς always for the true and supreme God, and Θεοῦ for the false or inferior; that, where the true is expressly opposed to the false, even there he is styled simply Θεοῦ: as, Αὐτὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες Θεοῦ, εὐνοείτες τοῖς μη φύσει σοι Θεοί; νυν δὲ γνώτες Θεοὺς, μάλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ. (Gal. iv. 8, 9.) And where the supreme is distinguished from him whom they make the inferior God, he is called likewise Θεοῦ, without an article: as, Δόξα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀφορισμένος εἰς εναγγελίαν Θεοῦ: and, Τοῦ ὀρφανοῦ Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ εν δυναμε. (Rom. i. 1, 4.) Ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ διάλυματος Θεοῦ. (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1.) And if this distinction was good, our Saviour's argument to the Pharisees were not so: Εἴ δὲ εἶδον ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἢ ἔθανεν ἐφ' υἱας ἢ βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Matt. xii. 23.) For it doth not follow, that if by the power of an inferior or false god he cast out devils, that therefore the kingdom of the true and supreme God is come upon them.
apostle should thus use this phrase: and then observing the manner of *St. John's writing*, who rises strangely by degrees, making the last word of the former sentence the first of that which followeth: as, *In him was life, and the life was the light of men; and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not:*¹ so, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word, which so was in the beginning, was with God, and the Word was God; that is, the same God with whom the Word was in the beginning. But he could not be the same God with him any other way, than by having the same divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived by the Virgin was the divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.

25.—Secondly, He who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equal with God (in which thought he could not be deceived, nor be injurious to God), must of necessity be truly and essentially God: because there can be no equality between the divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite. But this is true of Christ, and that antecedently to his conception in the Virgin's womb, and existence in his human nature. *For, being (or rather subsisting)² in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.*³ Out of which words naturally result three propositions fully demonstrating our assertion. First. That Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man. Secondly. That he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant. Thirdly. That he was in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the divine nature, as in the form of a servant, or in the nature of man. It is a vain imagination that our Saviour then first appeared a servant when he was apprehended, bound, scourged, crucified. For they were not all slaves which ever suffered such indignities, or died that death; and when they did, their death did not make, but find them, or suppose them servants. Beside, our Saviour in all the degrees of his humiliation never lived as a servant unto any master on earth. It is true, at first he was subject, but as a Son, to his reputed father and undoubtedly mother. *When he appeared in public he lived after the manner of a prophet, and a doctor sent from God, accompanied with a family, as it were, of his apostles, whose master he professed himself, subject to the commands of no man in that office, and obedient only unto God. The form then of a servant which he took*

¹ John i. 4, 5.
² "In effigie Dei constitutus." — *Tertull. "In figurâ Dei constitutus"* — *S. Cyprian.*
³ *Phil. ii. 6, 7.*
upon him must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was when he so submitted and so suffered. In that he was made flesh, sent in the likeness of sinful flesh, subject unto all infirmities and miseries of this life attending on the sons of men fallen by the sin of Adam: in that he was made of a woman, made under the law, and so obliged to perform the same; which law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from servants: in that he was born, bred, and lived in a mean, low, and abject condition; as a root out of a dry ground, he had no form nor comeliness, and when they saw him, there was no beauty that they should desire him; but was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: in that he was thus made man, he took upon him the form of a servant. Which is not mine, but the apostle's explication; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe, that our translation of that verse is not only not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth which is contained in it. For we read it thus: He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. Where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the original text, and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christ's exinanition, with an explication showing in what it consisteth: which will clearly appear by this literal translation, But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men. Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied himself, the text will satisfy him, by taking the form of a servant; if any still question how he took the form of a servant, he hath the apostle's resolution, by being made in the likeness of men. Indeed after the expression of this exinanition, he goes on with a conjunction, to add another act of Christ's humiliation; And being found in fashion as a man, being already by his exinanition in the form of a servant, or the likeness of men, he humbled himself, and became (or rather, becoming) obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience to ekéνωσε, or, which is all one, ἐκένωσε λαβὼν, ἠλαβὲ γενόμενος. 5 Phil. ii. 8. Ἐπανένωσεν ἑαυτόν, γενόμενος υπόκοιος For in both these verses there is but one conjunction, joining together two acts of our Saviour, his first exinanition, or ἐκένωσε, and his farther humiliation, or Ἐπανένωσε; the rest are all participles added for explanation to the verbs.
unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man. All which is very fitly expressed by a strange interpretation on the epistle to the Hebrews. For whereas these words are clearly in the Psalmist, Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened: 1 the apostle appropriated the sentence to Christ; When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. 2 Now being the boring of the ear under the law was a note of perpetual servitude, 3 being this was expressed in the words of the Psalmist, and changed by the apostle into the preparing of a body; it followeth, that when Christ's body first was framed, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Again, it appeareth out of the same text that Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he which is presupposed to be, and to think of that being which he hath, and upon that thought to assume, must have that being before that assumption: but Christ is first expressly said to be in the form of God, and, being so, to think it no robbery to be equal with God, and, notwithstanding that equality, to take upon him the form of a servant: therefore it cannot be denied but he was before in the form of God. Beside, he was not in the form of a servant but by the emptying himself, and all exinanition necessarily presupposeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impossible to empty anything which hath no fulness, as to fill anything which hath no emptiness. But the fulness which Christ had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a servant he is said to empty himself, could be in nothing else but in the form of God, in which he was before. Wherefore, if the assumption of the form of a servant be contemporary with his exinanition: if that exinanition necessarily presupposeth a plenitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be also coeval with that precedent plenitude: then must we confess Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant; which is the second proposition.

26.—Again, it is as evident from the same scripture, that Christ was as much in the form of God as the form of a servant, and did actually subsist in the divine nature as in the nature of man. For he was so in the form of God, as thereby to be equal 4 with God.
But no other form beside the essential, which is the divine nature itself, could infer an equality with God. *To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal? saith the Holy One.*

There can be but one infinite, eternal and independent Being: and there can be no comparison between that and whatsoever is finite, temporal, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himself equal with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternal and independent nature of God. Again, the phrase, in the *form of God*, not elsewhere mentioned, is used by the apostle with a respect unto that other, of the *form of a servant*, exegetically continued in the *likeness of man*; and the respect of one unto the other is so necessary, that if the form of God be not as real and essential as the form of a servant, or the likeness of man, there is no force in the apostle’s words, nor will his argument be fit to work any great degree of humiliation upon the consideration of Christ’s exinanition. But by the *form* is certainly understood the true condition of a servant, and by the

So whom the Greeks call ἵσοθεν, Homer, ἵσαθεν. (Od. O. 519:)—

Τὸν μὴν ἵσαθεν Ἡβακτήριοι εἰσερόφωσι.

Where ἵσαθεν has not the nature of an adverb, as belonging to εἰσερόφωσι, but of a noun referred to the antecedent τὸν, or including an adverb added to a noun, τὸν μὴν ἵσοθεν.

The collection of Grotius from this verse is very strange: Εἶναι ἵσαθεν, "est spectari tanquam deum." As if he should have said, εἰσερόφωσι signifies "spectant," therefore εἶναι signifies "spectari." This he was forced to put off thus, because the strength of our interpretation, rendering an equality, lies in the verb substantive τὸ εἶναι. As Dionysius of Alexandria very anciently: Κενότος ἡμῶν, καὶ ταπεινώσας ἡμᾶς θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, ἵσα θείω ὑπάρχει.—Epist. ad Paulum Samosat. For we acknowledge that ἵσα by itself oft-times signifies no more than "instar," and so inferreth nothing but a similitude: as we find it frequently in the Book of Job. Where it sometimes answereth to the inseparable particle ὅ; as, ἵσα ὅ τὸ πτερόν ὅν νυκτὶ (Job v. 14); ἵσα ὅ τὸ ἄγαν "sicut casum," ἵσα τυρπὸν (x. 10); "sicut putredo," Symmachus, ὁμοίως σηχθεῖσιν, LXX. ἵσα ὅκτων (xiii. 28); ἵσα ὅ κατά "sicut aquam," ἵσα ποτῆρ (xv. 16); ἵσα τὸν ἵσα ὅ "tanquam ligimn," ἵσα μέλος (xxiv. 20); ἵσα τὸν ἵσα "sicut lutum," ἵσα τὸν ἵσα (xxvii. 16); ἵσα τὸν ἵσα ἵσα ἵσα "sicut vestimento," ἵσα διά "sicut vestimentum," ἵσα μετανοία (xii. 11); ἵσα τοῦ ἅγιου "quasi bos," ἵσα βουσών. (xii. 16.) Where we see the Vulgar Latin useth for the Hebrew ב, "quasi, sicut, tanquam," the LXX. ἵσα. Sometime it answereth to no word in the original, but supplieth a similitude understood, not expressed, in the Hebrew: as ἵσα "tanquam pullum," ἵσα ὅνω (Job xi. 12); ἵσα ὅνω "et lapsis," ἵσα λιθοί (xxviii. 2); ἵσα ὅνω "Iuto," ἵσα πτερό (xxx. 19). Once it rendereth at Hebrew word rather according to the intention, than the signification: ἵσα τὸν ἵσα "comparabitur ceneri," ἵσα τὸν ἵσα "proverbia ceneris," ἵσα τὸν ἵσα (xiii. 12.) So that in all these places it is used advertently for "instar," and in none hath the addition of τὸ εἶναι to it. As for that answer of Socinus, that Christ cannot be God, because he is said to be equal with God: "Tantum absit ut ex eo quod Christus sit aequalis Deo sequeatur ipsum esse aeternum et summum Deum, ut potius ex hoc ipsa necessario consequatur non esse aeternum et summum Deum." Nemo enim sibi ipsi aequalis esse potest,—Socin. ad Ἡ, c. Wiek.: as if there could be no predicament of equality where we find a substantial identity: it is most certainly false, because the most exact speakers use such language as this. There can be no expressions more exact and pertinent than those which are used by geometerics, neither can there be any better judges of equality than they are; but they most frequently use that expression in this notion, proving an equality, and inferring it from identity. As in the fifth proposition of the first Element of Euclid, two lines are said to contain an angle equal to the angle contained by two other lines, because they contained the same angle, or γωνίας κοινήν and the basis of one triangle is supposed equal to the basis of another triangle, because the same line was basis to both, or βάσεις κοινῆς. In the same manner certainly may the Son be said to be equal to the Father in essence or power, because they both have the same essence and power, that is, ὀνείδων καὶ δύναμιν κοινῷ. Αλλ’ Αἰαὶ κατὰ τ’ ἄνθροπον καὶ ὁμοίως διατελεῖ καὶ ἴσον καὶ ὁμοίως αὐτῷ ἐμάτων.—Ocelius 1.3, p. 11. 2. Isai. xi. 25; xlvii. 6.
likeness infallibly meant the real nature of man: nor doth the
fashion in which he was found destroy, but rather assert, the truth
of his humanity. And therefore, as sure as Christ was really and
essentially man, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude
he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God,
of the same nature and being with him, in whose form he did
subsist. Seeing then we have clearly evinced from the express
words of St. Paul, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon
as he was made man, that he was in the form of God before he was
in the form of a servant, that the form of God in which he sub-
sisted doth as truly signify the Divine, as the likeness of man the
humane nature; it necessarily followeth that Christ had a real
existence before he was begotten of the Virgin, and that the being
which he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly, really,
and properly God.

27.—Thirdly, He which is expressly styled Alpha and Omega,
the first and the last without any restriction or limitation; as he
is after, so was before any time assignable, truly and essentially
God. For by this title God describeth his own being, and dis-
tinguisheth it from all other. I the Lord, the first, and with the last,
I am he. I am he, I am the first, I also am the last. I am the first,
and I am the last, and beside me there is no God. But Christ is
expressly called Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. He so
proclaimed himself by a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am
Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. Which answereth to that
solemn call and proclamation in the prophet, Hearken unto me, O
Jacob, and Israel my called. He comforteth St. John with the
majesty of this title, Fear not, I am the first and the last. Which
words were spoken by one like unto the Son of man, by him
that liveth, and was dead, and is alive, for evermore; that is,
undoubtedly, by Christ. He upholdeth the Church of Smyrna
in her tribulation by virtue of the same description, These things
saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive? He
ascertaineth his coming unto judgment with the same asser-
tion, I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first
and the last. And in all these places this title is attributed
unto Christ absolutely and universally, without any kind of re-
striction or limitation, without any assignation of any par-
ticular in respect of which he is the first or last; in the same
latitude and eminence of expression in which it is or can be attrib-
uted to the supreme God. There is yet another scripture in

1 Isal. xlii. 4; xlivii. 12; xliv. 6.
2 Rev. i. 11.
3 Isal. xlviii. 12.
4 Rev. i. 17.
5 Rev. ii. 8.
6 Rev. xii. 13.
7 Rev. ii. 8.
8 Rev. xxii. 13.
9 With the article, so much elsewhere
which the same description may seem of a more dubios interpretation: I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. For being it is the Lord who so calls himself, which title belongeth to the Father and the Son, it may be doubted whether it be spoken by the Father or the Son; but whether it be understood of the one or of the other, it will sufficiently make good what we intend to prove. For if they be understood of Christ, as the precedent and the following words imply, then is he certainly that Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come; as the familiar explication of that name which God revealed to Moses. If they belong unto the supreme God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; then did he so describe himself unto St. John, and express his supreme Deity, that by those words, I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, he might be known to be the one Almighty and eternal God; and consequently, whosoever should assume that title, must attribute as much unto himself. Wherefore being Christ hath so immediately, and with so great solemnity and frequency, taken the same style upon him by which the Father did express his Godhead; it followeth, that he hath declared himself to be the supreme, almighty, and eternal God. And being thus the Alpha and the first, he was before any time assignable, and consequently before he was conceived of the Virgin; and the being which then he had was the Divine essence, by which he was truly and properly the Almighty and Eternal God.

28.—Fourthly, He whose glory Isaiah saw in the year that King Uzziah died had a being before Christ was begotten of the Virgin, and that being was the Divine essence, by which he was naturally and essentially God: For he is expressly called the Lord, Holy, holy, holy, the Lord of Hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth; which titles can belong to none beside the one and only God. But Christ was he whose glory Isaiah saw, as St. John doth testify, saying, These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him; and he whose glory he saw, and of whom he spake, was cer-
tainly Christ: for of him the apostle treateth in that place, and of none but him. These things spake Jesus, and departed. But though he (that is, Jesus) had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that is, Christ, who wrought those miracles. The reason why they believed not on him was, That the saying of Esaias the Prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? And as they did not, so they could not believe in Christ, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them. For those who God fore-saw, and the prophet foretold should not believe, could not do it without contradicting the prescience of the one, and the predictions of the other. But the Jews refusing to assent unto the doctrine of our Saviour were those of whom the prophet spake: For these things said Esaias when he saw his glory, and spake of him. Now if the glory which Isaias saw were the glory of Christ, and he of whom Isaias in that chapter spake were Christ himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardened hearts belong unto these Jews, and then their infidelity was so long since foretold. Thus doth the fixing of that prophecy upon that people, which saw our Saviour’s miracles, depend upon Isaias’s vision, and the appropriation of it unto Christ. Wherefore St. John infallibly hath taught us, that the prophet saw the glory of Christ; and the prophet hath as undoubtedly assured us, that he whose glory then he saw was the one omnipotent and eternal God; and consequently both together have sealed this truth, that Christ did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternal Godhead.

29.—Lastly, He who, being man, is frequently in the scriptures called God, and that in such a manner as by that name no other can be understood but the one only and eternal God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other than the Divine essence; because all novity is repugnant to the Deity, nor can any be that one God, who was not so from all eternity. But Jesus Christ, being in the nature of man, is frequently in the sacred scriptures called God; and that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and eternal God.

Which may be thus demonstrated. It hath been already proved, and we all agree in this, that there can be but one Divine essence, and so but one supreme God. Wherefore were it not said in the scriptures, there are many Gods; did not he himself who is supreme call others so; we durst not give that name to any but to him alone, nor could we think any called God to be any other but that

---
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one. It had been then enough to have alleged that Christ is God, to prove his supreme and eternal Deity; whereas now we are answered that there are Gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name that he is the one eternal God. But if Christ be none of those many Gods, and yet be God, then can he be no other but that one. And that he is not to be numbered with them is certain, because he is clearly distinguished from them and opposed to them. We read in the Psalmist, I have said ye are Gods, and all of you are children of the most High. But we must not reckon Christ among those Gods, we must not number the only-begotten Son among those children. For they knew not, neither would they understand, they walked on in darkness: and whosoever were Gods only as they were, either did, or might do so. Whereas Christ, in whom alone dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, is not only distinguished from, but opposed to, such Gods as those, by his disciple's saying, Now we are sure that thou knowest all things: by himself proclaiming, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.

St. Paul hath told us there be gods many, and lords many; but withal hath taught us, that to us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ. In which words, as the Father is opposed as much unto the many Lords as many Gods, so is the Son as much unto the many Gods as many Lords; the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord. Wherefore being we find in scripture frequent mention of one God, and beside that one an intimation of many Gods, and whosoever is called God must either be that one, or one of those many; being we find our blessed Saviour to be wholly opposed to the many Gods, and consequently to be none of them, and yet we read him often styled God: it followeth that that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and eternal God.

30.—Again, those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father have invented rules to be the touchstone of the eternal power and Godhead. First, where the name of God is taken absolutely, as the subject of any proposition, it always signifieth the supreme power and Majesty, excluding all others from that Deity. Secondly, where the same name is any way used with an article by way of excellency, it likewise signifieth the same supreme Godhead as admitting others to a communion of Deity, but excluding them from the supremacy. Upon these two rules they have raised unto themselves this observation, that whenssoever

1 Psalm. lxxxii. 6. 2 Psalm lxxxi. 5. 3 Col. ii. 9. 4 John xvi. 30. 5 John viii. 12. 6 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.
the name of God absolutely taken is placed as the subject of any proposition, it is not to be understood of Christ: and wheresoever the same name is spoken of our Saviour by way of predicate, it never hath an article denoting excellency annexed to it; and consequently leaves him in the number of those Gods who are excluded from the Majesty of the eternal Deity.

Now though there can be no kind of certainty in any such observations of the articles, because the Greeks promiscuously often use them or omit them, without any reason of their usurpation or omission (wherof examples are innumerable); though, if those rules were granted, yet would not their conclusion follow, because the supreme God is often named (as they confess) without an article, and therefore the same name may signify the same God when spoken of Christ, as well as when of the Father, so far as can concern the omission of the article: yet, to complete my demonstration, I shall show, first, that the name of God taken subjectively is to be understood of Christ; secondly, that the same name with the article affixed is attributed unto him; thirdly, that if it were not so, yet where the article is wanting there is that added to the predicate which hath as great a virtue to signify that excellency as the article could have.

31.—St. Paul, unfolding the mystery of Godliness, hath delivered six propositions together, and the subject of all and each of them is God. Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. And this God which is the subject of all these propositions must be understood of Christ, because of him each one is true, and all are so of none but him. He was the Word which was God, and was made flesh, and consequently God manifested in the flesh. Upon him the spirit descended at his baptism, and after his ascension was poured upon his apostles, ratifying his commission and confirming the doctrine which they received from him: wherefore he was God justified in the spirit. His nativity the angels celebrated, in the discharge of his office they ministered unto him, at his resurrection and ascension they were present, always ready to confess and adore him: he was therefore God seen of angels. The apostles preached unto all nations, and he whom they preached was Jesus Christ. The Father separated St. Paul from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace, to reveal his Son unto him, that he might preach him among the heathen: therefore he was God

1 Tim. iii. 16.
2 Acts viii. 5, 35; lxi. 20; xl. 20; xviii. 3, 18; xix. 13; Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Cor. i. 19; xi. 4, 18.
3 Gal. i. 15, 16.
preached unto the Gentiles. John the Baptist spake unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. 1 We have believed in Jesus Christ, 2 saith St. Paul, who so taught the gaoler trembling at his feet, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved: 3 he therefore was God believed on in the world. When he had been forty days on earth after his resurrection, he was taken visibly up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father: wherefore he was God received up into glory. And thus all these six propositions, according to the plain and familiar language of the scriptures, are infallibly true of Christ, and so of God, as he is taken by St. John, when he speaks those words, the Word was God. But all these cannot be understood of any other, which either is, or is called, God. For though we grant the Divine perfections and attributes to be the same with the Divine essence, yet are they never in the scriptures called God; nor can any of them with the least show of probability be pretended as the subject of these propositions, or afford any tolerable interpretation. When they tell us that God, that is, the will of God, was manifested in the flesh, that is, was revealed by frail and mortal men, 4 and received up in glory, that is, was received gloriously on earth, 5 they teach us a language which the scriptures know not, 6 and the Holy Ghost never used. And as no attribute, so no person but the Son can be here understood under the name of God: not the Holy Ghost, for he is distinguished from him, as being justified by the Spirit; not the Father, who was not manifested in the flesh, nor received up in glory. It remaineth therefore that, whereas the Son is the only person to whom all these clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here jointly attributed unto God, as sure as the name of God is expressed universally in

1 Acts xix. 4. 2 Gal. ii. 16. 3 Acts xvi. 31. 4 "Deus, id est, voluntas ipsius de servandis hominibus, per homines infirmos et mortales perfecta patefacta est," &c.—Catech. Racov. ad Quest. 59. 5 "Insignem in modum et summa cum gloria recepta fuit."—Ibid. 16. 6 For Θεός is not θελήμα Θεοῦ, much less ἀνεληφθή "received or embraced." Elias speaketh not of his reception, but his ascension, when he saith to Elisha, Τό ποιήσω σοι τὴν ἁνελήφθη με ἀπὸ σοῦ; (2 Kings ii. 9; and, (verse 10,) Ἐὰν Ἰδης με ἀνελαμβανόμενον ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ ἐσται σοι σῶτος. When he actually ascended, as the original, θυμία, it is no otherwise translated by the Septuagint, ἀνεληθήθη Παλαιον ἐν συνεσιμω ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Which language was preserved by the Hellenizing Jews: Ο άναληθήθη ἐν λαλαὶ πυρός. (Sirac. xlviii. 9;) and again, ἀνεληθήθη ἐσσ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. (1 Macc. ii. 55.) Neither did they use it of Elias only, but of Enoch also: Οὗτος εἰς ἐκτίσθη ο λος Ἑνώχ, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνεληθήθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. (Sirac. xlix. 14.) The same language is continued in the New Testament of our Saviour's ascension: Ἀνεληθήθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, (Mark xvi. 19,) 'Ο ἀνεληθήθης ἂν ἤμων εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, (Acts i. 11;) and singly, Ἀνεληθήθη, (Acts i. 2;) and, Ἀνεληθήθη ἂν ἦμων. (Acts i. 22.) As therefore ἀναληθεύομαι τοῦ Μαυσωλείου, in the language of the Jews, was not the reception of Moses by the Israelites, but the assumption of his body; so ἀναληθεύομαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the ascension of Christ. (Luke ix. 51.) Wherefore, this being the constant notion of the word, it must so be here likewise understood, Ἀνεληθήθη ἐν δόξῃ, as the Vulgar Latin, (whose authority is pretended against us,) "Assumptum est in gloria;" rendering it here by the same word by which he always translated ἀνελήθη.
the copies of the original language, so thus absolutely and subjectively taken must it be understood of Christ.

1 For being [seeing] the Epistle was written in the Greek language, it is enough if all those copies do agree. Nor need we be troubled with the observation of Grotius on the place; “Suspectam nobis hanc lectionem faciunt interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabes, et Ambrosius, qui omnes legerunt, ‘Ο έφανερώθη.’ I confess the Vulgar Latin reads it otherwise than the Greek; ‘Quod manifestatum est in earne;’ and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however translated by Trebellius, agreeth with the Latin; and both seem to have read δ instead of Θεος. But the joint consent of the Greek copies and interpreters is above the authority of these two translators; and the Arabic set forth in the “Biblia Polyglotta” agreeth expressly with them. But that which Grotius hath farther observed is of far greater consideration: “Addit Hincmarus opusculo 55, ille Θεος hic positum a Nestorianis.” For if at first the Greeks read δ έφανερωθη, and that δ were altered into Θεος by the Nestorians, then ought we to correct the Greek copy by the Latin, and confess there is not only no force, but not so much as any ground or colour for our argument. But, First, It is no way probable that the Nestorians should find it in the original, δ, and make it Θεος, because that by so doing they had overthrown their own assertion, which was, that God was not incarnate, nor born of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend into heaven, but Christ by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, και την ανάλυσιν αυτον χριστιανον — Concil. Epis. pars. i. cap. 17. Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because the Catholic Greeks read it Θεος, before there were such heretics so called. “Nestoriano a Nestorio episcopo, patriarcha Constantinopolitanico.”—S. Aquins, Hieres. Nestorius, from whom that heresy began, was patriarch of Constantinople after Sisinnius, Sisinnius after Atticus, Atticus after Nectarius, who succeeded Joannes, vulgarly called Chrysozontus. But St. Chrysostom read not δ, but Θεος, as appears by his commentaries upon the place: “Θεος έφανερωθη εν σαρκι, τυποτεται, ο ημερουργος.” And St. Cyril, who by all means opposed Nestorius upon the first appearance of his heresy, wrote two large epistles to the queens Pulcheria and Eudokia, in both which he maketh great use of this text. In the first, after the repetition of the words which they are now in the Greek copies, he proceedeth thus: “Υς δ εν σαρκι φανερωθησε; “Η δηλων, οτι την τε και παντων δ εκ Θεου Πατρος Δοξας, αυτον γε εσται μενα το της εισεται μεστην, Θεος έφανερωθη εν σαρκε.” Wherefore in St. Paul he read Θεος, “God,” and took that God to be the Word. In the second, repeating the same text verbatim, he manageth it thus against Nestorius: Ει Θεος ων ο Δοξος ενανθρωπησα λεγοντα, και να δησιν μεθεις το ειναι Θεος, αλλ εν οι δει δαιμονιν, μεγα δη τοτε και ομολογουμενως μεγα εστι το της εισεται μυστηριον. ει δε άνθρωπος νοειται κοινον ο Χριστος, ποι εν σαρκι πεφανερωμεν; Και τοι ποι ουσι απασιν εναρχισι, οτι πας άνθρωπος εν σαρκι τε εστι, και ουκ αν ετερως ωφον της. And in the explanation of his second anathemaism he maketh use of no other text but this to prove the hypostatical union, giving it this gloss or exposition: “Τι εστι το, Εφανερωθη εν σαρκι Τυποτεται, Τυποτεται εκ Θεου Πατρος Δοξος, αισ. The same he urgeth in his Scholion de Unigeniti Incarnatione. So also Theodoret, contemporary with St. Cyril: Θεος γαρ αν και Θεου Υδος, και ανατων εγων την φωνην, δηλος απασιν ενανθρωπησα εγενετο, σαφος δε ημας δι φωτεις εδιαβανεν, εν σαρκι γαρ την θειαν ενθα φανερωθηναι φωτις. Thirdly. Hincmarus does not say that the Nestorians put Θεος into the Greek text, but that he which put it in was cast out of his bishopric for a Nestorian. His words are these: “Quidam nimium ipsas scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt: sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitans episcopus, qui ab Anastasio imperatore ideo a civitate expulsus legitur, quomiam falsavit Evangelia, et illum apostoli locum ubi dicit, Quod apparuit in carne, justificationem est in Spiritu, per cognationem Graecarum litterarum, O in Θ hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit qui, hoc est Ωξ, monosyllabum Graecum, litera mutata O in Θ veriti; et fecit Ωξ, id est esse, Deus apparuit per carmen. O quam propcr tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus.”

—HINCM. Opusc. Io. cap. 18. Now whereas Hincmarus says, Expulsus legitur, we read not in Evagrius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Johannes Malala, that Macedonius was cast out of his bishopric for any such falsation. It is therefore probable that he had it from Liberatus, a deacon of the church of Carthage, who wrote a Breviary, collected partly out of the ecclesiastical histories and acts of the councils, partly out of the relations of such men as he thought fit to believe, existant in the fourth tome of the councils; in which (chap. xix.) we have the same relation, only with this difference, that O is not turned into Θ, but into Ω, and so ΩΣ becomes not ΘΞ, but ΩΞ. So that, First, The Greek copies are not said to have read it δ, but Θεος, and so not to have relation to the mystery, but to the person, of Christ; and therefore this makes nothing for the Vulgar Latin. Secondly. Whereas Hincmarus says there was but one letter changed, no such mutation can of ΩΞ make ΘΕΟΣ; it may ΩΞ, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek text. Thirdly, Macedonius was no Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutychian; and he ejected him, as he did other Catholic bishops, under the pretence of Nestorianism, but for other reasons. Howso
32.—Again, St. Paul speaketh thus to the elders of the Church of Ephesus: Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.1 In these words this doctrinal proposition is clearly contained, God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. For there is no other word either in or near the text which can by any grammatical construction be joined with the verb, except the Holy Ghost, to whom the predicate is repugnant, both in respect of the act, or our redemption, and of the means, the blood. If then the Holy Ghost hath not purchased the Church; if he hath not blood to shed for our redemption, and without bloodshed there is no remission;2 if there be no other word to which, according to the literal construction, the act of purchasing can be applied; if the name of God, most frequently joined to his Church,3 be immediately and properly applicable by all rules of syntax to the verb which followeth it: then is it of necessity to be received as the subject of this proposition, then is this to be embraced as infallible scripture-truth, God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. But this God may and must be understood of Christ: it may, because he hath; it must, because no other person which is called God hath so purchased the Church. We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.4 With this price were we bought; and therefore it may well be said that Christ our God hath purchased us with his own blood. But no other person which is, or is called, God, can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the mediatorship; and there is but one Mediator between God and men.5 And the Church is sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.6 Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attri-

ever, Macedonius could not falsify all the Greek copies, when as well those which were before his time, as those which were written since, all acknowledge Θεός. And if he had been ejected for substituting Θεός, without question Anastasius would have taken care for the restoring Θεός, which we find not in any copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsify the text by reading, Θεός ἐγενερώθη, but that the ancient Greek fathers read it so; and consequently, being [seeing] the Greek is the original, this lection must be acknowledged authentic.

1 Acts xx. 28. 2 Heb. ix. 22.
3 Τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. For though the church be properly the church of Christ, (Matt. xvi. 18; Col. i. 24,) and in the plural we read once at ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, (Rom. xvi. 16,) as we do of the “churches of God;” (1 Cor. xi. 16; 2 Thess. i. 4; and 1 Thess. ii. 14,) yet ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ is frequently used; as 1 Cor. i. 2; and x. 32; and xvi. 9; and xlii. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 5, 15; but ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ not once named. And therefore we have no reason to alter it in this text, or to fancy it first written χριστοῦ, and then made Χριστοῦ, when it is so often written Θεοῦ, not Χριστοῦ. Some MSS., as the Alexandrian, Cantabrigian, and New Coll. MSS., read it τοῦ Κυρίου, and the interpreter of Irenæus, “regere ecclesiam Domini.”—Lib. iii. cap. xiv. Others represent Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ, followed by the Arabic interpreter; which makes not at all against our argument; but, because in this particular unusual, not like to be true. The Syriac, translating it “Christi,” (Χριστοῦ, not “Domini,” as it is in the Latin translation,) gives rather an exposition than a version.
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but to the Father, because this blood signifieth death; and though the Father be omnipotent, and can do all things, yet he cannot die. And though it might be said that he purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a ransom for us, yet it cannot be said that he did it by his own blood; for then it would follow that he gave not his Son, or that the Son and the Father were the same person. Beside, it is very observable, that this particular phrase of his own blood is in the scripture put by way of opposition to the blood of another: and howsoever we may attribute the acts of the Son unto the Father, because sent by him; yet we cannot but acknowledge that the blood and death was of another than the Father. Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place: and whereas the high-priest entered every year with the blood of others, Christ appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. He then which purchased us wrought it by his own blood, as an high-priest opposed to the Aaronical, who made atonement by the blood of others. But the Father taketh no priestly office, neither could he be opposed to the legal priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore wheresoever the Father and the Son are described together as working the salvation of man, the blood by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the Father: as when St. Paul speaketh of the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness; his, that is, his own righteousness, hath reference to God the Father; but his, that is, his own blood, must be referred to Christ the Son. When he glorifieth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, attributing unto him that he hath blessed, elected, predestinated, adopted, accepted us, made known unto us the mystery of his will, and gathered us together in one; in the midst of this acknowledgment he brings in the beloved in whom we have redemption through his blood, as that which cannot be attributed to the Father. Christ hath blessed; and the apostle saith, the Father hath blessed us: which is true, because he sent his Son to bless us. Christ hath made known unto us the will of his Father; and the apostle saith the Father hath made known unto us the mystery of his will; because he sent his Son to reveal it. Christ

1 Ἰδον αἷμα is opposed to αἷμα ἀλλότριον. And therefore it is observable that the author of the "Racovian Catechism," in his answer to this place of scripture, doth never make the least mention of Ἰδον, or "proprium," but only affirms that the blood of Christ may be called "the blood of God the Father;" and totidem verbis did Socinus answer to Wiekus before, but in his whole answer concealed the force of Ἰδον whereas the strength of our argument lies in those words, διὰ τοῦ Ἰδον αἷματος, or, as the Alexandrian ms and one mentioned by Beza, διὰ τοῦ αἷματος τοῦ Ἰδον. 2 Heb. ix. 12, 25, 26. 3 "Οὐ προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἡς ἀλαστὴριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως εἰς τῷ αὐτῷ αἷματι, εἰς ἐνδέξειν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ." Rom. iii. 25. 4 Eph. l. 6, 7. 5 Acts iii. 26. 6 Eph. l. 2.
hath delivered us; and the Father is said to deliver us from the power of darkness:¹ not that we are twice delivered, but because the Father delivereth us by his Son. And thus these general acts are familiarly attributed to them both; but still a difference must be observed and acknowledged in the means or manner of the performance of these acts. For though it is true that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God; yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by himself to us; but that the Son did so, it is. They doth deliver us from sin and death: but the Son gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us;² the Father is not, cannot be, said to have given himself, but his Son; and therefore the apostle giveth thanks unto the Father, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood.³ Now this blood is not only the blood of the new covenant, and consequently of the mediator; but the nature of this covenant is such that it is also a testament, and therefore the blood must be the blood of the testator; for where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.⁴ But the testator which died is not, cannot be, the Father, but the Son; and consequently the blood is the blood of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth, therefore, that God, who purchased the Church with his own blood, is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or any other which is called God, but only Jesus Christ the Son of God, and God. And thus have I proved the first of the three assertions, that the name of God absolutely taken and placed subjectively, is sometimes to be understood of Christ.

33.—The second, That the name of God invested by way of excellency with an article is attributed in the scriptures unto Christ, may be thus made good. He which is called Emmanuel is named God by way of excellency; for that name, saith St. Matthew, being interpreted, is God with us,⁵ and in that interpretation the Greek article is prefixed. But Christ is called Emmanuel: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel.⁶ Therefore he is that God with us, which is expressed by way of excellency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honoured with that name. For it is a vain imagination to think that Christ is called Emmanuel, but that he is not what he is called: as Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah Nissi,⁷ and Gideon another

¹ Col. i. 13. ² Gal. i. 4. ³ Rovifi: ó ésti mebêropou mavenomenv, Mel' hêmu. ⁴ Col. i. 13, 14. ⁵ Heb. ix. 16. ⁶ Oiêôs. Matt. i. 23. ⁷ Verbes 22, 23. ⁸ Kai kalêsoni, tó ómou aýntov 'Emma- ⁹ Exod. xviii. 15.
called Jehovah Shalom; and yet neither altar was Jehovah: as Jerusalem was called the Lord our righteousness, and yet that city was not the Lord. Because these two notions, which are conjoined in the name Emmanuel, are severally true of Christ. First, he is Emmanuel, that is, with us, for he hath dwelt among us: and when he parted from the earth, he said to his disciples, I am with you always, even to the end of the world. Secondly, he is El, and that name was given him, as the same prophet testifieth, For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God. He then who is both properly called El, that is, God, and is also really Emmanuel, that is, with us, he must infallibly be that Emmanuel who is God with us. Indeed if the name Emmanuel were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, God is with us, as the Lord our righteousness, and the Lord is there, must be understood where they are the names of Jerusalem; then should it have been the name not of Christ, but of his Church: and if we under the gospel had been called so, it could have received no other interpretation in reference to us. But being it is not ours, but our Saviour’s name, it bears no kind of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly and directly to be attributed to the Messias as the name of Jesus. Wherefore it remaineth that Christ be acknowledged God with us, according to the evangelical interpretation, with an expression of that excellency which belongeth to the supreme Deity.

34.—Again, He to whom St. Thomas said My Lord and my God, or rather, The Lord of me and the God of me, he is that God before whose names the Greek article is prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But St. Thomas spake these words to Christ. For Jesus spake unto Thomas, and Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. And in these words he made confession of his faith; for our Saviour replied, Thomas, because thou

---

1 Judges vi. 21.  2 Jer. xxxiii. 16.  3 John i. 14.  4 Matt. xxviii. 20.  5 Isai. ix. 6.  6 Ezek. xlvi. 35.  7 John xx. 23.  8 Indeed, it hath been answered, that these words are not to be referred to Christ, but to God the Father. So Theodorus Mopsuesthenus, in his commentary on St. John: “Thomas judidum cum sic credidisset, Dominus meus et Deus meus, dicit; non ipsum Dominum et Deum dicens, (non enim resurrectionis scientia docebat et Deum esse even qui resur- rexit,) sed quasi pro miraculo suo factum Deum collaudat.”—Syn. v. Collat. 4. As if Thomas had intended only to have praised God for raising Christ. But, First, It is plain that Thomas answered Christ; Secondly, That he spake unto him, (that is, to Christ,) and consequently that the words which he spake belong to Christ; Thirdly, That the words are a confession of his faith in Christ, as our Saviour doth acknowledge. And whereas Franciscus Davidis did object, that in a Latin Testament he found not “et dixit ei,” but “et dixit,” without “el,” it is sufficiently dis- countenanced by Socinus, in his epistle, affirming that all the Greek and Latin copies had it, except that one which he had found; and therefore the omission must be imputed to the negligence of the printer.

9 O Kipros mou kai o Theos mou. Either in these words there is an ellipsis of ei ov, “Thou art my Lord, thou art my God;” or an antiposition, the nominative case used for the vocative, as, Ethlo, Ekai, o Theos mou, o Theos mou, (Mark xvi. 34,) Aββα δ Πατηρ, (Mark xiv. 36,) and, Χαρα δ Βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων. (John xix. 3.) If it be an ellipsis of the verb...
35.—Nor have we only their acquired testimony of Christ’s supreme Divinity, but also an addition of verity asserting that supremacy. For he is not only termed the God, but, for a farther certainty, the true God: and the same apostle who said the Word was God, lest any cavil should arise by any omission of an article, though so frequently neglected by all, even the most accurate authors, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For, we know, saith he, that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.¹ As, therefore, we read in the Acts of the Word.

¹, so frequent in the scriptures, and of the person sufficiently understood in the preceding pronoun, then is it evident that ὁ Θεὸς is attributed unto Christ; for then St. Thomas said unto him, “Thou art ὁ Θεὸς μου.” If it be an antiposition, though the construction require not a verb, yet the significature virtually requireth as much, which is equivalent: for he acknowledged him as much God while he calleth him so, as if he did affirm him to be so. Neither can it be objected, that the article ὁ serveth only in the place of δ, as signifying that the nominative is to be taken for the vocative case; because the nominative may as well stand vocatively without an article, as Ἰωσήφ νῦν Δαβίς, (Matt. i. 20,) and, Ἐλέεσον ἡμᾶς, Κύριε, Υἱός Δαβίς, (Matt. xx. 30, 31,) and, therefore, when the vocative is invested with an article, it is as considerable as in a nominative. And being [seeing] these words were an expression of the apostle’s faith, as Christ understood and approved them, they must contain in them, virtually at least, a proposition; because no act of our faith can be expressed, where the object is not at least a virtual proposition. And in that proposition, ὁ Θεὸς must be the predicate; and Christ, to whom these words are spoken, must also be the subject. It cannot, therefore, be avoided but that St. Thomas did attribute the name of God to our Saviour with an article. Indeed, to me there is no doubt but St. Thomas in these words did make as true and real a confession of his faith concerning the person of Christ as St. Peter did, when he “answered and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;” (Matt. xvi. 16;) and, consequently, that ὁ Κύριος and ὁ Θεὸς do as properly belong unto him as St. Peter’s ὁ Χριστός and ο Ὑιός. As, therefore, Christ said to his disciples, “Vos vocatis me ὁ Δαδάκαλος καὶ ὁ Κύριος, et bene dicitis, sum etenim;” (John xiii. 13;) so he might have replied to Thomas, “You call me ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς and you say well, for I am so.” As for the objection of Socinus, that though Θεὸς be here spoken of Christ, and that with an article ὁ, yet that article is of no force, because of the following pronoun μου— it is most groundless; for the article ὁ cannot have relation to the following pronoun μου. Ὑπείποι πῶς ἡ ἀπαράδεκτος ἀντιγυμνα τῶν ἀδρῶν ἐν γενεικῇ πτώσει εὐθεία τῶν ἀδρῶν παραδέχεται? as that great critic Apollonius Alexandrinus observes, lib. i. De Syntaxi, cap. 30. And if, for μου, it were ὁ εἷς, yet even that article would belong to Θεὸς, for in these words, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ εἷς, neither article belongs to εἷς, but both to Θεὸς: for, as the same critic observes in the same case, τὰ δύο ἀδρῷ εἰς μίαν τὴν εὐθείαν ἀνοφεταχθούσιν ἀρᾶ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ, κατηγοριάζοντα τὸ ἐπερῶν τῶν ἀδρῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀντιγυμνασίαν ἀνοφεταχθεῖν. So that if ὁ Θεὸς be the “supreme God,” then ὁ Θεὸς μου must be “my supreme God;” as when David speaks to God, Ο Θεὸς, ὁ Θεὸς μου, πρῶς σε ὅρνίσσω, (Psalm xlix. 1,) the latter is of as great importance as the former. So again, Psalm xxxii. 5: ἐξυμολογήσωμεν ἐν κύριῳ, ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεὸς μου· and, lxx. 3: ὁ Θεὸς ἐφαρμοσάτα ἦσε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, and lxx. 12: ὁ Θεὸς μὴ μακρύνῃς απ' ἐμοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς μου. I dare not, therefore, say to any person, that he is ὁ Θεὸς μου, except I do believe that he is ὁ Θεὸς. Wherefore I conclude that the words of St. Thomas, ὁ Κύριος μου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς μου, are as fully and highly significative as those of David, Πρόσεχε τῇ ὕμνῳ τῆς δεήσεως μου, ὁ Βασιλεὺς μου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς μου. (Psalm v. 2;) or those, ὁ Θεὸς μου καὶ τὸ τῆς δεήσεως μου, ὁ Βασιλεὺς μου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς μου. (Psalm v. 2;) or those, ὁ Θεὸς μου καὶ τὸ τῆς δεήσεως μου, ὁ Βασιλεὺς μου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς μου. (Psalm v. 2;) or those of St. John in the Revelation, as they lie in the Alexandrian and Complutian copies, Ἀλεος εἰ, ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ Ἁγιός, λαβεῖν, ἡμᾶς; or that, lastly, in the most ancient hymn, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, ὁ Αμών τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐλέοντος ἡμᾶς. ¹ Οὗτος ἐστίν ὁ ἄλληθρος Θεὸς, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. “Hie agitur non solum de vero Deo, sed de illo uno vero Deo, ut articulat in Greco additus indicat”—Caeli. Rerum 1 John, v. 20.
which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all;¹ where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the pronoun he joined unto Jesus Christ,² the immediate, not unto God, the remote antecedent: so likewise here the true God is to be referred unto Christ, who stands next unto it, not unto the Father, spoken of indeed in the text, but at a distance. There is no reason alleged why these last words should not be referred to the Son of God, but only this, that in grammatical construction they may be ascribed to the Father. As, when another king arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred;³ the same referreth us not to Joseph, but to the king of Egypt. Whereas, if nothing else can be objected but a possibility in respect of the grammatical construction, we may as well say that Joseph dealt subtilly with his kindred as the king of Egypt; for whatsoever the incongruity be in history, it makes no solecism in the syntax. Wherefore being Jesus Christ is the immediate antecedent to which the relative may properly be referred; being the Son of God he is of whom the apostle chiefly speaketh; being this is rendered as a reason why we are in him that is true, by being in his Son, to wit, because that Son is the true God; being in the language of St. John the constant title of our Saviour is eternal life; being all these reasons may be drawn out of the text itself, why the title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no one reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father: I can conclude no less than that our Saviour is the true God, so styled in the scriptures by way of eminency, with an article prefixed, as the first Christian writers which immediately followed the apostles did both speak and write.⁴

36.—But, thirdly, were there no such particular place in which the article were expressed, yet shall we find such adjuncts fixed to the name of God when attributed unto Christ as will prove equivalent to an article, or whatsoever may express the supreme majesty. As when St. Paul doth magnify the Jews, out of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen.⁵

¹ Acts x. 36.
³ Ἰδοὺ γὰρ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν. — Iddi. 'Ο γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦν ὁ Χριστός, ἐκνομοφηθέν ὑπὸ Μαρίας.—Ibid. 'Ο γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἐν Πατρὶ ὑπὸ μᾶλλον φαίνεται. —Epist. ad Rom. Τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τὰ λογικὰ πλάσματα ἡμᾶς. — S. Clement ALEXAN. Adv. Gentes. And it was well observed by the author of the Smyrna Laodicea
⁴ ρυθός, written about the beginning of the third century, that not only the ancients, fathers before him, as Justin, Miltiades, Tatianus, Clemens, Irenaeus, Melito, &c., did speak of Christ as God, but that the hymn also penned by Christians, from the beginning, did express Christ's Divinity: θαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι καὶ ὧδαι ἀδελφῶν ἀν' ἀργής ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφεῖσα τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν Ἱσχυρῶν ὑμοῦσιν θεολογοῦντες. And the Epistle of Pliny to Trajan testifies the same: "Quod essent soliti stato die ante incem convenire, carmenque Christo quas Deo dicere." — Epist. lib. x. ep. 97.
⁵ Rom. ix. 5
First, it is evident that Christ is called God\(^1\) even he who came of the Jews, though not as he came of them, that is, according to the flesh, which is here distinguished from his Godhead.\(^2\) Secondly, he is so called God, as not to be any of the many Gods, but the one supreme or most high God; for he is God over all.\(^3\) Thirdly, he hath also added the title of blessed; which of itself elsewhere signifies the supreme God, and was always used by the Jews to express that one God of Israel.\(^4\) Wherefore it cannot be conceived

\(^1\) Though some would leave "God" out of the text, upon this pretence, because St. Cyprian, in lib. ii. Adv. Judæos, citing this place, leaves it out. But that must needs be by the negligence of some of the scribes, as is evident, First, Because Manutius and Morellius found the word "Deus" in their copies, and both the mss. which Pamellius used acknowledged it. Secondly, Because St. Cyprian produceth the text to prove "quod Deus Christus"; and reckoneth it among the rest in which he is called expressly God. Thirdly, Because Tertullian, whose disciple St. Cyprian professed himself, did both so read it, and so use it. "Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus: Ex quibus Christus, qui est (inquit) Deus super omnia bene dictus in eum omnem."—Adv. Præxænat. And again, in the same book: "Iheuc et Paulus conspexit, nec tamen Patrem vidit. Nonne, inquit, vidit Jesum? Christum autem et ipsum Deum cognominavit: Quorum patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carmen, qui est per (vel super) omnia Deus benefictus in eum omnem." Novatianus, De Trinitate, useth the same argument. And another ancient author very expressly: "Rogo te, Deum credis esse Filium, an non? Sine dubio, responsum es, Deum; quia eti neque volueris, et sanctis scripturis convinceris, dicente apostolo, Ex quibus Christus secundum carmen, qui est super omnia Deus benefictus in secula." So also St. Augustin: "Non somum Pater Deus est, sicut etiam omnes heretics concedunt, sed etiam Filium; quod, velint nolint, coguntur fateri, dicente apostolo, Qui est super omnia Deus benefictus in secula."—De Trin. lib. ii. cap. 13; et Cont. Faustum, lib. xvi. cap. 15. As for the objection, that St. Chrysostom doth not signify in his Commentaries that he read Θεός in the text: I answer, that neither does he signify that he read ὁ ἐπί πάντων; for in his exposition he passeth over wholly ὁ ἐπί πάντων Θεός, but it doth not follow that he read not ὁ ἐπί πάντων in the text. But when he repeats the words of the apostle, he agrees wholly with the Greek text, ὁ ὁ ἐπί πάντων Θεός εὐλογησ. and Theodoret, who lived not long after him, doth not only acknowledge the words, but give a full exposition of them: "Προς μὲν ἡ τῇ κατά σάρκα προσβήκυ παραδόθηνα τον Δικαιοσύνην Χριστοῦ τῆς Θεοτόκου αλλὰ ἀστερὲν ἐν τῇ παραμυθείᾳ, τού γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ κατά σάρκα, ἐπίγαγε, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος Βιοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει οὗτος ἐπάθθαι ειπτώ, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, προστεθείκε τῷ, ὅτι ἐπί πάντων Θεός εὐλογησ ἐν τοῖς αἰῶναῖς. As for the omission of "Deus" in St. Hilary on the Psalms, it must of necessity be attributed to the negligence of the scribe, not to the reading of the father. For, how he read it, he hath clearly expressed in his books De Trinitate: "Non ignorat Paulus Christum Deum, dicens, Quorum sunt patres, et ex quibus Christus, qui est super omnia Deus, Non hic creatura in Deum deputatur, sed creaturarum Deus est, qui super omnia Deus est." The pretence, therefore, of Erasmus from the fathers is vain; and as vain is that of Grotius from the Syriac translation, which hath in it the name of "God" expressed as well as all the copies of the original, and all the rest of the translations.

\(^2\) Tó κατά σάρκα opposed unto τό κατά πνεύμα. As Rom. i. 3, where κατά σάρκα is used without an article, because κατά πνεύμα, to which it is opposed, followeth; and so the opposition is of itself apparent. But here, being [seeing] κατά πνεύμα is not to be expressed in the following words, the article τό, signifying of itself a distinction or exception, showeth that it is to be understood.

\(^3\) Ὁ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων. Not "in omnibus," as Erasmus, nor "super omnes," as Beza, with reference to the fathers, which should have been ὁ ἐπί πάντων αὐτῶν but as the Vulgar Translation, and the ancient fathers before that, "super omnia," ἐπί for ἐπάνω as John iii. 31, ὁ ἀνωθέν ἐρεξοιμίου ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστι, which signifies not less than ἐπί ὁ the ordinary name of God, ὁ Ὁμοστος, "the Most High," as it is taken for the supreme God by itself, Acts vii. 48, and is described, Psalm xcvii. 9: Ὑψίστος ἐπί πάντων τῆς γῆς, σφόδρα ὑπερψυχής ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν θεῶν.

\(^4\) As Mark xiv. 61: Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Ἑλεογνητοῦ; "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" Where the vulgar attribute is taken for God himself, which is usually added to the name of God; as 2 Cor. xii. 31: ὁ Θεὸς — ὁ Ὅν ἐυλογησ ἐν τοίς αἰῶναῖς ὅτε to any description of
St. Paul should write unto the Christians, most of which then were converted Jesus or proselytes, and give unto our Saviour not only the name of God, but also add that title which they always gave unto the one God of Israel, and to none but him; except he did intend they should believe him to be the same God whom they always in that manner and under that notion had adored. As, therefore, the apostle speaketh of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore,1 of the Creator, who is blessed for ever, Amen;2 and thereby doth signify the supreme Deity, which was so glorified by the Israelites; and doth also testify that we worship the same God under the gospel which they did under the law: so doth he speak of Christ in as sublime a style, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen; and thereby doth testify the equality, or rather identity, of his Deity. If we consider the scope of the apostle, which is to magnify the Israelites by the enumeration of such privileges as belonged peculiarly to that chosen nation (the most eminent of which was contained in the genealogy of our Saviour), we shall find their glory did not consist in this, that Christ at first was born of them a man, and afterwards made a God; for what great honour could accrue to them by the nativity of a man, whose Godhead is referred not to his birth, but to his death? whereas this is truly honourable, and the peculiar glory of that nation, that the most high God blessed for ever should take on him the seed of Abraham,3 and come out of the Israelites as concerning the flesh. Thus every way it doth appear the apostle spake of Christ as of the one eternal God.

He then who was the Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God; he whose glory Isaias saw as the glory of the God of Israel; he who is styled Alpha and Omega without any restriction or limitation; he who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equal with him, before he was in the nature of man; he who being man is frequently called God, and that in all those ways by which the supreme Deity is expressed he had a being before Christ was conceived by the Virgin Mary, and the being which he had was the one eternal and indivisible Divine essence, by which he always was truly, really, and properly God. But all

1 2 Cor. xli. 31. 2 Rom. i. 26 3 Heb. ii. 16.
these are certainly true of him in whom we believe, Jesus Christ, as hath been proved by clear testimonies of the sacred scriptures. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived of the Virgin was not any created, but the Divine essence; nor was he any creature but the true eternal God: which was our second assertion, particularly opposed to the Arian 1 heresy.

37.—The third assertion, next to be demonstrated, is, That the divine essence which Christ had as the Word, before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary, he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father. For this is not to be denied, that there can be but one essence properly Divine, and so but one God of infinite wisdom, power, and majesty; that there can be but one person originally of himself subsisting in that infinite being, 2 because a plurality of more persons so subsisting would necessarily infer a multiplicity of Gods; that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is originally God, as not receiving his eternal being from any other. Wherefore it necessarily followeth that Jesus Christ, who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the Divine nature originally of himself, and consequently, being we have already proved that he is truly and properly the eternal God, he must be understood to have the Godhead communicated to him by the father, who is not only eternally but originally God. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine, 3 saith Christ; 4 because in him is the same fulness of the Godhead, and more than that the Father cannot have: but yet in that perfect and absolute equality there is, notwithstanding this disparity, that the Father hath the Godhead not from the Son, or any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father. Christ is the true God and eternal life; but that he is so, is from the Father:

1 This heresy was so called from two who bare the same name, and fell at the same time into the same opinion: one of them being a presbyter, and rector of a church in Alexandria, the other a deacon: as Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in his epistle extant in Theodoret: Eisi de oi ἀνάθεματισθέντες αἰρετοῦται, ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων μὲν Ἀρειος, ἀπὸ διακόνων δὲ, Ἀγιλλᾶς, Ἐξεύοις, Ἀρειος ἑτερος, ἓ. In the epistle of the Arians to Alexander, he is reckoned amongst the presbyters; Ἀρειος, Λευβάλικης, Ἀγιλλᾶς, Καρπώνης, Σαρματᾶς, Ἀρειος, πρεσβυτέροι. Of these two Phoebadius Contra Arian. cap. 25: "Patrem et Filium esse non unam personam, ut Sabellius, aut duas substantias, ut Arii." The heresy is so well known, that it needs no explanation: and indeed it cannot be better described than in the anathematism of the Nicene council: Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, Ἡν κοὶ οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ οὔτε οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἡ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ὡς οὐνίας φασκαντις εἶναι, ἡ κτισταν, ἡ ἀλλοωταν, ἡ τρεπτον τον Υἱον τοῦ Θεου, τοῦτον ἀναθηματιζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Thus translated by St. Hilary: "Eos autem qui dicent, Erat quando non erat, et antequam nascetur non erat, et quod de non extantibus factus est, vel ex alia substantia aut essentia, dicentes esse convertibilem et demutabilem, Deum, hos anathematizat catholica ecclesia." 2 "Ενα γαρ οἴδαμεν αἰγένητον, καὶ μᾶν τῶν παντῶν ἄρχην, τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.—S. Basili. Epist. 72. "Εν αἰγενὴνον, ο Πατέρα.—ALEX. Epist. apud THEODORETUM.

3 Πάντα ὅσα ἐχει ὁ Πατρής, τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστιν, ὲς ἐμπάλη τα τοῦ Υἱου του Πατρος, οὐδεν οὐν ἱδιον, ὡς οὐν ἱδιον, ὡς οὐν ἱδιον, καὶ αὐτὸ τε εἶναι κοινον καὶ ὑμητος, εἰ καὶ τοι τοῦ Υἱου παρὰ τοῦ Πατρός.—S. Greg. Naz. Ortal. 2 De Filio.

4 John xvi. 15.
For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; not by participation, but by communication. It is true our Saviour was so in the form of God, that he thought it no robbery to be equal with God: but when the Jews sought to kill him because he made himself equal with God, he answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: by that connexion of his operations, showing the reception of his essence, and by the acknowledgment of his power, professing his substance from the Father. From whence he which was equal, even in that equality confesses a priority, saying, The Father is greater than I: the Son equal in respect of his nature, the Father greater in reference to the communication of the Godhead. I know him, saith Christ, for I am from him. And because he is from the Father, therefore he is called by those of the Nicene Council, in their Creed, God of God, light of light, very God of very God. The Father is God, but not of God, light, but not of light; Christ is God, but of God, light, but of light. There is no difference or inequality in the nature or essence, because the same in both; but the Father of


2 "Tantum diceret, Quid sequatur estis quia Patrem meum dixit Deum, quia equalis me facio Deo? Ha sum aequalis, ut non ille a me, sed ego ab illo sim. Hoc enim intelligitur, in eri verbo, Non potest Filius a se facere quicumque, &c.; hoc est, quicumque Filius habet ut faciat, a Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet a Patre ut faciat? Quia a Patre habet ut possit, quia a Patre habet ut sit. Filio enim hoc est esse quod possit." — S. August. in locum. Paulo post: "Hoc est, Non potest Filius a se facere quicumque facere, quod esset, si diceret, Non est Filius a se. Etenim si Filius est, natus est; si natus est, ab illo est de quo


5 So St. Augustin hath observed: "Ab ipso, inquit, sum, quia Filius de Patre; et quicquid est filius, de illo est cujus est filius: idem Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo; Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo, sed tantum Deum: et dicimus Dominum Lumen de Luminie; Patrem non dicimus Lumen de Luminie, sed tantum Lumen. Ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, "Ab ipso sum." From hence then did the Nicene council gather those words of their Creed, "Deo, esti Qeou, &c. Hoc est eho, 160705, Deqo &lqhothou, Deqo alqhothou, &c. Thee &lqhothou. But not immediately, for they were partly in some of the Oriental Creeds before; as appeareth by that confession which Eusebius presented to the council as containing what he had believed and taught ever since his baptism, in which he had these words: "Kai eina Kipin 160705, Kai on the Father, Deqo, Thee &lqhothou, Thee &lqhothou, &c. Thee &lqhothou. Thee &lqhothou. And as Eusebius calls him "Life of Life," so others, "Power of Power," and "Wisdom of Wisdom;" "Ideo Christus Virtus et Sapiencia Dei, quia de Patre Virtute et Sapiencia etiam ipse Virtus et Sapiencia est, sicut Lumen de Patre Luminie, et Fons Vitae apud Deam Patrem utique Fontem Vitae." — S. August. De Trin. lib. vii. cap. 3. And not only so, but "Essence of Essence;" "Pater et Filius simul una Sapientia, quia una Essentia; et singillatus Sapientia de Sapientia, sicut Lumen de Essentia." — Ibid. cap. 2.
On the Creed.

[ART. II.]

our Lord Jesus Christ hath that essence of himself, from none, Christ hath the same not of himself, but from him.

38.—And being the divine nature, as it is absolutely immaterial and incorporeal, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it only communicated unto him, but the whole, by which he must be acknowledged co-essential of the same substance with the Father;¹ as the Council of Nice determined, and the ancient fathers before them taught. Hence appearth the truth of those words of our Saviour, which raised a second motion in the Jews to stone him, I and the Father are one;² where the plurality of the verb, and the neutrality of the noun, with the distinction of their persons, speak a perfect identity of their essence. And though

¹ 'Ωμοούσιος, which is "co-essential or consubstantial," is not to be taken of a part of the divine essence, as if the Son were a part of the essence of the Father and so of the same nature with him, which was the opinion of the Manichees. Όυχ ὡς Οια-λευτίνος προβολήν το γέννημα τοῦ Πατρός εὐδομάτεισέν ευδῷ ὡς Μανχαίος μέρος ὁμο-ούσιον τοῦ Πατρός το γέννημα εισηγήσατο: as Arius in his epistle to Alexander: by the interpretation of St. Hilary: "Nec, ut Valentinus, prolationem natum Patris commentatus est,—nec, sicut Manicheus, partem unius substantiae Patris natum exspouit." — De Trin. lib. vi. cap. 9. "Quod Hilarius ita Latine reddidit, tanquam ὁμο-ούσιον id signifiueat quod partem substantiae habet ex toto resectam," says Dionysius Petavius, without any reason; for St. Hilary clearly translates ὁμοούσιον barely "unius substantiae," and it was in the original μέρος ὁμοούσιον, which he expressed by "partem unius substantiae." Under this notion first the Arians pretended to refuse the name ὁμοούσιον, as Arius in the same epistle signifieth, lest thereby they should admit a real composition and division in the Deity: Ei τὸ εκ γαστρὸς, καὶ τὸ εκ Πατρὸς ἐξηθον, ως μέρος τοῦ ὁμοούσιον καὶ ως προβολὴ υπὸ τῶν νοείται, συνῆθετος ἐσται τὸ Πατρί, καὶ διαερτός, καὶ τρεπτός. And St. Jerome testifies thus much, not only of Arius and Eunomius, but also of Origen before them: Habetur Dialogus apud Grecos Origenis, et Candidi Valentinianae herescess defen- soris. Quos duos andabantis disdilantes spectasse me fatero. Dicit Candidus, Filium de Patris esse substantiam, eam in eo quod proslâν assere: o regulae Origenis, juxta Arion et Eunomium, repugnat eum vel prophetum esse vel natum, ne Deus Patris dividatur in partes."—Apol. ii. in Rufin. And therefore, Eusebius, bishop of Cesarea, refused not to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, being so interpreted as that objection might be taken away. Τὸ, ἐκ τῆς ὁμοουσίας, ὁμολόγητο ἐπὶ αὐτῶν δηλωτικόν εἶναι τὸ, ἐκ μὲν τοῦ Πατρός εἶναι, ὡς μὲν ὁμος, ἐπάγωμεν τοῦ Πατρός. Upon this confes-

² John x. 30.
Christ say, the Father is in me, and I in him; 1 yet withal he saith, I came out from the Father: 2 by the former showing the divinity of his essence, by the latter the origination of himself. We must not look upon the divine nature as sterile, 3 but rather acknowledge and admire the fecundity and communicability of itself upon which the creation of the world dependeth; 4 God making all things by his Word, to whom he first communicated that omnipotency which is the cause of all things. And this may suffice for the illustration of our third assertion, that the Father hath communicated the divine essence to the Word, who is that Jesus who is the Christ.

39.—The fourth assertion followeth, that the communication of the divine essence by the Father is the generation of the Son; and Christ, who was eternally God, not from himself, but from the Father, is the eternal Son of God. That God always had a Son, appeareth by Agur's question in the Proverbs of Solomon: Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name? and what is his Son's name? if thou canst tell. 5 And it was the chief design of Mahomet to deny this truth, because he knew it was not otherwise possible to prefer himself before our Saviour. One prophet may be greater than another, and Mahomet might persuade his credulous disciples that he was greater than any of the sons of men; but while any one was believed to be the eternal Son of God, he knew it wholly impossible to prefer himself before him. Wherefore he frequently inculcates that blasphemy in his Alcoran, 6 that God hath no such Son, nor any equal with him; and his disciples have corrupted the Psalm of David, 7 reading (instead of

1 John x. 33. 2 John xvi. 27. 3 Ἄδινατον γὰρ τὸν Θεὸν εἰπεῖν ἐρμον τῆς φωτικῆς γνωμότητος.—DAMAS. De Fide Orthod. lib. i. cap. 8. 4 Εϊ δὲ μὴ κατοχυρώσως ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ θεία οὐσία, ἄλλ' ἐρμος, κατ' αὐτοὺς, ὡς φῶς μὴ φωτίζον, καὶ πηγὴ ἡμάς, πας δημιουργημένη ἐνέργειαν ἐχειν αὐτόν λέγοντες οὐκ αἰσχυνόνται;—S. ATHAN. Orat. ii. Cont. Arianos. 5 Prov. xxx. 4. 6 This is often repeated there, and particularly in the last chapter but one, called Mekhlas: “Est ipses Deus unus, Deus ater- nus, qui nec genuit, nec genus est, et cu nullus est equalis.” And the Saraceni- can set forth by Sylburgius mention this as the first principle of Mahumetanism, “Ort ei Theos esti, Poisitidis toun elon, mite genni- theis, mite gennias. And Joannes Sicilus and Georgius Cedrenus relate how Maho- met gave command, “Euca μονον προσκυνειν Θεον, και τὸν Χριστον τιμάν ώς Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μεν, σύνι Υιὸν δε.” And we read of his ridiculous history, that Christ, after his ascension into heaven, was accused by God for calling himself his Son, and that he denied it, as being so named only by men without any authority from him. "Οτι ἀνελθαντα τῶν Χριστον εἰς τῶν ὑμάρων ἡρώτησαν τὸν ἱες λέγων, "Ο Ιησούς, εἰ εἶτε τῶν λόγων τούτων, "Οτι Υος εἰμι τοῦ Θεοῦ και Θεος και ἀντικήθη Ιησοῦς, "Οτι οὐκ εἶπας ἐγώ, οὐδὲ αἰσχύνομαι εἰναι δουλός σου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνθρώποι λέγοντων ὃτι εἶπον τῶν λόγων τούτων. 7 Aifirosabadius in his Kamus: “Dic- tum Dei Omnibonotis ad Jesum, (qui pro- pitiatus sit et paeam concesit Deus,) Tu es nabiya, prophetus meus, ego walladcco, fori te: at dixerunt Christiani, Tu es Bonaiva, Filius meus, ego walladcco, te genat. Longe est supra hac Deus.” And to the same purpose Ebnol Athir: “In Evangelio dixit Ise, Ego walladcco, id est, educavi te; at Christiani, dempta litera Lam altera, ipsum ei Filium statuerunt. Qui longe elatus es super ea quae dicunt.” Whereas then the apostles attributed those words of the Psalm to Christ, the Mahumetans, who could not deny but they were spoken of the Messias,
Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee), 1 Thou art my prophet, I have educated thee. The later Jews, 2 acknowledging the words and the proper literal reading of them, apply them so unto David as that they deny them to belong to Christ; and that upon no other ground than that by such an exposition they may avoid the Christians' confession. But by the consent of the ancient Jews, by the interpretation of the blessed apostles, we know these words belong to Christ, and in the most proper sense to him alone. For, unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? as the apostle argues. 3 And if he had spoken them unto any other man, as they were spoken unto him, the apostle's argument had been none at all.

40.—Now that the communication of the divine essence by the Father (which we have already proved) was the true and proper generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear; because the most proper generation which we know is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus man beggetteth a son, that is, produceth another man of the same human nature with himself; and this production, as a perfect generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of paternity in him that produceth, and of filiation in him that is produced. Thus after the prolific benediction, Be fruitful and multiply, Adam begat in his own likeness, after his image; 4 and by the continuation of the same blessing, the succession of human generations hath been continued. This then is the known confession of all men, that a son is nothing but another produced by his father in the same nature with him. 5 But God the Father hath communicated to the

Psalm: "Some interpret this Psalm of Joeg and Magog and the Anointed is Messias the King; and so our doctors of happy memory have expounded it." And Rabbi Solomon Jarchi not only confesseth that the ancient rabbins did interpret it of the Messias, but shows the reason why the later Jews understood it rather of David, that thereby they might the better answer the argument of the Christians deduced from thence: "Our doctors have expounded it of the Messias: but as to the literal sense, and for the answering heretics, (that is, in their language, "Christians") "it is rather to be interpreted of David in his own person." 6

1 Psalm ii. 7.
2 I say, the later Jews so attribute those words to David, as if they belonged not to the Messias; but the ancient Jews understood them of the Christ; as appeareth not only out of those places in the evangelists where "the Christ" and "the Son of God" are synonymous; but also by the testimony of the later Jews themselves, who have confessed no less. So Rabbi David Kimchi, in the end of his commentaries on the second

3 Heb. i. 5. 4 Gen. i. 28; v. 3. 5 Kouno ὑπάρχει πάντι καὶ αὐτοδίδακτον ὠμολογῆμα, ὃς ἀποκρύφη τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τῇ γεγονόντος ὁμοίας καὶ φύσεως. — Phot. Epist. 1. This is in the language of Aristotle. Τὸ ποιήσας ἐτέρων οἷον αὐτήν ζων μὲς ζων
Word the same divine essence by which he is God; and consequently he is of the same nature with him, and thereby the perfect image and similitude of him, and therefore his proper Son. In human generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude: one in respect of the internal nature, the other in reference to the external form or figure. The former similitude is essential and necessary; it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son not be by nature a man: the latter accidental; not only sometimes the child representing this, sometimes the other parent, but also oftentimes neither. The similitude then in which the propriety of generation is preserved is that which consisteth in the identity of nature: and this communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude; from whence Christ is called the image of God, the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person.

41.—Nor is this communication of the divine essence only the proper generation of the Son, but we must acknowledge it far more proper than any natural generation of the creature, not only because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect. As in the divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections of the creature, subtracting all the imperfections which adhere unto them here in things below; so in the communication we must look upon the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In human generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the father, which is performed by derivation, or decision of part of the substance of the parent: but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeal; whereas the essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication. In natural conceptions the father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger than himself; for being generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him and continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality, wholly to be removed when we speak of him who inhabiteth eternity: the essence which God always had without beginning,
without beginning he did communicate; being always Father, as always God. Animals, when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolific; in God eternal perfection showeth his eternal fecundity. And that which is most remarkable, in human generations the son is of the same nature with the father, and yet is not the same man; because though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence: the power of generation depending on the first prolifical benediction, Increase and multiply, it must be made by way of multiplication; and thus every son becomes another man. But the divine essence, being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied; insomuch that he which proceedeth by that communication hath not only the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God; Abraham man, and Isaac man: but Abraham one man, Isaac another man; not so the Father one God, and the Word another, but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essential similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same which he receiveth from him; being the full perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately and with a greater unity or identity than can be found in human generations: it followeth that this communication of the divine nature is the proper generation by which Christ is and is called the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of St. Peter's confession, thou art the Son of the living God; this the ground of our Saviour's distinction, I go unto my Father, and to your Father. Hence did St. John raise a verity, more than only a negation of falsity, when he said, we are in the true Son; for we which are in him are true, not false sons: we are not as the true Son. Hence did St. Paul draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man, in that he spared not his own proper Son. Thus have we sufficiently showed that the eternal communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word

---

1 P. xiv. 24. 2 Matt. xvi. 16. 3 "Multum distat inter dominationem et conditionem, inter generationem et adoptionem, inter substantiam et gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec passim dicitur, Ascendo ad Patrem nostrum aut Deum nostrum: sed, ad Patrem meum et Patrem vestrum, ad Deum meum et ad Deum vestrum. Aliter enim illi Deus Pater est, alter nobis. Illum sequi dem natura coequat, misericordia humilliat: nos vero natura prostermit, misericordia erigit." — CAPEROLES CATHOIG. Epist. 4 John xx. 17. 5 1 John v. 20. 6 ROM. viii. 32.
was a proper generation by which Christ Jesus always was the true and proper Son of God: which was our fourth assertion.

42.—The fifth and last assertion followeth, that the divine essence was so peculiarly communicated to the Word, that there was never any other naturally begotten by the Father; and in that respect Christ is the only-begotten Son of God. For the clearing of which truth it will first be necessary to inquire into the true notion of the only-begotten, and then show how it belongs particularly to Christ, by reason of the divine nature communicated by way of generation to him alone. First, therefore, we must avoid the vain interpretation of the ancient heretics, who would have the restraining term only to belong, not to the Son, but to the Father; as if the only-begotten were no more than begotten of the Father only; which is both contrary to the language of the scriptures and the common custom of men, who use it not for him who is begotten of one, but for him who alone is begotten of any.

43.—Secondly, we must by no means admit the exposition of the later heretics, who take the only-begotten to be nothing else but the most beloved of all the sons; because Isaac was called the

1 This was the fallacy which Eunomius endeavoured to put upon the church, as appears by those words of his delivered and answered by St. Basil: Die τοῦτο γὰρ, φησὶ, Μονογενὴς, ἀπεδίπλωμεν παρὰ μόνῳ τῇ τοῦ Ἀγγελία τοῦ δυναμεὶς γεννηθήκας καὶ κτισθήκας τελεόοτασι γέγονεν ὑποφυγὸς. as if Monogenēs were only para μόνων, and Unigenitus were nothing else but genitus ab uno. This St. Basil refuted copiously: First. From the language of the scriptures and the usage of mankind: Die τήν παρουσίαν, ἃν περὶ τῷ δόμῳ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ἔκκοπαιπερα, παρὰ τῇ τῶν ἁμαρτων συνήθειαν, καὶ παρὰ τήν εὐερίδα τῶν γραμμῶν παράδοσιν εἰκολαμβάνων αὐτὸν τῇ τίνανοι. Μονογενής γὰρ σύν οἵ παρὰ μόνω γεννήμονος, ἀλλ’ οί μόνος γεννηθήκας, εἰ τῇ κοινῇ χρίσει προσαγορεύται. Secondly. By a retort peculiar to that heresy, which held the Son of God might be called κτισθείς, as well as γεννηθείς, "created," as well as "begotten," and consequently might be as properly named Monόκτιστος as Monogenēs. Ei μὴ παρὰ τό μόνον γεγενηθήκας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τό παρὰ μόνον Μονογενῆς ἐγέρθη, ταῦτα δὲ εὖτς κατὰ τό ἐκκοπαί τῷ γεγενηθῆ, τί σύμι καὶ Μονόκτιστον αὐτῶν ὄνομασί; Thirdly. By a particular instance showing the absurdity of such an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be called monogenēs, because not begotten of one, but two parents: Μονογενής δὲ, ὡς εὐκοπεῖ, ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς κατὰ γα τῶν ἦμετερων λόγων, διὰ τὸ ἑκ συνδυασμῷ παίνων υπάρχειν τῷ γεγενηθαι, οὐκ ἡ Δαυδ διὰ μήτρα μονογενοῦς ἦ τελεοθετήτος, διότι σύμι μιαν αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ Λαβαδίου εἰκολαμβάνων.

2 The Socinians make very much of this notion, and apply it so unto Christ, as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternal generation. So the Racovian Catechism: "Causa cur Christo ista attributa (selicet, proprium et unigenitum Dei Filium esse) competunt, hee est; quod inter omnes Dei filios et precipitus sit, et Deo charissimus: quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abraham charissimus et haeres exstitit, unigenitus vocatus est, Heb. xi. 17, licet fratrem Isaacem habuerit; et Solomone unigenitus curam matre sua, licet plures ex eadem matre frater fuerint. (I Paral. iii. 1-3, &c.)" And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Schlichtingius hath inserted it as a material observation: "Nam hic unicus seu unigena filius nominatur, qui ceteris longe clarior est patri longeque praestantior;" and confirms the interpretation with those two testimonies concerning Isaac and Solomon. But certainly this observation of theirs is vain, or what else they say is false. For if Christ be called "the Son of God," because conceived by the Holy Ghost, and none else was ever so conceived, then is he the Only-begotten by virtue of his generation. And if so, then is he not the only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, that is, by the affection and prelation of their parents. Or if Christ were the only-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then was he not conceived after a singular manner; for the brethren of Solomon no way differed from him in their generation. It is plain, therefore, that this interpretation was invented, that when all the rest should fail, they might stick to this.
only son of Abraham, when we know that he had Ishmael beside, and Solomon said to be the only-begotten before his mother, when David had other children even by the mother of Solomon. For the only-begotten and the most beloved are not the same; the one having the nature of a cause in respect of the other, and the same cannot be cause and effect to itself. For though it be true that the only son is the beloved son, yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved because the only, not therefore the only because beloved. Although, therefore, Christ be the only-begotten and the beloved Son of God, yet we must not look upon these two attributes as synonymous, or equally significant of the same thing, but as one depending on the other, unigeniture being the foundation of his singular love. Beside, Isaac was called the only son of Abraham for some other reason than because he was singularly beloved of Abraham; for he was the only son of the free woman, the only son of the promise made to Abraham, which was first this, Sarah shall have a son, and then, In Isaac shall thy seed be called.¹ So that Isaac may well be called the only son of Abraham in reference to the promise, as the apostle speaks expressly, By faith Abraham when he was tried offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son.² Avoiding, therefore, these two expositions, as far short of the true notion of the only-begotten, we must look upon it in the most proper, full, and significant sense, as signifying a son so begotten as none other is, was, or can be; so as the term restrictive only shall have relation not only to the father generating,³ but also to the son begotten, and to the manner of the generation. It is true the Father spake from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;⁴ and thereby we are to understand that whosoever of us are beloved by the Father are so begotten and in through the Son. In the same manner Christ is the only-begotten Son of God; and a many of us as God hath bestowed his love upon, that we should be called the sons of God, are all brought into that near relation by our fellowship with him, who is by far more near relation the natural and eternal Son.

1 Gen. xviii. 14; xxii. 12. 2 Heb. xi. 17. 3 Eunomius would have it only parà mónon, in relation to the Father only. St. Basil shows that no way proper, and shows that Monogenês is not he which parà mónon, but mónos γεγεννηται. St. Cyril [of Alexandria] adds these two parà mónon and mónos together, in relation to the Father and the Son: Monogenês kata' φύσιν ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ὑωμίκειται Δόγως, ὁτι mónos ἐκ mónos γεγεννηται τοῦ Πατρός. — Epist. i. Ad Regin. As Ruffinus doth in Unicus: "Ideo subjungit Unicium hunc esse Filium Dei, unus enim de uno nascitur." — Epist. Symb. St. Gregory Nazianzen adds to these two a third, in respect of the manner: Monogenês ἐστι, οὐχ ὅτι mónos ἐκ mónos καὶ mónos, ἀλλὰ ὅτι καὶ μονοτρόπος, οὐχ ὃς τὰ σώμαta. So he, something obscurely and corruptly; but plainly enough in Damascene, who aims often to deliver himself in the words of Nazianzen: Λέγεται Monogenês, ὅτι mónos ἐκ mónos τοῦ Πατρὸς mónos ἑγέννηται, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁμοιοῦται ἑτέρα γέννησιν τῇ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεννησθείς, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔσται ἄλλος Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4 Matt. iii. 17
Having thus declared the interpretation of the word, that, properly, as primogeniture consisteth in prelation, so unigeniture in exclusion, and that none can be strictly called the only-begotten but he who alone was so begotten: we shall proceed to make good our assertion, showing that the divine essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son.

And here we meet with two difficulties: one showing that there were other sons of God said to be begotten of him, to whom either the divine essence was communicated, and then the communication of that to the Word made him not the only-begotten; or it was not communicated, and then there is no such communication necessary to found such a filiation: the other alleging that the same divine essence may be communicated to another beside the Word, and not only that it may, but that it is so, to the person of the Holy Ghost; whence the Holy Ghost must be the Son of God, and then the Word is not the only-begotten; or if he be not the Son, then is not the communication of the divine essence a sufficient foundation of the relation of sonship. These two objections being answered, nothing will remain farther to demonstrate this last assertion.

44.—For the first, we acknowledge that others are frequently called the sons of God, and that we call the same God our Father which Christ called his; that both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren: 1 we confess that those whom St. Paul hath begotten through the gospel 2 may well be termed the begotten of God whose seed remaineth in them: 3 but withal we affirm that this our regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the generation of the on. We are first generated, 4 and have our natural being; after that regenerated, and so receive a spiritual renovation, and by virtue thereof an inheritance incorruptible: whereas the generation of Christ admits no regeneration, he becoming at once thereby

---

1 Heb. ii. 11. 2 1 Cor. iv. 15. 3 'En yap Xristo· 1·pseo dìa tou eisag·ge·le·ion evw emas ege·nnyθa. (1 Cor. iv. 15) Πας ο γεγεννημένος εκ του Θεου άμαρτίαν ου ποσει, οτι σπέρμα αυτου εν αυτῳ μενει. (1 John iii. 9.) And more expressly, 1 John v. 1. Πας ο πατείων οτι Ιησου εστιν ο Χριστος, εκ του Θεου γεγεννηται και πας ο αγαπων των γεννησαντων ανασται και των γεγεννημενων ει αυτων. "Quisquis credid Jesum esse Christum filium, ex Deo genitus est; et quisquis diliguit eum qui genuit, diligat etiam eum qui ex eo genitus est." 1 John iii. 9.

4 "Nos genuit Deus ut filii ejus simus, quos fecerat ut homines esserint. Unicum autem genuit, non solum ut Filius esset, quod Pater non est, sed etiam ut Deus esset, quod et Pater est."—S. August. De Consens. Evang. lib. ii. cap. 3. In the book of Celsus there was a Jew introduced speaking thus to Christ: Et tuto leges, ot pax anathemas kata thein prounean geowou Yioς etsi Theou, τι δεν συν άπλων διαφιρον; who is thus answered by Origen: Pròs on epros, οτι πας μεν δε, ου δ Παιδεω πνευματος, μη·κετι υπò δοθων παιδεγωγουμενοι, αλλα δι' αυτο το καλον αιρομενον, Υιος etsi Theou· oûthos de polio kai μακρο διαφερει παντως του δια την αρετην χρηματισοντος Υιου του Theou· οστις ωσπερι πυτη της και αρκη των τοιοτων τυχαειν.—Oppi. Cont. Cels. lib. 1
God and Son and heir of all. The state of sonship which we come into is but of adoption, showing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphorical: whereas Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the natural Son of God, that his generation clearly excluded the name of adoption; 1 and not only so, but when he becometh the son of man, even in his humanity refuseth the name of an adopted son. For when the fulness of time was come God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law (not that he, but) that we might receive the adoption of sons. 2 He then whose generation is totally different from ours whom he calleth brethren; he whom in the sacred scriptures the Spirit nameth the true Son, the Father sometimes his own, sometimes his beloved, but never his adopted Son; 3 he who by those proper and peculiar appellations is distinguished from us, 4 who can claim no higher filiation than that

1 First. It is most certain that the Word of God, as the Word, is not the adopted, but the natural, Son of God. “Non est Dei Filius Deus falsus, nec Deus adoptivus, nec Deus nuncupativus, sed Deus verus.” —S. Hilar. De Trin. lib. v. cap. 5. “Hic etiam Filius Dei natura est Filius, non adoptivus.” —Concil. Tolet. xi. Yión του Θεου εστι φιλεί, και ου θέσει, γεννηθεις εις Πατρος.  

2 S. Cyril. Hircosol. Catech. xi. And again: Οὐκ ἐκ τὸν μὴ διότι εἰς τὸ εἶναι τῶν Υἱῶν παρήγαγεν, οὐδὲ τὸν μὴ διότι εἰς Υιοθεσίαν ἤγαγεν ἀλλ’ ἀδίκων ὁ Πατὴρ, ἀδίκως ἐγένησα καὶ ἀνεκδράστως Υἱόν εν μοῖν, ἀδέλφων οὐκ ἔχοντα. This hath been so generally confessed, that Felix and Eilipandus, who were condemned for maintaining Christ as man to be the adopted Son of God, did acknowledge it, as appeareth by the beginning of their book: “Confitemur et credimus Deum, Dei Filium, ante omnia temporis sine initio ex Patre genitum, coeterum et consubstantalem, non adoptione, sed genere.” Secondly. It is also certain, that the man Christ Jesus taken personally is the natural, not the adopted, Son of God: because the man Christ Jesus is the eternal and natural Son, and by subsisting in the human nature could not leave off to be the natural Son. The denial of this by Felix and Eilipandus was condemned as heretical in the council of Franeord; and their opinion was thus expressed, partly in the words of St. Augustin, partly in their own additions: “Confitemur et credimus eum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege; non genere esse Filium Dei, sed adoptione; non natura, sed gratia.” This they maintained by forged testimonies of some fathers, and by the Liturgy of the church of Toledo, composed by Hildephonus, as the Roman by Gregory; in the mass de Caela Dominii, “Quis per adoptiæ hominis passionem dum suo non indulsit corpori;” and in the mass de Ascensione Domini, “Hodie Salvator noster, per adoptionem carnis, sedem repetivit Deitatis.” To this the synod opposed their determination in Sacrosyllabo: “Quod et te nascetur sanctum vocabitur Filiius Dei, non adoptivus sed verus, non alienus sed proprius.” And again: “Porro adoptivus dixi non potest, nisi quia estus ab eo a quo dicitur adoptatus: et gratis ci adoptio tribuitur, quoniam non ex debito, sed ex indulgentia tantummodo adoptio praestatur: sicut nos aliquando, cum essesum peccando filii ire, alieni eramus a Deo, per proprium et verum Filium, qui non eguit adoptione, adoptio nobis filiorum donata est.” And of this they give us the true ground in the synodic epistle: “Unitas personne quae est in Dei Filio et Filio Virginis adoptionis tollit injuriam.”  

3 Gal. iv. 4, 5.  

4 “Legi et regali scripturis, Jesum Filium Dei nasquam adoptione inveni.” —Ambrosiaster, Com. in Ep. ad Rom. “Dices mihi, Cur times adoptivum Christum Dominum nominare? Dico tibi, Quia nee apostoli eum sic nominabant, nec sancta Dei et catholica ecclesia consuetudinem habuit sic eum appellare.” — Synd. Epist. Concil. Francoford. From whence they charge all those to whom they write that synodic epistle, that they should be satisfied with such expressions as they found in the scriptures: “Intelligite, fratres, quae legitis, et nolite nova et incognita nomina fingere, sed quae in sacra scriptura invenientur tenete.” &c.  

5 St. Augustin hath observed, that St. Paul made use of vi@o@h@e@i@ia, that he might distinguish the filiation of Christ from ours. “At vero etiam nos, quibus dedit Deus potestatem filios ejus fieri, de natura atque substantia sua non nos censuit, sicut unicum Filium, sed utique dilectione adopta. Que
which we receive by the privilege of adoption; he is truly the only-begotten Son of God, notwithstanding the same God hath begotten us by his Word; and the reason why he is so is because the divine essence was communicated unto him in his natural and eternal generation, whereas only the grace of God is conveyed unto us in our adoption. Indeed, if we were begotten of the essence of God, as Christ was, or he were only by the grace of God adopted,\(^1\) as we are, then could he by no propriety of speech be called the only Son, by reason of so many brethren: but being we cannot aspire unto the first, nor he descend unto the latter, it remaineth we acknowledge him, notwithstanding the first difficulty, by virtue of his natural and peculiar generation to be the only-begotten Son.

45.—But though neither men nor angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by virtue of any such natural generation be called sons; yet one person we know, to whom the divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father as to the Son, which is the third person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word by that communication of the divine essence become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by receiving the same nature, he also be the Son of God, how is the Word the only Son? To this I answer, that the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word: but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication, the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession; and though everything which is begotten proceedeth, yet everything which proceedeth is not begotten.\(^2\) Wherefore in the lan-

---

\(^1\) "Si Unicus, quomodo adoptivus, dum multi sunt adoptivi filii? Unicus itaque de multis non potest dici?" — Concil. Francoford. "Quod si etiam Unigenitus Filius factus dicitur ex gratia, non vere genitus ex natura, proculdubio nomen et veritatem Unigeniti perditid, postquam fratres habere jam coepit: privatum enim hujus veritate nominis, si in Unigeniti non est de Patre veritas naturalis." — Fulgent. Ad Thrasim. lib. iii. cap. 3. "Si divina illa Filii semiternae nativitas non de natura Dei Patris, sed ex gratia, creditur substitisse, non debeat Unigenitus vocari, sed tantummodo genus.

Quoniam sicut ei nomen genitii largitas adoptionis paternae contribuit, sic eum at Unigeniti nomine nobis quoque tribuit communio paternae adoptionis exclusit. Unigenitus enim non vocatur, quamvis genitus possit vocari, cum genitis." — Ibid. cap. 4.

\(^2\) "Non omne quod procedit nascitur, quamvis omne procedat quod nascitur." — S. August. Contra Maxim. lib. ii. cap. 14, who gives the same solution to the same argument: "Queras a me, Si de substantia Patris est Filius, de substantia Patris est etiam Spiritus Sanctus, cur nonnus Filius sit, et alius non sit Filius? Ego respondeo, sive capias, sive non capias: De Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus Sanctus, sed ille genitus est, iste procedens."
guage of the sacred scriptures and the Church, the Holy Ghost is never said to be begotten, but to proceed from the Father; nor is he ever called the son, but the gift of God. Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam; whereas Seth proceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production, Eve descending not from Adam, as Seth did, by way of generation, that is, by natural fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him, the Word proceedeth from the same person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other is not. As, therefore, the regeneration and adoption of man, so the procession of the Holy Ghost doth no way prejudice the eternal generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour Jesus Christ had a real being and existence before he was conceived by the Virgin Mary; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that conception was not any created, but the one and indivisible divine essence; seeing he had not that divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper generation; we cannot but believe that the same Jesus Christ is the begotten Son of God: and seeing the same essence was never so by way of generation communicated unto any, we must also acknowledge him the only-begotten, distinguished from the Holy Ghost, as Son, from the adopted children, as the natural Son.

46.—The necessity of the belief of this part of the article, that Jesus Christ is the proper and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, and by that singular way of generation the only Son, appeareth first in the confirmation of our faith concerning the redemption of mankind. For this doth show such an excellency and dignity in the person of the Mediator as will assure us of an infinite efficacy in his actions and value in his sufferings. We know it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take

Πνεύμα, οὐ εὐγενεώμενον, ἄλλα ἐνὼν, καὶ παροματῶν, καὶ ἐκπορευόμενον. — Θεοδορ. Serm. II. p. 504.
1 "Nunquam fuit non Pater, a quo Filiius natus, a quo Spiritus Sanctus non natus, quia non est Filius?"—Greg. N. Ecdes. Dogm. "Dens Pater innascibilis non ex aliquo, Deus Filius Unigenitus ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre, Spiritus Sanctus innascibilis ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre."—Isaac. Lib. Fidei. "Quod neque natum neque factum est, Spiritus Sanctus est, qui a Pater et Filio procedit."—S. Ambros. In Symb.
2 'Ος μὲν οὖν Υἱός φυσικῶς κείμεναι τῷ Πατρός; ὦς ἐν Μονογενείᾳ, ἔλα ἐξει ἐν ξανθῷ συλλαβῳ, οὐδενός καταμεριζόμενος τροῖς ἐπεγεν. —S. Basil. Homil. de Fide.
away sins; and we may very well doubt how the blood of him who hath no other nature than that of man can take away the sins of other men, there appearing no such difference as will show a certainty in the one and an impossibility in the other. But since we may be bought with a price;² well may we believe the blood of Christ sufficiently precious, when we are assured that it is the blood of God;³ nor can we question the efficacy of it in purging our conscience from dead works, if we believe Christ offered up himself through the eternal Spirit.⁴ If we be truly sensible of our sins, we must acknowledge that in every one we have offended God; and the gravity of every offence must needs increase proportionally to the dignity of the party offended in respect of the offender, because the more worthy any person is, the more reverence is due unto him, and every injury tendeth to his dishonour: but between God and man, there is an infinite disproportion, and therefore every offence committed against him must be esteemed as in the highest degree of injury. Again, as the gravity of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended, so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignity of the person satisfying; because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honour which by the injury was eclipsed, and all honour doth increase proportionally as the person yielding it is honourable. If, then, by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminency, according unto which the injury is aggravated, how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation be of the same infinite dignity, so as the honour rendered by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence and that dishonour which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied than by a belief in such a mediator as is the only-begotten Son of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the same power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

Secondly, the belief of the eternal generation of the Son, by which he is the same God with the Father, is necessary for the confirming and encouraging a Christian in ascribing that honour and glory unto Christ which is due unto him. For we are commanded to give that worship unto the Son, which is truly and properly divine, the same which we give unto God the Father, who hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father.⁵ As it was represented to St. John in a vision, when he heard every creature which

⁴ Heb. x. 4. ⁵ 1 Cor. v. 20; vii. 23. ⁶ 1 Peter i. 19; Acts xx. 28. ⁷ Heb. ix. 14. ⁸ John v 22, 23.
is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, saying, Blessing, honour, glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.\(^1\) Again we are commanded to fear the Lord our God, and to serve him;\(^2\) and that with such an emphasis, as by him we are to understand him alone,\(^3\) because the Lord our God is one Lord.\(^4\) From whence, if any one arose among the Jews teaching under the title of a prophet to worship any other beside him for God, the judgment of the Rabbins\(^5\) was, that notwithstanding all the miracles which he could work, though they were as great as Moses wrought, he ought immediately to be strangled, because the evidence of this truth, that one God only must be worshipped, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon this precept as valid only under the law, as if then there were only one God to be worshipped, but since the gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commanded it to our observation by making use of it against the devil in his temptation, saying, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.\(^6\) If, then, we be obliged to worship the God of Israel only; if we be also commanded to give the same worship to the Son which we give to him; it is necessary that we should believe that the Son is the God of Israel. When the scripture bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, it saith, Let all the angels of God worship him;\(^7\) but then the same scripture calleth that first begotten Jehovah,\(^8\) and the Lord of the whole earth.\(^9\) For a man to worship that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and gross idolatry; to worship that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not the same degree, but the same sin; to worship him as God who is God, thinking that he is not God, cannot be thought an act in the formality void of idolatry. Lest, therefore, while we are all obliged to give unto him divine worship, we should fall into that sin which of all others we ought most to abhor, it is no less necessary that we should believe that Son to be that eternal God, whom we are bound to worship and whom only we should serve.

Thirdly, our belief in Christ as the eternal Son of God is necessary to raise us unto a thankful acknowledgment of the infinite

\(^1\) Rev. v. 13. 
\(^2\) Deut. x. 20. 
\(^3\) The emphasis appears in this, that it is not barely Et services et, butEt ipsi services, with such a peculiar restriction as is expressed by the Chaldee Paraphrase: Et in conspectu ejus services; by the LXX. Καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρείας; and that restriction approved by our Saviour, Matt. iv 10. 
\(^4\) Deut. vi. 4. 
\(^5\) Moses Maim. Prof. in Seder Zerain. 
\(^6\) Matt. iv. 10. 
\(^7\) Heb. i. 6. 
\(^9\) Psalm xcvi. 6.
love of God appearing in the sending of his only-begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of God is frequently extolled and admired by the apostles. God so loved the world, saith St. John, that he gave his only-begotten Son.\(^1\) God commendeth his love towards us, saith St. Paul, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us; in that he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.\(^2\) In this, saith St. John again, was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.\(^3\) If we look upon all this as nothing else but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner than other men, and when he was so born after a peculiar manner, yet a mortal man, should deliver him to die for the sins of the world, I see no such great expression of his love in this way of redemption more than would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. It is true, indeed, that the reparation of lapsed man is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely designed our redemption as our creation: considering the misery from which we are redeemed and the happiness to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God even in the act of redemption itself: but yet the apostles have raised that consideration higher and placed the choicest mark of the love of God in the choosing such means and performing in that manner our reparation by sending his only-begotten into the world; by not sparing his own Son, by giving and delivering him up to be scourged and crucified for us: and the estimation of this act of God’s love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son so sent into the world, because the more worthy the person of Christ before he suffered, the greater his condescension unto such a suffering condition, and the nearer his relation to the Father, the greater his love to us for whose sakes he sent him so to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the person and nature of our Saviour before he suffered, is so far to undervalue the love of God, and consequently, to come short of that acknowledgment and thanksgiving which is due unto him for it. If then the sending of Christ into the world were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged unto a return of thankfulness some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignity of nature in the person sent: then it is absolutely necessary to believe

\(^1\) John iii. 16. \(^2\) Rom. v. 8; viii. 32. \(^3\) 1 John iv. 9, 10.
that Christ is so the only-begotten Son of the Father, as to be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of majesty co-eternal.

47.—By this discourse in way of explication every Christian may understand what it is he says, and express his mind how he would be understood, when he maketh this brief confession, I believe in Christ the only Son of God. For by these words he must be thought to intend no less than this: I do profess to be fully assured of this assertion as of a most certain, infallible, and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Messiah, is the true, proper, and natural Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father; which being incapable of division or multiplication, is so really and totally communicated to him, that he is of the same essence with him, God of God, light of light, very God of very God. And as I assert him so to be Son, so do I also exclude all other persons from that kind of sonship, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and natural generation, and thereby excluding all which are not begotten, as it is a generation; all which are said to be begotten, and are called sons, but are so only by adoption, as it is natural. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son.

CHAPTER IV.

Our Lord.

1.—AFTER our Saviour’s relation, founded upon his eternal generation, followeth his dominion, in all ancient Creeds, as the necessary consequent of his filiation. For as we believe him to be the Son of God, so must we acknowledge him to be our Lord, because the only Son must of necessity be heir and lord of all in his Father’s house; and all others which bear the name of sons, whether they be men or angels, if compared to him, must not be looked upon as sons of God, but as servants of Christ.

Three things are necessary, and more cannot be, for a plenary explication of this part of the Article. First, the proper notation of the word Lord in the scripture-phrase, or language of the Holy

1 For though in the first rules of faith mentioned by Irenaeus and Tertullian we find not Dominum nostrum, yet in all the creeds afterward we find those words; probably inserted because denied by the Valentinians, of whom Irenaeus, Did tou tov Sotioro λέγουσιν, ουδέ γαρ Κύριον δνομάζειν αυτὰς θέλουσι.—Lib. 1. cap. 1.
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Ghost. Secondly, the full signification of the same in the adequate latitude of the sense, as it belongs to Christ. Thirdly, the application of it to the person making confession of his faith, and all others whom he involves in the same condition with himself, as saying, not my, nor their, but, Our Lord.

2.—First, then, we must observe that not only Christ is the Lord, but that this title doth so properly belong unto him, that the Lord alone absolutely taken is frequently used by the evangelists and apostles determinately for Christ,1 insomuch that the angels observe that dialect, Come, see the place where the Lord lay.2 Now for the true notation of the word, it will not be so necessary to inquire into the use or origination of the Greek;3 much less into the etymology of the correspondent Latin, as to search into the notion of the Jews, and the language of the scriptures, according unto which the evangelists and apostles spake and wrote.

3.—And first, it cannot be denied but that the word which we translate the Lord, was used by the interpreters of the Old Testament sometimes for men, with no relation unto any other than human dominion.4 And as it was by the translators of the

1 Mark xvi. 19, 20; Luke xii. 42; xxiv. 34; John iv. 1; vi. 23; xl. 2; xx. 18, 20, 25; xxi. 7; Acts ix. 1, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 27, 31, 42; xl. 16, 24; xiii. 47, &c.

2 Matt. xxviii. 6.

3 For whosoever shall consider the signification of Κύριος in the scriptures, I think he will scarce find any footsteps of the same in the ancient Greeks. In our sacred writ it is the frequent name of God; whereas I imagine it is not to be found so used by any of the old Greek authors. Julius Pollux, whose business is to observe what words and phrases may be properly made use of in that language, tells us the gods may be called θεοί or δαίμονες, but mentions not Κύριος, as neither proper, nor any name of God with them at all. Nor did they anciently use it in their economies; where their constant terms were, not Κύριος, but δεσπότης, and δούλος: and they had then another kind of notion of it, as appears by the complaint of the servant in Aristophanes:

Τοῖς σώμασις γάρ οίκοι εἰς τὸν κύριον
Κρατεῖν ὁ δαίμων, ἄλλα τὸν ἑαυτόν.

—Plut. 7.

In which words, if they were interpreted by the scripture usage, κύριος would signify "the master," and ἑωνημένος the person "bought," that is, the servant; whereas the place requires an interpretation wholly contrary; for ἑωνημένος is not here ἱγροορασιμιον, but ἱγροσαφείς, or ἑωνησάμιον, as the Scholiasts, Suidas, and Moschopulus have observed, that is, not the servant, but the master who bought him. And though those grammarians bring no other place to prove this active signification beside this of Aristophanes, by which means it might be still questionable whether they had rightly interpreted him without any authority; yet Phrynichus will sufficiently secure us of this sense: Ἐν Χριστίν ἑωνημένοις οἰκιῶν ἡ ἄγριον. Ἔννοια αὐτῶν ἐγκρινεῖ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίσπασι· μένει τὸ ἑωνημένος δόκιμον. Ἐωνημένον then here is he which buyeth, that is, the master; and consequently κύριος not the master, but the servant bought, whom he supposeth originally to have power over his own body. Indeed, it was not only distinguished, but in a manner opposed to δεσπότης, as appears by that observation of Ammonius, thus delivered by Eustathius in Odys. Εἰς: Κύριος γυναικός καὶ νῦν ἀνήρ καὶ πατὴρ, δεσποτὴς δὲ ἐργυρωπώτατος.

4 As ἸΑΝ is generally translated κύριος when it signifieth "lord" or "master" in respect of a servant or inferior, So Sarah called her husband, Gen. xviii. 12; 1 Peter iii. 6; so Eilezer, his master Abraham, Gen. xxiv. frequently. Thus Rachel saluted her father Laban, Gen. xxxi. 38; and Jacob, his brother Esau, Gen. xxxiii. 5. Potiphar is the κύριος of Joseph whom he bought, Gen. xxxix. 2, &c.; and Joseph in power so is saluted by his brethren, Gen. xiii. 10, and acknowledged by his servant, xlv. 5. The general name in the law of Moses for "servant" and "master" is πάῖς and κύριος, Exod. xxii. 2, 4. It is indeed so plain that the ancient Jews used this word to signify no more than human power, that we find ἸΑΝ, the name of 'vian,' so tran
Old, so is it also by the penmen of the New. But it is most
certain that Christ is called Lord in another notion than that
which signifies any kind of human dominion; because, as so,
there are many Lords, but he is in that notion Lord which admits
of no more than one. They are only masters according to the flesh; He the Lord of glory, the Lord from heaven, King of Kings, and
Lord of all other Lords.

4.—Nor is it difficult to find that name amongst the books of
the law in the most high and full signification; for it is most
frequently used as the name of the supreme God, sometimes for
El or Elohim, sometimes for Shaddai or the Rock, often for Adonai,
and most universally for Jehovah, the undoubted proper name of
God, and that to which the Greek translators, long before our
Saviour’s birth, had most appropriated the name of Lord, not
only by way of explication, but distinction and particular ex-
pression. As when we read, Thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art
the most high in all the earth; and when God so expresseth himself,
I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name
of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto
them. In both these places, for the name Jehovah, the Greek
translation, which the apostles followed, hath no other name but
Lord; and therefore undoubtedly by that word which we translate
the Lord did they understand the proper name of God, Jehovah.
And had they placed it there as the exposition of any other name of God, they had made an interpretation contrary to the manifest

verborum substitut consuevit, ideo illius etiam interpretatio huic accommodatur," says Crellius, De Deo et Attribut. cap. 14. But, First, it is not probable that the LXX. should think κύριος to be the proper interpretation of Ἰησοῦς, and give it to Jehovah only in the place of Adonai; for if they had, it would have followed, that where Adonai and Jehovah had met together in one sentence, they would not have put another word for Adonai, to which κύριος was proper, and place κύριος for Jehovah, to whom of itself (according to their observation) it did not belong. Whereas we read not only in

τον translated Δεσσάτα τύχε, Gen. xv. 2, 8, and ναβαζ ω Ἰησοῦν τύχεν Ἱερον. "Ο Δεσσάτας κύριος Ἠλαβαθ, Isa. i. 24, but also inντον τον τύχεν Ἴησος, Neh. x. 29. Secondly. The reason of this asser tion is most uncertain; for though it be confessed that the translators of the Sept., and also of the Masoreths of the LXX., where they found ישוע, and Josephus before them expresses the sense of the Jews of his age, that the τετραγάμματος was not to be pronounced, and before him Philo speaks as much; yet it followeth not from thence, that the Jews were so superstitious above three hundred years before; which must be proved before we can be assured that the LXX. read Adonai for Jehovah, and for that reason translated it κύριος. Thirdly. As we know no reason why the Jews should so confound the names of God, so were it now very irrational in some places to read ישוע for יוה: as when God saith, (Exod. vi. 3,) "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob," though the Vulgar translation render it, "In Deo Omnipotente, et nomen meum Adonai non indicavi eis;" and thereby make an apparent sense no way congruous to the intended importance of the Holy Ghost; (for it cannot be imagined either that God should not be known to Abraham by the name of Adonai, or that it were any thing to the present intentment, which was to encourage Moses and the Israelites, by the interpretation of the name Jehovah;) yet we have no reason to believe the LXX. made any such heterogeneous translation, where we read, Καὶ το ονόμα μου Κύριος οὐκ ἔδραμα αὐτοῖς. Thus, again, where God speaks unto Moses, Οὕτως ἐρεῖ τοίς νῦσι Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἀπεστάλκε με πρὸς ὑμᾶς: τούτῳ μοι ἔστω ονόμα αἰώνων (Exod. iii. 15;) whosoever thinks κύριος stands for Adonai does injury to the translators; and whosoever readeth Adonai for Jehovah, puts a force upon the text. As also when the prophet David saith, "That men may know that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the Most High over all the earth," (Psalm lxxiii. 18,) I confess the ancient fathers did together with the Jews, read Adonai for Jehovah in the Hebrew text; as appeareth by those words of Epiphanius De Ponderibus, Αδωνᾶ, ἡλαχα, καρπή, ἰσαμα, ἰεββετα, ἀκάλω, which very corruptly represent part of the first verse of Psalm cxlii. But, Notwithstanding, it is very observable, that they were wont to distinguish κύριος in the Greek translations, where it stood for Jehovah, from κύριος, where it stood for Adonai; and that was done by adding _ the margin the tetragrammaton itself, τον_, which, by the ignorance of the Greek scribes, who understood not the Hebrew characters, was converted into four Greek letters, and so made a word of no signification, ΠΙΠΙ. This is still extant in the copy of the text of Isaiah printed by Curterius, with the Commentary of Procopius; and St. Jerome gives an account of it in the Greek copies of his age: "Nomen tetragrammaton, quod ανεκδόθηντο, id est, ineffabile, putaverunt, quod his litteris scribuntur, god he ναυ περι ου: quod quidam non intelligentes, proper elementorum similitudinem, cum in Graecis libris repererint, Pipi legere consueverunt."—Epkist. 136. Neither did the Greeks only place this ΠΙΠΙ in the margin of their translations, but when they described the Hebrew text in Greek characters, they used the same ΠΙΠΙ for τον, and consequently did not read Adonai for Jehovah. An example of this is to be found in that excellent copy of the Prophets according to the LXX. collated with the rest of the translators, in the library of the most eminent Cardinal Barberini; where, at the thirteenth verse of the second chapter of Malachi, these words are written after the translation of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, out of the Hebrew text, after the manner of Origen's Hexapla, of which there is an excellent example in that ms.; ὅσαθ, σημάθ, θέσαι, φησίν, δεμα, εἴρηθη, (I. θη.) πιει, βέβαι, οὐσινκα, μην, ἀθαν, σελακ, αμανα, σσαλκεβ, ρακων, μετάφορα, which are a very proper expression of these following Hebrew words, according to the punctuation and reading of that age. ἀνατίθητε ὑμεῖς τότε τον δόμον αὐτοῦ. By which it is evident that Origen in his Hexapla, from whence undoubtedly that ancient scholiast took his various translations, did not read Ἀδωνᾶ in that place; but kept the Hebrew characters, which they who understood them not formed into these Greek letters πιπι. And certainly the preserving of the name "Jehovah" in the Greek translations was very ancient, for it was de-
intention of the Spirit: for it cannot be denied but God was known to Abraham by the true importance of the title Adonai, as much as by the name of Shaddai; as much by his dominion and sovereignty, as by his power and all-sufficiency: but by any experimental and personal sense of the fulfilling of his promises his name Jehovah was not known unto him: for though God spake expressly unto Abraham, All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever: yet the history teacheth us, and St. Stephen confirmed us, that he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on, though he promised that he would give it to him for a possession. Wherefore when God saith he was not known to Abraham by his name Jehovah, the interpretation of no other name can make good that expression: and therefore we have reason to believe the word which the first Greek translators, and after them the apostles, used, may be appropriated to that notion which the original requires; as indeed it may, being derived from a verb of the same signification with the Hebrew root.

scribed in some of them with the ancient characters, as St. Jerome testifieth: "Et nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam Graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquissimum expressum literis invenimus." — Epist. 106. Being [seeing] then we cannot be assured that the LXX. read Ἱ. X. for Ἱ. X.; being [seeing] they have used Κύριος for Jehovah, when they have made use of the general word Θεός for Adonai; being [seeing] in some places Adonai cannot be read for Jehovah without manifest violence offered to the text; it followeth, that it is no way probable that Κύριος should therefore be used for Jehovah, because it was taken for the proper signification of Adonai.

1 Gen. xiii. 15; xxvi. 3. 2 Acts viii. 5. 3 It is acknowledged by all that Ἰ. X. is from Λ. X. or Λ. X., and God’s own interpretation proves no less: "Exod. iii. 14;) and though some contend that futurition is essential to the name, yet all agree the root signifieth nothing but essence or existence, that is, τὸ ἐστὶν, or ὑπάρχειν. Now as from Ἰ. X. in the Hebrew Ι. X., so in the Greek, ἀπὸ του κυρίου, Κύριος. And what the proper signification of κύριος is, no man can teach us better than Hesychius, in whom we read, Κύριος, ὑπάρχει, τυγχανει κύριον, πρίμα longa, κύριον, πρίμα breve. —Παρ’ Φ.

Θωμος ἐκβολος.—SOPHOCLES, Ἐνίπ. Κολον. 1158. Schol.: Θωμος ἐκβολος, ἀντι του εκβολου, ταυτω δε του ἐντυγχανον. Hence was κύριον by the Attics used for ἐστιν, so: I take it from the words of the scholiast upon Sophocles: Το κυριω περιποιηκαίνεν φησιν ἡ συνήθεια και Αττικοι, ὡς ἐν εὐθυκείοις βαρβαρουσίν αὐτῷ Ἀττικοί μετὰ ἐκτάσεως του ν, κύριον ἄλαθες ἀντι του κυριου. Not that they used it by an apopoeis, taking ἑτερον κυριου, but that κυριον was taken in the sense of κυριον or κυριον, from κυριον, υπάρχει, κύριον, εἰς ὑπάρχειν, as the scholiast upon those words of Sophocles,—

Δειλαία δελαίον κυρίων—Elect. 849: Κυρίων, ἐγών υπάρχειν. Neither know I how better to render κυρίων than by υπάρχειν in that place of Aeschylus’s Prometheus, 330:—

Ζηλοί ο’ ὀδ’ οὐνεκ’ ἐκτὸς αὐτίας κυρίων, Πάντων μετασχοίν καὶ τετολικοίς ἐμοί. As the Arundelian scholiast upon the Septem Thebana, κυρίω, υπάρχειν: and in the same tragedy, εἰς ἀπίστως κυρίων, is rendered by the more ancient scholiast, εἰς τὸν ἀπίστος: as in the Persae, σεσωμεῖος κυρίει, is by the same interpreter explained, κυρεί καὶ υπάρχει σεσωμεῖος. So the same poet in his Agamemnon, 1379:—

Ταυτινὴ ἐπαυνεῖν πάντωθεν πληθύνοιμι, Τραγωδία Ἀρείθεν ἐπίδεινα κυριοῦθ’ ὧνως: which the scholiast renders thus: Εγανοιμαί διαφόρος ταυτινὴ γνώμην, τὸ μαζεῖν ἐν οἷα ἔστι καταστάσεις ὁ βασιλεὺς. And no other sense can be imagined of that verse in Sophocles,—

Φονέα σε φημετα γιατρὸν ου χειρετες κυρίων.—Ὁδρ. Τυραν. 362, than by rendering it εἶναι ὑπάρχειν: and:—

Καί γὰρ εἰ γενόμενοι κυρίων, Τὸ τῆσθε χωρᾶς όυ γεγορακε σοφός.—Ὁδρ. Κολον. 726; and:—

'ΑΛΛ' ἐνθάδ' ἥδη τοῦτο του πάθους κυρίω.—Πρωικ. 899; or of that in Euripides’s Phoebis, 1074:—

'Ολ' τις ἐν πῦλαις δωμάτων κυρίει;
and so denoting the essence or existence of God, and whatsoever else may be deduced from thence, as revealed by him to be signified thereby.

5.—Being then this title Lord thus signifieth the proper name of God Jehovah; being the same is certainly attributed unto Christ in a notion far surpassing all other Lords, which are rather to be looked upon as servants unto him: it will be worth our inquiry next, whether as it is the translation of the name Jehovah it belong to Christ; or whether, though he be Lord of all other Lords, as subjected under his authority, yet he be so inferior unto him

This original interpretation appeareth farther in the frequent use of κυρίος for τυγχάνω, as it signifieth no more than sum: as in Sophocles, εὐνόουσι κυρίοις for εὐνοεῖσθαι; yet the same word in τυγχάνω, ἐπεικείας κυρίοις for εὐπρόσωποις; so in Aristophanes, κυρίοις for κυρίοι; as ηγομένοι κυρίοις for ηγομένης; eirikóν κυρίοις for εἴρηκεν; εἰσερχόμενοι κυρίοις for εἰσέρχεται; so in Euripides, εὐκρίσια κυρίοις for εὐκρίσια ἐτών. From all which it is evident, that the ancient signification of κυρίος, or κυρίο, is the same with εἰμί, or ύπάρχω, sum. "I am:" which is much confirmed by that it was anciently observed to be a verb transitive, as it was used by the fore-mentioned author: Κυρίοις συνεκάθισεν πρώτος τῶν περισσομένων, τὸ περιτυγχάνον αὐτί δὲ τῷ ύπάρχῳ κατὰ τοῦ τραγουδικοῦ ἄμητατον. So an ancient Lexicon: and therefore κυρίος, immediately derived from thence, must be δ' ὄν, or δ' ύπάρχων, and consequently the proper interpretation of ΠΗλίον, descending from the root ΠΗλίον of the same signification. And well may we conceive the LXX, for this reason to have so translated it, because we find the origination delivered by them in that notion, rendering ΠΗλίον δ' Οὐν. Ἐκδ. iii. 14: 'Εγὼ εἰμί. δ' Οὖν, and again, 'Ο Οὐν ἀνέσταλκε μὲ πρός ύμᾶς. Whence we consider the name ΠΗλίον proceeding from that root, and given in relation to that sense, they made use of the word Κύριος for the standing interpretation of that name, as being equivalent to δ' Οὖν. We have no reason then to conceive either that they so translated it out of the superstition of the Jews, (as some would persuade us, whom we have already refuted,) or because they had no letters in the Greek language by which they could express the Hebrew name, whereas we find it often expressed even among the Gentile Greeks; but because they thought the Greek Κύριος to be a proper interpretation, as being reducible to the same signification. For even they which are pretended to have read Ἀδώνας for Jehovah, as Origen, &c., do acknowledge that the Heavens and the ancient heretics descending from the Jews had a name by which they did express the Hebrew Jehovah. We know that oracle preserved by Macrobius:—

Φράσεω τῶν πάντων ὑπάτων Θεῶν ἐμμὲν Ἰακ. —Satureal. lib. i. cap. 12.

And Diodorus hath taught us from whence that name first came, mentioning Moses in this manner: Παῦλος τοῦ Ἰουδαίων Μοσέως τοῦ Ἰακ. εὐπλασίας ὑποστημένων Θεῶν, and Theodoret more expressly, Quast. 13 in Exod. : Καλοῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν Σαμαρητάς μὲν Ιαβέ, Ἰουδαίοι δὲ Ἰακ. Porphyrius, lib. iv. Cont. Christian. tells us, Sanchoniathon had his relations of the Jews para Ἰερομυθίαν τοῦ ἱεροῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰερών. Eusebius (as we formerly mentioned) said, Ἰουσίνεν εὕστε, Ἰακ. σωφρίαν Ἑσγέραν, Ἰαδόθαι, Ἰακ. συντίθενε, taking ιω in composition for the contraction of Ἰακ. as Ιωνας ἐριμυνεται, Ἠγίστου προνυμόν. And the LXX., Jer. xxiii. 6, have rendered Ἰαβέ Ἰαδέ, "id est, Dominus justus," saith St. Jerome. And as the Heavens and the first Christians, so the heretics, had among them the pronunciation and expression of the name ΠΗλίον. As the Valentinian was baptized in τὸν Ὀρθὸν τοῦ Ἱακ. (Iren. lib. 1.,) and the Ophians had their several gods, among the rest, ἀπὸ μὲν μαγείας τοῦ Ἰαλαβαλδα καὶ τοῦ Ἀσταφάεως, καὶ τοῦ Πραίροι ἀπό δὲ τῶν Ἐβραίων ὑγατόν τοῦ Ἰακ., ἦ παρ' Ἐβραίων ὑγατόμενον.—Oratio Cont. Celis. lib. vi. So I read it, not as it is in the edition of Hesychius, Ἰαδαί a one word, or Ἰαδαία, as our learned countryman Niclaus Fullerus hath endeavoured in vain to rectify it; but Ἰακ. Ἰακ. that is, the Ophians took the name Ἰακ. from the Jews among whom it signifies the same who is called Ἰαβ. For that it ought so to be read appeareth by the former words of Origen: Οἰσται τῶν θεολόγων τοῦ Ἰαλαβαλδα καὶ Ἰαλαβαλδαὶ καὶ Ἰαλαβαλδαί ἐπί τοῦ Ἰακ. δεῖ λέγειν Ἰαβ. δὲ κρυπτομενῶν μναστηριών Ἰουνίου καὶ Πατρὸς ἄρχων νυκτοφανῆς δεινιτε Ἰακ. In the printed copy indeed it is Ἰαδείς, and in the Latin Iadin, but without sense; whereas, dividing the words, the sense is manifest, and the reason of the former emendation apparent. Being [seeing] then there were so many among the Greeks which did in all ages express the Hebrew name, it can be no way probable that the LXX. should avoid it as inexpressible in their language.
On the Creed.

[ART. II.

whose name alone is Jehovah, 1 as that in that propriety and eminency in which it belongs unto the supreme God it may not be attributed unto Christ.

6.—This doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can show the name Jehovah itself to be given unto our Saviour; it being against all reason to acknowledge the original name, and to deny the interpretation in the sense and full importance of that original. Wherefore if Christ be the Jehovah, as so called by the Spirit of God; then is he so the Lord, in the same propriety and eminency in which Jehovah is. Now whatsoever did belong to the Messias, that may and must be attributed unto Jesus, as being the true and only Christ. But the Jews themselves acknowledge that Jehovah shall be known clearly in the days of the Messias, and not only so, but that it is the name which properly belongeth to him. And if they cannot but confess so much who only read the prophecies, as the Eunuch did, without an interpreter; how can we be ignorant of so plain and necessary a truth, whose eyes have seen the full completion, and read the infallible interpretation of them? If they could see Jehovah the Lord of hosts to be the name of the Messias, who was to them for a stone of stumbling and rock of offence; 3 how can we possibly be ignorant of it, who are taught by St. Paul, that in Christ this prophecy was fulfilled, As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone and rock of offence, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed? 4 It was no other than Jehovah who spake those words, 5 I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord (Jehovah) their God, and will not save them by bow nor sword. 6 Where not only he who is described as the original and principal cause, that is, the Father who gave his Son, but also he who is the immediate efficient of our salvation, and that in opposition to all other means or instrumental causes, is called Jehovah: who can be no other than our Jesus, because there is no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we must be saved. 7 As in another place he speaketh, I will strengthen them in the Lord (Jehovah) and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the Lord (Jehovah); 8 where he which strengtheneth is one, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another, clearly distinguished from him by the personal pronoun, and yet each of them is Jehovah, and Jehovah our God is one Jehovah. 9 Whatever objections may be framed against us, 10

1 Psalm lxxxiii. 18.
2 As Midrasch Tillim, on Psalm xxi. Echa Rabati, Lam. i. 6.
3 Isai. viii. 13, 14. 4 Rom. ix. 33.
5 Hosea i. 7, where it is farther observable, that the Chaldee Paraphrase hath for בָּהִיָּה, "By the Word of Jehovah," for "Jehovah."
6 Hosea i. 7. 7 Acts iv. 12.
8 Zech. x. 12. 9 Dent. vi. 4.
10 Two adversaries we have to the exposition of this place, the Jew and the Socinian; only with this difference, that we find the less opposition from the Jew, from whom...
Indeed we have so ample a concession as will destroy the other's contradiction. First, Socinus answers, the name belongeth not to Christ, but unto Israel; and that it so appears by a parallel place in the same prophet, Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16. — Socin. Refut. Jac. Wielé, cap. 6. & Catech. Racoov. de Pers. Christi, cap. 1; Crellius, De Deo et Atrib., lib. i. cap. 11. To this we first oppose the constant interpretation of the Jews, who attribute the name "Jehovah" to the Messias from this one particular text. As in the Sepher Hecharim, lib. ii. cap. 8: Ἰησοῦς ὁ οὖς ἀκεμνή. "The scripture calleth the name of the Messias, Jehovah our Righteousness." And in Midrasch Tillim on Psalm xxii.:

καλοῦσιν αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν ὁ ὁ ἀκαμάθησαι ἢ τινὲς ἔφη πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡ ἀνάθεμήν ἔστιν ἡ ἱματία σαρώσματος, ἑαυτῷ δὲ χαίρειν γενέσεως ἐὰν ἔκρυβεν ὁ κρατῶν ἄλλοο...

"God calleth the Messias by his own name, and his name is Jehovah; as it is said, (Exod. xv. 3) The Lord is a man of war, Jehovah is his name. And it is written of the Messias, (Jer. xxiii. 6) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our Righteousness." Thus Echa Rabati, Lam. 1. 6: בָּשָׂר בֶּן בֶּן הַגָּדוֹל שֶׁתַּפַּר חַיָּל שֶׁבֶר לַחַיָּל שֶׁל בָּשָׂר שֶׁל מְכָרָה הַקּוֹרָה לַהַתַּקּוֹרָה. "What is the name of the Messias? R. Abba said, Jehovah is his name: as it is said, (Jer. xxiii. 6) And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our Righteousness." The same be reports of Rabbi Levi. The rabbins, then, though enemies to the truth which we deduce from thence, constrained by the literal importance of the text, did acknowledge that the name "Jehovah" did belong to the Messias. And as for the collection of the contrary from the parallel place pretended, there is not so great a similitude as to enforce the same interpretation. For whereas in Jer. xxiii. 6 it is expressly said, "This is the name," in chap. xxxiii. 16 it is only ἡ γενεσία, without any mention of a name; and surely that place cannot prove "Jehovah" to be the name of Israel, which speaks not one word of the name of Jerusalem; for where we read in Crellius, "Hoc scilicet nomen est," all but hoc is not scripture, but the gloss of Crellius, and hoc itself cannot be warranted for the interpretation of יְהוָה, nor quo for יְהוָה, the simplest interpretation of those words הַיְהוָה אֲשֶׁר אָבִ֖ד לֹא בְּאֵ֣ד וְיֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר אָבִ֖ד לֹא בְּאֵ֣ד. "He which calleth Jerusalem is the Lord our Righteousness," that is, Christ. And thus the first answer of Socinus is invalid; which he easily foreseeing, bath joined with the Jewish rabbins in the second answer, admitting that "Jehovah our Righteousness" is the name of the Messias, but withal denying that the Christ is that Jehovah. To which purpose they assert those words, "Jehovah our Righteousness," to be delivered by way of proposition, not of apposition; and this they endeavour to prove by such places of scripture as seem to infer as much. As, "Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-Nissi." (Exod. xvii. 15.) "Gideon built an altar unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah-Shalom." (Judges vi. 24.) And the name of the city in the last words of Ezekiel is "Jehovah-Shamah." In all which places it is most certain, that the name "Jehovah" is not predicated of that, of whose name it is a part; but is the subject of a proposition, given by way of nomination, whose verb substantive or copula is understood. But from thence to conclude that "the Lord our Righteousness" can be no otherwise understood of Christ than as a proposition, and that we by calling him so, according to the former prediction, can understand no more thereby than that God the Father of Christ doth justify us, is most irrational. For, First, it is therefore necessary to interpret those names by way of a proposition of themselves, because Jehovah cannot be the predicate of that which is named; it being most apparent, that an altar or a city built cannot be God; and whatsoever is not Jehovah without addition, cannot be Jehovah with addition. But there is no incongruity in attributing of that name to Christ, to whom we have already proved it actually given; and our adversaries, who teach that the name "Jehovah" is sometimes given to the angels representing God, must acknowledge that it may be given unto Christ, whom they confess to be above all angels, and far more fully and exactly to represent the Father. Secondly, That which is the addition in those names cannot be truly predicated of that thing which bears the name. Moses could not say that altar was his "Exaltation," nor Gideon that it was his "Peace." And if it could not so be predicated by itself, it could neither be by apposition; and, consequently even in this respect, it was necessary to make the name a proposition. But "our Righteousness" may undoubtedly be predicated of him who is here called by the name of "the Lord our Righteousness;" the apostle hath expressly taught us, that he is made Righteousness unto us." (1 Cor. i. 30.) And if it may be in itself, there can be no repugnancy in its predication by way of apposition. Thirdly. That addition of "our Righteousness" doth not only truly belong to Christ, but in some manner properly and peculiarly, so as in that notion it can belong to no other person called Jehovah but to that Christ alone. For he alone..."
saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; we are assured that this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness: 1 the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the expression of his supremacy; and the addition of our Righteousness can be no diminution to his majesty. If those words in the prophet, Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Sion; for lo, I come, and I dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord (Jehovah), 2 did not sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt amongst us, as they certainly do; yet the words which follow would evince as much, And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee: 3 for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but Christ?

7.—And as the original Jehovah was spoken of Christ by the holy prophets; so the title of Lord, as the usual interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the apostles. In that signal prediction of the first age of the gospel God promised by Joel, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be delivered: 4 and St. Paul hath assured us that Christ is that Lord, by proving from thence, that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed, and inferring from that, if we confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus, we shall be saved. 5 For if it be a certain truth, that whosoever confesseth the Lord Jesus shall be saved: and the certainty of this truth depend upon that foundation, that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed; and the certainty of that in relation to Christ depend upon that other promise, Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved: 6 then must the Lord, in the thirteenth verse of the tenth chapter to the Romans, be the same with the Lord Jesus in the ninth verse; or else St. Paul's argument must be invalid and fallacious, as containing that in the conclusion which was not comprehended in the premises. But the Lord, in the ninth verse, is no other than Jehovah, as appeareth by the prophet Joel, from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New

the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;” [Rom. x. 4:1] and when he is said to be “made unto us righteousness” (1 Cor. i. 30,) he is thereby distinguished from God the Father. Being, [seeing,] then, Christ is thus peculiarly called “our Righteousness” under the gospel; being [seeing] the place of the prophet forementioned speaketh of this as a name to be used under the gospel; being [seeing] no other person called Jehovah is ever expressly called “our Righteousness” in the gospel; it followeth, not only that Christ may be so called, but that the prophecy cannot otherwise be fulfilled, than by acknowledging that Christ is “the Lord our Righteousness;” and, consequently, that is his name, not by way of proposition, but of apposition and appropriation; so that, being both “Jehovah” and “our Righteousness,” he is as truly “Jehovah” as “our Righteousness.”

1 Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. 2 Zech. ii. 10. 3 Verse 11. 4 Joel ii. 32. 5 Rom. x. 9, 11. 6 Verse 13.
Testament is called Lord, as that name or title is the interpretation of Jehovah.

8.—If we consider the office of John, the Baptist peculiar unto him, we know it was he of whom it is written in the prophet Malachi, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare my way before me: we are sure he which spake those words was (Jehovah) the Lord of hosts; and we are as sure that Christ is that Lord before whose face John the Baptist prepared the way. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, saith Isaiah, Prepare ye the way of the Lord (Jehovah); and this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, saith St. Matthew: this is he of whom his father Zachariah did divinely presage, Thou child shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways. Where Christ is certainly the Lord, and the Lord undeniably Jehovah.

1 Matt. xi. 10. 2 Mal. iii. 1. 3 Isa. xl. 3. 4 Matt. iii. 3. 5 Luke i. 76. 6 I say therefore "undiennably," because it is not only the undoubted translation of the name _SW_ in the prophet, (which of itself were sufficient,) but also is delivered in that manner which is (though unreasonably) required to signify the proper name of God, _Πρωτοειδης_ γαρ προ των σωσων Κυρου, not του Κυρου, that is, without, not with, an article. For now our Saviour's Deity must be tried by a new kind of school-divinity, and the most fundamental doctrine, maintained as such ever since the apostles' times by the whole catholic church, must be examined, censured, and condemned, by _δ_, _η_, _τ_., Socinus first makes use of this observation against Wiclif; and after him Crellius hath laid it as a grave and serious foundation, and spread it out into its several corners, to uphold the fabric of his superstitions. First. "Vox Jehovah magis quam catena Dei nomina propriorum naturam sequitur; ideo etiam Graecu Kυρου, cum pro illa ponitur, propriorum indolem, qua licet, armulatur." Secondly. "Propri nominibus articulus libentius subtrahitur, licet cum etiam sepe concomitatis potissum quas necessitatis causa adimitunt. Idem fit in voce Kυρου, cum pro Jehovah ponitur." Thirdly. "Hoc est causa cur in Novo Testamento, maxime apud Lukem et Paulum, vos Kυρου, cum Deum summum designat, articulo libentius careat; at cum de Christo subjectiva usurpatur, raro articulis omitterit." What strange uncertainties are these to build the denial of so important an article as Christ's Divinity upon! He does not say absolutely Jehovah is the proper name of God, but only that it doth more follow the nature of proper names than the other names of God. And, indeed, it is certain that sometimes it hath the nature of an appellative, as Deut. vi. 4, ἡ ἀρχή Ὀρῆ "The Lord our God is one Lord;" and yet if it be not always and absolutely a proper name, though all the rest were granted to be true, the argument must be of no validity. Again, he cannot say an article is never affixed to a proper name, but only that _libentius subtrahitur_, it is rather omitted than affixed; which yet is far from a certain or a true rule, especially in the language of the New Testament. For no man can deny Jesus to be the proper name of Christ, given him according to the law at his circumcision, ἐκ ἐκκλησίας το ὀνόμα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ; (Luke ii. 21;) and yet whosoever shall read the Gospel of St. Matthew, will find it ten times ὁ Ἰησοῦς with an article, for once Ἰησοῦς without it. And in the Acts of the Apostles, written in a more Attic style, St. Paul is oftener styled ὁ Ἰησοῦς than simply Ἰησοῦς. So Balaam, Galil, &c. Some persons we find in the New Testament, whom, if we should stay till we found them without an article, we should never call by their names at all; as Apelles, Balak, &c. Thirdly. 'Ο Κυριος is so often used for that article, which is the Father with the Son without an article, (for the Father, Matt. i. 22; ii. 15; v. 33; xxii. 44; Mark xii. 36; Luke i. 6, 9, 15, 25, 46; ii. 15, 22, 23; x. 2; Acts ii. 25, 34; iii. 19; xvii. 27; Rom. xv. 11; 1 Cor. x. 26; xvii. 2; 2 Cor. v. 11; Eph. v. 17, 19; Col. iii. 16, 20, 23; 2 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Tim. i. 16; Heb. viii. 2; xii. 14; James iv. 10, 15; 1 Peter ii. 3. For the Son, Matt. iii. 3; xxii. 43, 45; Mark i. 3; Luke i. 76; ii. 11; iii. 4; John i. 23; Acts ii. 36; x. 36; xi. 16, 21; xv. 11; Rom. i. 7; x. 9, 12; xiv. 6, 8, 14; xvii. 2, 8, 11-13, 22; 1 Cor. i. 3; iv. 17; vii. 22, 25, 39; ix. 1, 2; x. 21; xi. 11; xii. 3; xiv. 37; xv. 58; xvi. 10, 19; 2 Cor. i. 2; ii. 12; iv. 8; 11.
Nor is this the only notation of the name or title Lord taken in a sense divine, above the expression of all mere human power and dominion; for as it is often used as the interpretation of the name Jehovah, so is it also for that of Adon or Adonai. The Lord said unto my Lord, saith David, that is, in the original, Jehovah unto Adon; and that Adon is the Word, that Lord is Christ. We know the Temple at Jerusalem was the Temple of the most High God, and the Lord of that Temple in the emphasis of an Hebrew article was Christ, as appeareth by that prophet; The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in.

Now this notation, as it is the interpretation of Adon, signifieth immediately and properly dominion implying a right of possession, and power of disposing. Which doth not only agree with that other notion of Jehovah, but presupposes it, as following from it. For he who alone hath a being or existence of himself, and thereby is the fountain of all things beside himself, must be acknowledged to have full power and dominion over all: because everything must necessarily belong to him from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore being Christ is the Lord, as that title is taken for Jehovah, the name of God, expressing the

whom they acknowledge God, and Кύριος for him whom they cannot deny to be the Christ; it followeth that Christ, acknowledged to be the Lord, cannot by any virtue of an article be denied to be the true Jehovah. We must not then think to decide this controversy by the articles, of which the sacred penmen were not curios, and the transcribers have been very careless; nor is there so great uncertainty of the ancient MSS. in any thing as in the words and articles of Κύριος and Θεός. The Vulgar edition, Rev. i. 8, hath Λέγει ο Κύριος only, the Complutensis, Λέγει Κύριος ο Θεός, Plantine Λέγει ο Κύριος ο Θεός, against the Socinian rule, who will have an accession by ο to Θεός, and a diminution by ο from Κύριος. As Rev. iv. 11: "Απός ει, Κύριε, λαβειν τη δόξαν" in other MSS., "Απός ει, ο Κύριος και ο Θεός ἡμῶν ο Αγίος, λαβειν την δόξαν. 1 Cor. xli. 27:—το ποτήριον του Κυριου ανέζως others, with an addition, το ποτήριον του Κυριου ανεζως του Κυριου. 1 Cor. xiv. 37: the Vulgar edition, οτι του Κυριου εισιν εντολαι, the Complutens, οτι Κυριου. So where we usually read Χριστός, divers ancient MSS. have Κύριος. Lastly, it is observable that even in these words of the Creed, which we now expound, Κύριος is spoken expressly of Christ without an article; for so we read it, Και εις Κυριον Χρισ-

τον, των Ευαγγελιαν, Κυριον ἡμων. 1 Psalm ex. i.
necessary existence and independence of his single being, and consequently the dependency of all others upon him; it followeth that he be acknowledged also the Lord, as that name expresseth Adon, signifying power authoritative and proper dominion. Thus having explained the notation of the word Lord, which we propounded as the first part of our exposition; we come next to the second, which is, to declare the nature of this dominion, and to show how and in what respect Christ is the Lord.

9.—Now for the full and exact understanding of the dominion seated or invested in Christ as the Lord, it will be necessary to distinguish it according to that diversity which the scriptures represent unto us. As therefore we have observed two natures united in his person, so must we also consider two kinds of dominion belonging respectively to those natures; one inherent in his divinity, the other bestowed upon his humanity; one as he is the Lord the maker of all things, the other as he is made Lord of all things.

10.—For the first, we are assured that the Word was God, that by the same Word all things were made, and without him was not anything made that was made;¹ we must acknowledge that whosoever is the Creator of all things must have a direct dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creator who made all things. Therefore the Word, that is, Christ as God, hath the supreme and universal dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting, but believing Thomas, my Lord and my God.²

11.—For the second, it is also certain that there was some kind of lordship given or bestowed on Christ, whose very union proves no less than an imparted dominion; as St. Peter tells us that he was made both Lord and Christ.³ What David spake of man,⁴ the apostle hath applied peculiarly unto him, Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.⁵

Now a dominion thus imparted, given, derived or bestowed, cannot be that which belongeth unto God as God, founded in the divine nature, because whatsoever is such is absolute and independent. Wherefore this lordship thus imparted or acquired appertaineth to the human nature, and belongeth to our Saviour as the Son of man. The right of judicature is part of this power; and Christ himself hath told us, that the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man:⁶ and by

¹ John i. 1, 3.
² John xx. 28.
³ Acts ii. 36.
⁴ Psalm viii. 5, 6.
⁵ John v. 27.
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virtue of this delegated authority, the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and reward every man according to his works. 1 Part of the same dominion is the power of forgiving sins: as pardoning, no less than punishing, is a branch of the supreme magistracy: and Christ did therefore say to the sick of the palsy, thy sins be forgiven thee, that we might know that the son of man had power on earth to forgive sins. 2 Another branch of that power is the alteration of the law, there being the same authority required to abrogate or alter, which is to make a law: and Christ asserted himself to be greater than the Temple, showing that the Son of man was Lord even of the Sabbath-day. 3 12.—This dominion thus given unto Christ in his human nature was a direct and plenary power over all things, but was not actually given him at once, but part while he lived on earth, part after his death and resurrection. For though it be true that Jesus knew, before his death, that the Father had given all things into his hands; yet it is observable that in the same place it is written that he likewise knew that he was come from God, and went to God: 4 and part of that power he received when he came from God, with part he was invested when he went to God; the first to enable him, the second, not only so, but also to reward him. For to this end Christ both died, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. 5 After his resurrection he said to the disciples, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. 6 He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore he hath lift up his head. 7 Because he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: Therefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. 8 Thus for and after his death he was instated in a full power and dominion over all things, even as the Son of man, but exalted by the Father, who raised him from the dead, and set him at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church. 9 13.—Now as all the power given unto Christ as man had not one same beginning in respect of the use or possession, so neither, when begun, shall it all have the same duration. For part of it being merely economical, aiming at a certain end, shall then cease

---

1 Matt. xvi. 27. 2 Matt. ix. 2. 6. 3 Matt. xii. 6, 8. 4 John xiii. 3. 5 Rom. xiv. 9. 6 Matt. xxviii. 18. 7 Psalm cx. 7. 8 Phil. ii. 8-11. 9 Eph. i 20-22.
and determinate, when that end for which it was given shall be accomplished: part, being either due upon the union of the human nature with the divine, or upon covenant, as a reward for the sufferings endured in that nature, must be coeval with that union and that nature which so suffered, and consequently must be eternal.

14.—Of the first part of this dominion did David speak, when by the spirit of prophecy he called his Son his Lord; The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool: where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged until their final and total subjection. For he must reign till he hath put all things under his feet. And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdom till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. For when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Thus he which was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion, shall resign up his commission after their subjection.

15.—But we must not look upon Christ only in the nature of a general, who hath received a commission, or of an ambassador, with perfect instructions; but of the only Son of God, impowered and employed to destroy the enemies of his Father's kingdom: and though thus impowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the only Son, and the heir of all things in his Father's house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath purchased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward which was assigned him for his sufferings: for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience be an immarceable crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternal; then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath always reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings; but so that he continue still for ever High Priest and King of Kings.

The certainty of this eternal dominion of Christ as man we may well ground upon the promise made to David, because by reason of that promise Christ himself is called David. For so God speaketh concerning his people; I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed

---

1 Psalm cx. 1.  2 1 Cor. xv. 25.  3 Verse 24.  4 Verse 23.  5 Psalm cx. 2.
them; and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it.  

Now the promise was thus made expressly to David, Thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.  

And although that term for ever in the Hebrew language may signify oft-times no more than a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable, or at the utmost but to the end of all things; and so the economical dominion or kingdom of Christ may be thought sufficiently to fulfil that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that economy requireth, till all things be performed for which Christ was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things: yet sometimes also the same term for ever signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all; and that it is so far to be extended particularly in that promise made to David, and to be fulfilled in his Son, is as certain as the promise. For the angel Gabriel did give that clear exposition to the blessed Virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her womb; The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. 

Nor is this clearer in Gabriel's explication of the promise, than in Daniel's prevision of the performance; who saw in the night-visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven; And came to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that shall not be destroyed.

Thus Christ is Lord both by a natural and independent dominion: as God, the Creator, and consequently the Owner, of the works of his hands; and by a derived, imparted and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed, raised and exalted, and so made Lord and Christ: which authority so given and bestowed upon him is partly economical, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted are accomplished; partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion, of the human nature, that it must be coeval with it, that is, of eternal duration.

16.—The third part of our explication is, the due consideration of the object of Christ's dominion, inquiring whose Lord he is,
and how ours. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality, of his power, under which all things are comprehended, as subjected to it. For he is Lord of all, saith St. Peter, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected whose subjection implieth not a contradiction. For he hath put all things under his feet: but when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. God only then excepted, whose original dominion is repugnant to the least subjection, all things are subject unto Christ, whether they be things in heaven or things on earth. In heaven he is far above all principalities and powers, and all the angels of God worship him; on earth all nations are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession. Thus Christ is certainly our Lord, because he is the Lord of all; and when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

17.—But in the midst of this universality of Christ's regal authority, it will be farther necessary to find some propriety of dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly our Lord. It is true, he made us, and not we ourselves, we are the work of his hands; but the lowest of his creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens and clotheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his original right of creation, and his continued right of preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this redemption, though a single word, we shall find a double title to a most just dominion, one of conquest, another of purchase.

1 Acts x. 36. 2 1 Cor. xv. 27. 3 Heb. i. 6. 4 Psalm ii. 8. 5 For the right understanding of this double title involved in the word "redemption," it will be necessary to take notice of the ways by which human dominion is acquired, and servitude introduced. "Servi aut nascentur, aut fiunt," saith the civilian, [Justinian.] Inst. lib. i. tit. 3; but in theology we say more, "Servi et nascentur, et fiunt." Man is born the servant of God his Maker; man is made the servant of his Redeemer. Two ways in general they observed by which they came to serve who were not born slaves. "Flunt aut jure gentium, id est, captivitate; aut jure civil, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad pretium participandum sese venundari passus est." Two ways then also there were by which dominion over these servants was acquired, by conquest or by purchase; and both these were always accounted just.
We were first servants of the enemy of God; for him we obeyed, and his servants we are whom we obey: when Christ through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and delivered us; He spoiled principalities and powers, and made a show of them openly, triumphing over them. But, contrary to the custom of triumphing conquerors, he did not sell, but buy us; because, while he saved us, he died for us, and that death was the price by which he purchased us; even so this dying victor gave us life: upon the cross, as his triumphant chariot, he shed that precious blood which bought us, and thereby became our Lord by right of redemption, both as to conquest and to purchase.

Beside, he hath not only bought us, but provideth for us; whatever we have, we receive from him as the master of the family; we hold of him all temporal and eternal blessings, which we enjoy in this, or hope for in another life. He is the Prince of life, and by him we live; he is the Lord of glory, and we are called by his gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord. Wherefore he hath us under his dominion, and becomes our Lord by right of promotion.

Lastly, men were not ancietly sold always by others, but sometimes by themselves; and whosoever of us truly believe in Christ, have given up our names unto him. In our baptismal vow we bind ourselves unto his service, that henceforth we will not serve sin; but yield ourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God: that, as we have yielded our members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity; even so we should yield our members servants to righteousness, unto holiness. And thus the same dominion is acknowledged by compact, and confirmed by covenant; and so Christ becomes our Lord by right of obligation.

18.—The necessity of believing and professing our faith in this part of the article appeareth, first, in the discovery of our condition; for by this we know that we are not our own, neither our persons, nor our actions. Know ye not, saith St. Paul, that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price. And ancient servitude, to which the scriptures relate, put the servants wholly in the possession of their master; so that their persons were as
properly his as the rest of his goods. And if we be so in respect of Christ, then may we not live to ourselves, but to him; for this the difference of service and freedom doth properly consist: 1 we cannot do our own wills, but the will of him whose we are. 2 Christ took upon him the form of a servant: and to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he telleth us, I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. 3 First, therefore, we must conclude with the apostle, reflecting upon Christ's dominion and our obligation, that none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord: or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. 4

Secondly, the same is necessary both to enforce and invite us to obedience: to enforce us, as he is the Lord, to invite us, as Christ the Lord. If we acknowledge ourselves to be his servants, we must bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. 5 He which therefore died, and rose and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death and resurrection efficacious to any but such as by their service acknowledge that dominion which he purchased. He, though he were a son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; And being made perfect, he is become the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. 6 Thus the consideration of the power invested in him, and the necessity of the service due unto him, should force us to obedience; while the consideration of him whom we are thus obliged to serve should allure and invite us. When God gave the law with fire and thunder, the affrighted Israelites desired to receive it from Moses, and upon that receipt promised obedience. Go thou near, said they to him, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us, and we

1 So Aristotle, Eth. lib. iv., Proo. 2. an. 2. 2 Tim. 4. 18. 3 The servant is not only "servus dominii," but simply "domini;" but the master is not simply "servi," but "dominii servi." 4 John vi. 39. 5 2 Cor. x. 5. 6 Heb. v. 8 9.
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will hear it and do it. If they interpreted it so great a favour to receive the law by the hands of Moses; if they made so ready and cheerful a promise of exact obedience unto the law so given; how should we be invited to the same promise, and a better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of Man, who are to give an account of our performance to the same man set down at the right hand of the Father? He first took our nature to become our brother, that with so near a relation he might be made our Lord. If then the patriarchs did cheerfully live in the land of Goshen subject to the power and command of Egypt, because that power was in the hand of Joseph their exalted brother; shall not we with all readiness of mind submit ourselves to the divine dominion now given to him who gave himself for us? Shall all the angels worship him, and all the archangels bow down before him, and shall not we be proud to join with them?

Thirdly, the belief of Christ's dominion is necessary for the regulation of all power, authority, and dominion on earth, both in respect of those which rule and in relation to those that obey. From hence the most absolute monarchs learn that the people which they rule are not their own, but the subjects of a greater prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this St. Paul doth ground his admonition to masters, Give unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven. God gave a power to the Israelites to make hired servants of their brethren, but not slaves, and gives this reason of the interdiction, For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondsmen. What tenderness then should be used towards those who are the servants of that Lord who redeemed them from a greater bondage, who bought them with a higher price? From hence those which are subject learn to obey the powers which are of human ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the same proportion and stand in the same relation to their governors with servants to their masters; and St. Paul hath given them this charge, Obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. Neither do we learn from hence only whom but also how to obey. For while we look upon one Lord in heaven, while we consider him as the Lord of Lords, we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to him, and so are always ready to obey, but in the Lord.

Lastly, this title of our Saviour is of necessary belief for our
comfort and encouragement. **For being Lord of all, he is able to dispose of all things for the benefit of those which serve him. He who commanded the unconstant winds and stilled the raging seas, he who multiplied the loaves and fishes and created wine with the word of his mouth, hath all creatures **now under exact obedience, and therefore none can want whom he undertaketh to provide for. **For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.**¹ Many are the enemies of those persons who dedicate themselves unto his service; but our enemies are his, and part of his dominion is therefore given him and to continue in him until all his enemies be made his footstool. Great is the power of the lusts of our flesh which war in our members; but his grace is sufficient for us and the power of that spirit by which he ruleth in us. Heavy are the afflictions which we are called to undergo for his sake: but if we suffer with him we shall reign together with him; and blessed be that dominion which makes us all kings, that he may be for ever Lord of Lords and King of Kings.

19.—After this explication, every Christian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the article, and express himself how he would be understood when he maketh this profession of his faith, I believe in **Christ our Lord.** For thereby we may and ought to intend thus much: I do assent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himself, that Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, is the true Jehovah, who hath that being which is originally and eternally of itself, and on which all other beings do essentially depend: that, by the right of emanation of all things from him, he hath an absolute, supreme, and universal dominion over all things, as God: that as the Son of man he is invested with all power in heaven and earth: partly economical, for the completing our redemption and the destruction of our enemies to continue to the end of all things, and then to be resigned to the Father; partly consequent unto the union or due unto the obedience of his passion, and so eternal, as belonging to that kingdom which shall have no end. And though he be thus Lord of all things by right of the first creation and constant preservation of them, yet is he more peculiarly the Lord of us who by faith are consecrated to his service; for through the work of our redemption he becomes our Lord both by the right of conquest and of purchase; and making us the sons of God and providing heavenly mansions for us, he acquires a farther right of promotion, which, considering the covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligat**on. And thus I believe in Christ our Lord.

¹ Rom. x. 13,
ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

CHAPTER I.

Which was conceived.

1. THESE words, as they now stand, clearly distinguish the conception of Jesus from his nativity, attributing the first to the Holy Ghost, the second to the blessed Virgin: whereas the ancient Creeds make no such distinction, but, without any particular express mention of the conception, had it only in this manner, who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; or of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; understanding by the word born not only the nativity, but also the conception and generation. This is very necessary to be observed, because otherwise the addition of a word will prove the diminution of the sense of the article. For they which speak only of the operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, and of the manner of his birth, leave out most of that which was anciently understood under that one term of being born of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary.

1 "Deum Judæi sic prædicant solum, ut negent Filium ejus; negent simul cum eo unum esse qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virginis." — Novat. "Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virginis." — Ruffin. In Symb. "Natus de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virginis." — S. August. Enchir. ad Laurent. cap. 34, 37, 38. As also the council of Francford in Sacro symbole. "Natus est per Spiritum Sanctum ex Virgine Maria." — S. August. De Fide et Symb. "Nonne de Spiritu Sancto et Virginis Maria Dei Filius Unicus natus est?" — S. August. De Prædest. Sanct. cap. 15. Et paulo post: "Quia natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virginis." "Quia natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virginis." — S. Leo, Epist. x., cap. 2. Maximus Taurin., Chrysol., Etherius Uxam., Author Symb. ad Caecilium. So also Venantius Fortunatus. From whence Fulgen- tius De Fide ad Petrum Diaconum: "Na- tum de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virginis, in Symbolo acceptum, et corde ad Justitiam credit, et ore ad salutem sancta ecclesia confitetur." "Item pradicanum est quo- modo Filius Dei incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria semper Virginis. — Capitol. Carol. 82. And Alcuinus, De Trin. lib. iii., cap. 1: "Dictur in Symbolo Catholicæ fidei, quod Christus de Spiritu Sancto et ex Maria Virginis sit natus." In the ancient ms. transcribed by the learned archbishop of Armagh, Τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου. So Paulus Samosatensis in his fifth proposition: Τηρούσαν ὁ γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου. These words, omitted in the Nicene Creed, were put in by the council of Constantinople, upon the occasion of the Apollinarian heresy, as was observed by Diogenes, bishop of Cyzicus, in the council of Chalcedon: Οἱ γὰρ ἄγιοι πατέρες οἱ μετα ταύτα, τὸ ἐσἀρκωσθήνα δὲ εἶπον οἱ ἄγιοι ἐν Νικαια πατέρες, ἐσαρκωσθοι εἰς τούτοις. Ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου. In the several expositions among the sermons De Tempore, falsely attributed to St. Augustine: "Quia conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Virginis Maria." So Eusebius Gallicanus, Homil. de Symbolo. And from thence it hath so continued, as we now read it, "Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary."
2.—That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to express the full intent and to comprehend the utmost signification of this article, we shall consider three persons mentioned, so far as they are concerned in it. The first is he who was conceived and born; the second, he by whose energy or operation he was conceived; the third, she who did conceive and bear him.

3.—For the first, the relative in the front of this carries us clearly back unto the former article, and tells us that he which was thus conceived and born was Jesus Christ, the only Son of God. And being we have already demonstrated that this only Son is therefore called so, because he was begotten by the Father from all eternity, and so of the same substance with him, it followeth that this article at the first beginning, or by virtue of its connexion, can import no less than this most certain but miraculous truth, that he which was begotten by the Father before all worlds was now in the fulness of time conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. Again, being by the conception and birth is to be understood whatsoever was done toward the production of the human nature of our Saviour, therefore the same relative considered with the words which follow it can speak no less than the incarnation of that person. And thus even in the entry of the article we meet with the incarnation of the Son of God,—that great mystery wrapt up in that short sentence of St. John, The word was made flesh.2

4.—Indeed the pronoun hath relation not only unto this but to the following articles, which have their necessary connexion with and foundation in this third: for he who was conceived and born, and so made man, did in that human nature suffer, die, and rise again. Now when we say this was the Word, and that Word was God, being whosoever is God cannot cease to be so, it must necessarily follow that he was made man by joining the human nature with the divine. But then we must take heed lest we conceive, because the divine nature belongeth to the Father, to which the human is conjoined, that therefore the Father should be incarnate, or conceived and born. For as certainly as the Son was crucified, and the Son alone, so certainly the same Son was incarnate, and that Son alone. Although the human nature was conjoined with the divinity, which is the nature common to the Father and the Son; yet was that union made only in the person of the Son. Which doctrine is to be observed against the heresy of the Patripassians,3 which was both very ancient and far diffused,

1 "Huc, quem dudum de Patre natum ineffabiliter didicisti, nunc a Spiritu Sancto templum fabricatum intra secretas ateri virginalis intellige."—Ruffin. 2 John 1.14. 3 The heresy of the Patripassians seems only to have relation to the suffering of Christ.
making the Father to be incarnate, and becoming man to be crucified. But this very Creed was always thought to be a sufficient confirmation of that fond opinion, in that the incarnation is

Saviour, because the word signifies no more than "the passion of the Father." But it is founded in an error concerning the incarnation, it being out of question that he which was made man did suffer. Epiphanius observes, Noetus was the first which taught this heresy; who lived one hundred and thirty years before him, more or less; and when he was questioned for it, he denied it, dia to muevea p ro avto v e w e e e ta w t r i t h n p i k r a v. — Heret. IV. § 1. But certainly this heresy was ancilenter than Noetus; for the Patripassians are named by St. Cyprian, Epist. 73; and Tertullian, his master, chargeth it upo Praxaeas: "Duo negotia diaboli Romae procuravit: prophetiam expulit, et heresem intulit; paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit." — Adv. Praex. cap. 1. And expressing the isurdity of that opinion: "Itaque post temporum Pater natus et Pater passus, ipse Deus Dominus Omnipotens Jesus Christus predicatur." — Cap. 2. And, De Praex. Adv. Heret.: "Post hos omnes etiam Praexaeas quidam heresem introdixit, quam Victorius corrobore curavit. Hic Deum Patrem Omnipotentem Jesum Christum esse dicit, hunc crucifixum passumque contendit et mortuum; praeda seipsum sibi sedere ad dextram suam, cum profana et sacrilega temeritate proponit." — Cap. 53. After Praxaeas, Noetus taught the same: "ExColl. vsae legente tug Patrera perevorne, says Epiphanius: and being questioned for it, he answered, T i y or k o x o v e x o v o v i a ; " Ενα Θεω δοξαζω, ένα εψισταμαι, οι σων άλλο πλην αυτού γεννηθητα, πεποθητα αποθανων, He thought the Father and the Son to be the same person, and therefore, if the Son, the Father to be incarnate. Υποπατωρ την Χριστον ειδωκε, τον αυτον ευω Πατρα και Πατρο Πνευμα.—S. Evrj. Anaceth. After the Noetians followed the Sabellians. So Philastrius: "Sabellius discipulus ejus, qui similidudinem su on doctoris idem se scenarios, unde et Sabelliane postea sunt appellata, qui et Patripassiani, et Praexaeas a Praxae, et Hermogenians ab Hermogenes, qui fuerunt in Africa, qui et ista sentientes abjecti sunt ad ecclesiam catholica." So St. Augustin: "Sabelliani dicti sunt quidam heretici, qui vocantur et Patripassiani, qui dicunt ipsum Patrem passum esse." —Tract. 36 in Johan. This, I confess, is denied by Epiphanius, who acknowledged Sabellius to have followed Noetus in many things, but not in the incarnation or passion of the Father. Sandelliani ei t a δες άνωνυμος (1. αυνυμος, id est, Noe- tianos, vel a n o u , id est, Noet, as St. Augustin, Novato) doxeoteve para tauto μαξων λεγεται γαρ μη πεποθηναι την Πα- τηα. This St. Augustin wonders very much et in Epiphanius: "Sabelliani, inquit, similia Noeto dogmatizantes, prater hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum. Quomodo de Sabelliani intelligi potest, cum sic inno- muerint dicere Patrem passum, ut Patripas- siani quam Sabelliani sepius nuncupatur?" —S. August. De Heres. 41. Indeed the Latin fathers generally call the Sabellians Patripassians; and not only so, but Theodoret doth so describe them as professing one person, en me tη τη παλαιον, φως Πατηρ γο- μοδιεραι, εν δε τη καιρη, φως Πατηρ εναρδο- ρησαι.—Lib. II. cap. 9. After the Sabellians succeeded in the same heresy the Pis- cillanists, as appeareth by pope Leo, who shows they taught but one person of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: "Quod blaspheme- genue descunto Sabellinio sumpserent, cujus discipuli etiam Patripassiani merito nuncupatur: quia si ipse est Filius qui et Pater, crux Filii Patris est passio, et quic- quid in forma superb Filii Patri nubiendo sustinuit, totum in se Pater ipse suscepit." —Epist. xcvili. cap. 1. Thus the Patripas- sian heresy, beginning from Praxaeas and Hermogenes, was continued by Noetus, Sa- bellius, and Priscillianus, and mingled with all their several heresies, the sum and sub- stance of which is thus well set down by Victorinus: "Patripassiani Deum solum esse dicunt quem nos Patrem dicimus; ipsum solum existentem et Effectorem omnium, et venisse non solum in mundum, sed et in carnem, et alla omnia que nos Filium facies dicimus." 1

1 It appeareth plainly that Tertullian confuted Praxaeas, by reducing him to these words of the Creed. For when he had first declared, "Nos unicum quidem Deum cre- dimus," (which was the objection of Prax- eas) "sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam oikovnoicMic dicimus, ut Unici Dei sit et Filius Sermo ipsius, qui ej ipso processerit, per quum omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil:" then he subjoyneth, "Hunc mis- sum a Patre in Virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, Filium Hominis et Fil- ium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christianum. Hunc passuum, hunc mortuum et sepulturn secludum scrupulas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in ecclesiis resurrection, sedem ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vives et mort- tuos." And that we may be assured that he used these words out of the Creed, it follow- eth, "Hanc REGULAM ab initio evangelii de- ecruisse," &c. Adv. Praex. cap. 2. This is yet farther evident out of Epiphanius, who telis us the eastern doctors confuted Noetus in the same manner, by reducing him to the words of the Creed: "Ενα Θεω δοξαζω και αυτοι, (just as Tertullian: "Nos unicum quidem Deum creditamus," Allo ως εδειχ- ειακω δοξαζω και εαυ Χριστου θεον, πα- θοντα καθως ηπαθειν, ἀποθονοντα καθως άπι-
Which was Conceived.

not subjoined to the first but to the second article: we do not say I believe in God the Father Almighty, which was conceived, but in his only Son our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.

5.—First, then, we believe that he which was made flesh was the Word, that he which took upon him the nature of man was not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any other person but the only-begotten Son. And when we say that person was conceived and born, we declare he was made really and truly man, of the same human nature which is in all other men who by the ordinary way of generation are conceived and born. For the Mediator between God and man is the man Christ Jesus:1 That since by man came death, by man also should come the resurrection of the dead.2 As sure then as the first Adam and we who are redeemed are men, so certainly is the second Adam and our Mediator man. He is therefore frequently called the Son of man, and in that nature he was always promised. First to Eve, as her seed, and consequently her son.3 Then to Abraham, In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;4 and that seed is Christ,5 and so the son of Abraham. Next to David, as his son to sit upon his throne;6 and so he is made of the seed of David according to the flesh,7 the son of David, the son of Abraham,8 and consequently of the same nature with David and with Abraham. And as he was their son, so are we his brethren, as descending from the same Father Adam; and therefore it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren. For he laid not hold on the angels, but on the seed of Abraham,9 and so became not an angel, but a man.

6.—As then man consisteth of two different parts, body and soul, so doth Christ: he assumed a body, at his conception, of the blessed Virgin. Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.10 The verity of his body stands upon the truth of his nativity,11 and the actions and passions of his life show the nature of his flesh.

Constat autem apud nos additos, hæreses caussa Sabellii, illius profecto quæ a nostris Patrispassiana appellatur, id est, que Patrem ipsum vel ex Virgine natum dicit, et visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne. Ut ergo excluderetur tales impliebas de Patre, videntur hæ addidisse majores, et Invisibii Patrem atque Impossibilem dixisse. Constat enim Filium, non Patrem, in carne et ex carne natum, et ex nativitate carnis Filium visibilem et passibilem factum.

1 1 Tim. ii. 5. 2 1 Cor. xv. 21.
3 Gen. iii. 15. 4 Gen. xxii. 18.
5 Gal. iii. 16. 6 2 Sam. vii. 12 16.
7 Rom. i. 3. 8 Matt. i. 1.
11 "Marcion, ut carmen Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem; aut, ut nativita-
7.—He was first born with a body which was prepared for him of the same appearance with those of other infants; he grew up by degrees, and was so far from being sustained without the accustomed nutrition of our bodies, that he was observed even by his enemies to come eating and drinking; and when he did not so he suffered hunger and thirst. Those ploughers never doubted of the true nature of his flesh who ploughed upon his back and made long furrors. The thorns which pricked his sacred temples, the nails which penetrated through his hands and feet, the spear which pierced his sacred side, give sufficient testimony of the natural tenderness and frailty of his flesh. And lest his fasting forty days together; lest his walking on the waters and traversing the seas; lest his sudden standing in the midst of his disciples when the doors were shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh, he confirmed first his own disciples, *Feel and see, that a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me to have.* As therefore, we believe the coming of Christ, so must we confess him to have come in the verity of our human nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it always necessary to acknowledge him: *For every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is not of God.* This spirit appeared early in opposition to the apostolical doctrine; and Christ, who is both God and man, was as soon denied to be man as God. *Simon Magus,* the arch-heretic, first began, and many after followed him.

8.—And certainly, if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without which he could not be man. *For Jesus increased in wisdom and stature,* one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Wisdom belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, increase: he then whose knowledge did...
improve together with his years must have a subject proper for it, which was no other than a human soul. This was the subject of his finite understanding and directed will, distinct from the will of his Father, and consequently of his divine nature, as appeareth by that known submission, Not my will, but thine, be done. This was the subject of those affections and passions which so manifestly appeared in him; nor spake he any other than a proper language when, before his suffering, he said, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. This was it which on the cross, before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father, teaching us in whose hands the souls of the departed are: For when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit; and having said thus, he gave up the ghost. And as his death was nothing else but the separation of the soul from his body, so the life of Christ as man did consist in the conjunction and vital union of that soul with the body: so that he which was perfect God, was also perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. Which is to be observed and asserted against the ancient heretics, who taught that Christ assumed human flesh, but that the Word or his divinity was unto that body in the place of an informing soul.

9.—Thus the whole perfect and complete nature of man was

1 Luke xxii. 42. 2 Matt. xxvi. 83. 3 Luke xxii. 46. 4 Of this kind two several sects were most remarkable, the Arians and the Apollinarists. Arian taught that Christ had nothing of man but the flesh, and with that the Word was joined. "Arios de se prera mouw pros apo-

kouvny tis Theoctitos omologei: anu de toutou eiswv en hmin an'}
assumed by the Word, by him who was conceived and born of a woman, and so made a man. And being the divine nature which he had before could never cease to be what before it was, nor ever become what before it was not; therefore he who was God before by the divine nature which he had, was in this incarnation made man by that human nature which he then assumed, and so really and truly was both God and man. And thus this third article, from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no less than the two natures really distinct in Christ incarnate.

10.—For if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by the conversion and transsubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these ways can consist with the person of our Saviour, or the office of our Mediator. For if we should conceive such a mixtion and confusion of substances as to make an union of natures, we should be so far from acknowledging him to be both God and man, that thereby we should profess him to be neither God nor man, but a person of a nature as different from both, as all mixed bodies are distinct from each element which concurs unto their composition. Besides, we know there were in Christ the affections proper to the nature of man, and all those infirmities which belong to us, and cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the divine was but a part. Nor could our humanity be so commixed or confounded with the divinity of our Saviour, but that the Father had been made man as much as the Son, because the divine nature is the same both of the Father and the Son. Nor ought we to have so low an esteem of that infinite and independent being as to think it so commixed with, or immersed in, the creature.

11.—Again, as the confusion so the conversion of natures is impossible. For, first, we cannot with the least show of probability conceive the divine nature of Christ to be transsubstantiate into the human nature, as those whom they call Flandrian Anabaptists in the Low-Countries at this day maintain. There is a plain repugnancy even in the supposition; for the nature of man


must be made, the nature of God cannot be made, and consequently cannot become the nature of man. The immaterial, invisible, and immortal Godhead cannot be divided into a spiritual and incorruptible soul, and a carnal and corruptible body, of which two humanity consisteth. There is no other deity of the Father than of the Son, and therefore if this was converted into that humanity, then was the Father also that man, and grew in knowledge, suffered, and died. We must not, therefore, so far stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, The Word was made flesh, as to destroy the propriety both of the Word and of the flesh.

Secondly, we must not, on the contrary, invent a conversion of the human nature into the divine, as the Eutychians of old did fancy. For sure the incarnation could not at first consist in such a conversion, it being unimaginable how that which had no being should be made by being turned into something else. Therefore the humanity of Christ could not at the first be made by being the divinity of the Word, Nor is the incarnation so preposterously expressed, as if the flesh were made the Word, but that the Word was made flesh. And if the manhood were not in the first act of incarnation converted into the divine nature, as we see it could not be, then is there no pretence of any time or manner in or by which it was afterward so transsubstantiated. Vain, therefore, was that old conceit of Eutyches, who thought the union to be made so in the natures, that the humanity was absorbed and wholly turned into the divinity, so that by that transsubstantiation the human nature had no longer being. And well did the ancient

1 In that proposition, 'Ο Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, there hath been strange force used by men of contrary judgments, and for contrary ends, as to the word ἐγένετο: the Socinians endeavouring to prove it can have no other sense than simply fault, 'The Word was flesh,' the Flandrian Anabaptists stretching it to the highest sense of factum est, 'The Word was made flesh.' It is confessed that the verb γινεσθαι in the use of the Greek language is capable of either interpretation: it is also acknowledged that the most ancient interpreters were divided in their renditions. For the Syriac rendered it thus: ET VERBUM CARO FUIT; the ancient Latin, ET VERBUM CARO FACTUM EST. It cannot be denied but in the scriptures it hath been used indifferently in either sense. And the same old Vulgar translation in some places renders it as the Syriac doth here: Matt. x. 16: Γίνεσθε σῶν φίλων μοι ὡς οἱ δόξεις, Estolet ergo prudentes sicut serpentias; and, 25: Αρκετον τῳ μαθητῇ ἵνα γίνηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αυτοῦ, Suscipite discepulorum ut sicut magister ejus. From whence it is evident that they placed not the force in the signification of the word γινεσθαι, but in the circumstance of the matter in which it was used. Howsoever, neither of these interpretations proves either of these opinions. For if it be acknowledged that the Word was flesh; and it hath been already proved and presupposed by St. John in his precedent discourse, that the Word had a former being antecedent to his being flesh; it followeth, that He which was before the Word, and was not flesh, if after he were flesh, must be made such. And so the Socinian observation falls. Again: if He which was made flesh was the Word, and after he was made such was still the Word, as certainly he was, and is still the same; then his being made or becoming flesh can no way evacuat that nature in which he did before subsist. And so the Flandrian interpretation is of no validity. John i. 14.

2 This was the proper opinion of Eutyches, as appeareth by his own confession in the council of Chalcedon: Ομολογεῖ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγεννησθαι τὸν Κυρίον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐννόμου, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐννοιαν μιᾶν φύσιν δομ
Fathers, who opposed this heresy, make use of the sacramenta, union between the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, and thereby showed that the human nature of Christ is no more really converted into the divinity, and so ceaseth to be the human nature, than the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and blood, and thereby ceaseth to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable that the church in those days understood no such doctrine as that of transubstantiation.  

Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis de ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profiteatur, celebrans, et ut lemnus, ut sicut in hande spectavit, in Divinam, transcendant, Sancto Spiritu perfecte, substantiam, permanentes tamen in suo proprieate naturae; sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficiendis virtutemque veraciter representant, ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum verumque, permanere demonstrat.  

In which words it is plain he affirms the union of the human nature of Christ to be the principal mystery, the representation of that mystery to be in the sacrament of the eucharist: he concludes from hence, that as in the representation the substance of the bread and wine remaineth in the propriety of their own nature, so the human nature of Christ in the greater mystery doth still remain. In the margin of this place in the Bibliotheca Patrum there is printed Caude, as if there could be any danger in observing the sense of the fathers, when they speak so expressly and considerately. In the same manner we find a dispute between a heretic and a catholic in the second Dialogue of Theodoret, where Eranistes, as an heretic, asks Orthodoxus, by what names he calls the bread and wine after consecration; who answers, “The body and blood of Christ;” from whence Eranistes argues, Οστερ τοιν προ της συμβολα του Δεσποτικου σωματος το και αιματος αλλα μεν εισι προ της ιερατικης επεκλησιον μετα δε γε της έπικλησιον μεταβαλλεται και έτερα γινεται ουτο το δεσποτικον σωμα μετα της αναλυσι της συμβολα ουσιαν μεταβλησι την θειαν. “As the symbols of the body and blood of Christ are one thing before consecration, and after that change their name, and become another; so the body of Christ after his ascension is changed into the Divine substance.” To this Orthodoxus answers, Εκδεις αις ύψοντες ἀρκναιν, “You are taken in your own nets.” Oude γαρ μετα του αιματος τα μυστικα συμβολα της οικειας εξισουσιται φουσκος, μενε γαρ επι της προτερας ουσιας, και του σχηματος, και του ειδους και υπατα εστι και απατη, οια και προτεραν ην. “The bread and wine even after consecration leave not their own nature, but remain in their former substance, shape, and form.” In the same manner, Kαι εκείνου το σωμα τι
12.—Being then he which is conceived was the only Son of God, and that only Son begotten of the substance of the Father, and so always subsisted in the divine nature; being by the same conception he was made truly man, and consequently assumed an human nature; being these two natures cannot be made one either by commixtion or conversion, and yet there can be but one Christ subsisting in them both, because that only Son was he which is conceived and born; it followeth that the union which was not made in the nature was made in the person of the Word; that is, it was not so made, that out of both natures one only should result, but only so that to one person no other should be added.

13.—Nor is this union only a scholastic speculation, but a certain and necessary truth, without which we cannot have one Christ, but two Christs, one Mediator, but two Mediators; without which we cannot join the second article of our Creed with the third, making them equally belong to the same person; without which we cannot interpret the sacred scriptures, or understand the history of our Saviour. For certainly he which was before Abraham was in the days of Herod born of a woman; he which preached in the days of Noah began to preach in the reign of Tiberius, being at that time about thirty years of age; he was demonstrated the Son of God with power who was the seed of David according to the flesh; he who died on the cross raised him from the dead who died so, being put to death through the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit; 1 he was of the fathers according to the flesh who was God over all blessed for ever. 2 Being these and the like actions and affections cannot come from the same nature, and yet must be attributed to the same person; as we must acknowledge a diversity of natures united, so must we confess the identity of the person in whom they are conjoined, against the ancient heresy of the Nestorians, condemned in the council of Ephesus. 3

1 1 Peter iii. 18. 2 Rom. iv. 5. 3 This heresy doth most formally contra-
CHAPTER II.

By the Holy Ghost.

1.—HAVING thus dispatched the consideration of the first person concerned in this article, and the actions contained in it so far as distinctly from the rest they belong to him, we descend unto the other two concerned in the same; and first to him whose operation did precede in the conception, the Holy Ghost. Which second part some may think to require a threefold consideration: first, of the conception; secondly, of the person; thirdly, of the operation. But for the person or existence of the Holy Ghost, that is here only mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another article, where it is propounded directly. And for the conception itself, that belongeth not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the act cannot be predicated. For though Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive him, but said unto the Virgin, Thou shalt

dict these words of the Creed, because it immediately denies this truth, that the eternal Son of God was conceived and born. And in vain did Nestorius seek not only to avoid it in the Nicene Creed, but to make use of the words of the Creed even against the unity of the person of Christ. St. Cyril had well objected the series, order, and consequence of that confession: "Εφ' ἡ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη σύνοδος, αυτῶν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρός κατὰ φυσιν Υἱὸν Μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Ἀληθινὸν Θεοῦ 'Αληθινὸν, τὸ Φως τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατός, τὸν Δόθ' οὖ τὰ δύο πεποίηκεν ὁ Πατήρ, κατελθεῖν, σαρκῳδῆναι τε καὶ ενανθρωπῆς, παθεῖν, ἀναστήσαι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθεῖν εἰς οἰκουμένην. The strength of this objection lies in this, that Christ, the only-begotten Son, "begotten of the Father before all worlds," was incarnate. The answer of Nestorius was in this manner: Πιστεύομεν αὐτῶν τοῦ Κύριου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν ἀυτοῦ τῶν Μονογενῶν σκόπησαν ὑπὸς Ἰησοῦν, Χριστόν, καὶ Μονογενῆς, καὶ Υἱοῦ, γρηγοροῦ τῆς πατέρας ἀληθοῦς, ἀληθοῦς, ἀληθοῦς, ἀληθοῦς, ἀληθοῦς τῆς ἰδιοτῆτος, τῆς πατροτητοῦ, τῆς πατρότητος, τῆς ἀναστάσεως; ἐν παρὰ κεραυνοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ πατέρας. And the strength, or rather the weakness, thereof is this: That first the council placed the name "Jesus," "Christ," and "the only-begotten Son," names common to the Divinity and humanity of Christ; and then upon them built the doctrine of his incarnation. Whereas it is evident that, supposing "the Only-begotten" a term common to the humanity and Divinity, yet the council clearly expounds it of the eternal generation; adding immediately, "Begotten of his Father before all worlds;" neither is there any word between that exposition and the incarnation, but such as speak wholly of Christ as God. Therefore that only-begotten Son, who was "begotten of his Father before all worlds," descended from heaven, and was incarnate. Thus St. Cyril in his second Epistle to Nestorius, and Nestorius in his second to him. Which mistake of his seems yet more strange to me, when I consider in the same Epistle of Nestorius that fundamental truth asserted, which of itself sufficiently, may, fully, confines his heresy: for he acknowledged the name of "Christ" to be ἀπαθοῦς καὶ παθητὴς φυσιάς ἐν μοναδικῇ προσωπῇ προστηγμονὶ συμμετικῇ, and consequently Christ himself to be a single person in a double nature, passible and impassible: which once granted, it evidently followeth, that he which was born from eternity was also born in time, for by those several nativities he had those several natures; that he which was impassible as God, might and did suffer as man, because the same person was of an impassible and a passible nature; impassible as God, passible as man. Wherefore by that which Nestorius hath confessed, and notwithstanding that which he hath objected, it is evident out of the Nicene Creed, that the Son of God, "begotten of his Father before all worlds," was incarnate and made man; and as evident out of the Apostles' Creed, especially expounded by the Nicene, that the same only-begotten Son was "conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary."
conceive. There remaineth, therefore, nothing proper and peculiar to this second part but that operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, whereby the Virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be conceived by him.

2.—Now when we say the conception of our Saviour was wrought by the operation of the Spirit, it will be necessary to observe, first, what is excluded by that attribution to the Spirit; secondly, what is included in that operation of the Spirit.

3.—For the first of these, we may take notice in the salutation of the angel, when he told the blessed Virgin she should conceive and bring forth a son, she said, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? By which words she excluded first all men, and then herself: all men, by that assertion, I know not a man; herself, by the question, How shall this be, seeing it is so? First, our Melchizedek had no father on earth, in general; not any man in particular, not Joseph. It is true his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph; but it is as true before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. We read in St. Luke that the parents brought up the child Jesus into the Temple: but these parents were not the father and the mother, but, as it followeth, Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him. It is true Philip calleth him Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph; and, which is more, his mother said unto him, Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing: but this must be only the reputed father of Christ, he being only, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son of Eli. Whence they must needs appear without all excuse who therefore affirm our Saviour to have been the proper son of Joseph, because the genealogy belongs to him; whereas in that very place where the genealogy begins Joseph is called the supposed father. How can it then, therefore, be necessary Christ should be the true son of Joseph, that he may be known to be the son of David, when in the same place where it is proved that Joseph came from David it is denied that Christ came from Joseph? And that not only in St. Luke, where Joseph begins, but also in St. Matthew, where he ends the genealogy. Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ. Howsoever then the genealogies are described, whether one belong to Joseph, the other to Mary or both to Joseph, it is from other parts of the scriptures infallibly certain not only that Christ descended lineally from David according to the flesh, but also that

1 Luke i. 31. 2 Luke i. 34. 3 Luke ii. 27. 4 Luke ii. 33. 5 Luke ii. 48. 6 Luke iii. 23. 7 Indeed, in our translation, 'whom may relate to both, as well as one; and to Joseph, as well as Mary; but in the original it evidently belongs to Mary; Τον Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἀνδρα Μαρίας, εἶ ὁ γενεαλογίας. Matt. i. 16.
the same Christ was begotten of the Virgin Mary, and not by Joseph.

4.—Secondly, as the blessed Virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly Joseph, to whom she was then espoused, by her assertion, so did she exclude herself by the manner of the question, showing that of herself she could not cause any such conception. Although she may be thought the root of Jesse, yet could she not germinate of herself; though Eve were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the divine benediction which was given to both together: For God blessed them, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. Though Christ was promised as the seed of the woman, yet we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive him. When the Virgin thinks it impossible she should conceive because she knew not a man, at the same time she confesseth it otherwise as impossible; and the angel acknowledgeth as much in the satisfaction of his answer, For with God nothing shall be impossible. God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while Mary, Joseph, and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be excluded from that operation.

5.—But what is included in the conception by the Holy Ghost, or how his operation is to be distinguished from the conception of the Virgin, is not so easily determined. The words by which it is expressed in scripture are very general: First, as they are delivered by way of promise, prediction, or satisfaction to Mary; The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: secondly, as they suppose the conception already past, When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost; and give satisfaction unto Joseph, Fear not to take to thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. Now being the expressions in the scriptures are so general, that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot precisely be distinguished from the concurrence of the Virgin; much less shall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late distinction made in this article, conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin; because it is certain that the same Virgin also conceived him according to the prophecy, Thou shalt conceive and bear a son: and therefore, notwithstanding that distinction, the difficulty still remains, how he was conceived by the Spirit, how by the Virgin. Neither will any difference of prepositions be sufficient rightly to distinguish these

operations. Wherefore there is no other way to bound or determine the action of the Holy Ghost but by that concurrence of the Virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For if she were truly the mother of Christ (as certainly she was, and we shall hereafter prove), then is there no reason to deny to her in respect of him whatsoever is given to other mothers in relation to the fruit of their womb, and consequently no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit than what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother. When the scripture speaketh of regeneration, or the second birth, it denieth all which belongeth to natural procreation, describing the sons of God as begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God: And in the incarnation of our Saviour we remove all will or lust of the

1 As, "Concupisces a Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine." St. Augustin, indeed, hath delivered a distinction between de and ex, after this manner, speaking to those words of the apostle: "Quoniam ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso, sunt omnia." "Et ipso non hoc significat quod de ipso. Quod enim de ipso est, potest dici ex ipso; non autem omne quod ex ipso est, recte dicitur de ipso. Ex ipso enim caelem et terram, quia ipso fecit ex; non autem de ipso, quia non de substantiali sua. Sicut aliquid homo si gignit filium, et fact domum, ex ipso filius, ex ipso domus; sed filius de ipso, sicut domus de terrae et ligno." — De Nat. Boni aed. Monarch. cap. 27. This distinction, having no foundation in the Latin tongue, is ill made use of for the illustration of this Article, because in the Greek language of the Testament there is no such diversity of prepositions; for as we read of Mary, 'Ex izon 71 egenh 7o 7iswos, so also of the Holy Ghost, 'Evebde 7w 7a 7astri 3houna ex pnevmatou 'Agou, and, To 7o 7a7i 7e0n7h7en ex pnevmatos ettw 'Agou. It is therefore said as well ex pnevmatos, as ex Mariais. Again: the Vulgar observeth no such difference, as rendering for the one, De quia natius est Jesus, and for the other, In utero habens de Spiritu Sancto. Correspondently in the Greek Creeds, Σαλαβθαιντα ex pneumatos, γεννηθαιντα ex Mariais, or, as in the Nicene, εκ Πνευματος και Μαριας. And the Latin not only de Spirituo Sancto ex Maria Virgine, but sometimes de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine, and de Maria Virgine. Chrysologus and St. Augustin often De Trinitate. Wherefore in vain have the Schools first accepted of St. Augustin's distinction, and then applied it to Christ's conception; first taking the preposition de to signify no less than a procession from the substance of the cause, and then acknowledge Christ so begotten of the Holy Ghost, because the eternal Son, who was so begotten, was of the same substance with the Holy Ghost. Th's Thomas Aqui-
flesh, we deny all will of man concurring; but as the bloody in
the language of the Hebrews did signify that substance of which
the flesh was formed in the womb, so we acknowledge in the gene-
ration of Jesus Christ that he was made of the substance of his
mother.

6.—But as he was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so
was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose
essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did
not beget him by any communication of his essence, therefore he
is not the father of him, though he were conceived by him. And
if at any time I have said Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost
of the Virgin Mary, if the ancients speak as if he generated the
Son, it is not so to be understood, as if the Spirit did perform any
proper act of generation, such as is the foundation of paternity.

7.—Again, as the Holy Ghost did not frame the human nature
of Christ out of his own substance, so must we not believe that he
formed any part of his flesh of any other substance than of the
Virgin. For certainly he was of the fathers according to the flesh,
and was as to that truly and totally the son of David and of
Abraham. The Socinians, who will acknowledge no other way
before Christ’s conception by which he could be the only-begotten
Son of God, have been forced to invent a strange conjunction in
the nature of Christ: one part received from the Virgin, and so
consequently from David and from Abraham, from whom that
Virgin did descend: another framed by the Spirit, and conjoined

1 As Chrysologus, Serm. 57: “Ubi Spiritus

genarat, Virgo parturit, totum Divinum
genitur, nihil humanum.” Et Serm. 62: “Su-
				

ruent mundo solus a sperit quid est, quod

Spiritus generat, Virgo concipit, Virgo parit.”

2 “Deus ipsemet ad sanguinem Maria

addidit aliam materiam, ex quibis deinde

Christus conceptus est et natus est.” — Smal-

crus, De vero et naturali Dei Filio, cap. 2.

“Verum manet generationem et hanc dii

posse, quatenus in Deum ea cadere potest,

si ad sanguinem Mariae addita sit ex parte

Dei materia, ex qua cum sanguine Maria

 Juncta natus sit Christus.” — Ibid. cap. 3.

What this was, thus added to the substance of the Virgin, ne elsewhere explains: “Nos

Dei virtutem in Virginis utrum alium sub-

stantiam creatam vel immissae aut ibi
cresisse affirmamus, ex qua, juncto eo quod

ex ipsius Virginis substantia accessit, versus

homo generatus fuit.” This he doth not

only without any authority affirm, but

ground upon it the Sonship of Christ. For

so it follows: “Alias enim homo ille Dei

Filiius a conceptione et nativitate propria

non fetus.” And again: “Necesse est

magna fuit ut Christus ab initio vitae sine

esse Di Filiius, qualis futurus non fetus,

filius Dei virtute aliquid creatum fuisset,

quod ad constitendum Christi corpus una

cum Mariae sanguine concurririt.” Thus

while they deny the eternal generation of

the Son, they establish a temporal in such a

manner as is not consonant with that word

which they pretend wholly to follow, and

have made a body of Christ partly descend-

ing from the Father, partly not; and whereas

as man he is like to us in all things, sin

only excepted, they have invented a body,

partly like ours, partly not, and so in no

part totally like. Indeed some of the an-
cients did speak so as to make the Holy

Ghost the semen Dei; as Tertullian: “Ergo

ut Filiius ex Patris Dei semen, id est,

Spiritum, ut esset hominis Filiius, et ego

semel et semper ex hominis carne sumendum

sine viri semen. Vacabat enim viri semen apud

habentem Dei semen.” — De Carne Christi,

cap. 18. And St. Hilary calls it, “semen-

tivm ineuntis Spiritus efficaciam.” — De

Trin. lib. II. cap. 26. But in this they only

understand the operation of the Spirit, loco

semenis. And whosoever speak of any pro-

per semen, they abhorred, as appears by the

191st Sermon De Tempore: “Nec, ut qui-
dam socerarissimi opinionis, Spiritum Sanctu-
num dicimus pro semen fuisse, sed potentia

et virtute Creatoris operatum.” I know not
with it; by the one part of which humanity he was the son of man, as by the other part he was the Son of God.

8.—The belief of this is necessary to prevent all fear or suspicion of spot in this Lamb, of sin in this Jesus. Whatevsoever our original corruption is, howsoever displeasing unto God, we may be from hence assured there was none in him, in whom alone God hath declared himself to be well pleased. Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? saith Job; a clean and undefiled Redeemer out of an unclean and defiled nature? He whose name is Holiness, whose operation is to sanctify, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like unto us in all things, as born of a woman; sin only excepted, as conceived by the Holy Ghost. This original and total sanctification of the human nature was first necessary to fit it for the personal union with the Word, who, out of his infinite love, humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time, out of his infinite purity, could not defile himself by becoming sinful flesh. Secondly, the same sanctification was as necessary in respect of the end for which he was made man, the redemption of mankind; that as the first Adam was the fountain of our impurity, 1 so the second Adam should also be the pure fountain of our righteousness. God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh; 2 which he could not have condemned had he been sent in sinful flesh. The Father made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him; 3 which we could not have been made in him, but that he did no sin, and knew no sin. For whosoever is sinful wanteth a Redeemer; and he could have redeemed none who stood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ; therefore precious, because of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. 4 Our atonement can be made by no other high-priest than by him who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. 5 We cannot know that he was manifested to take away our sins, 6 except we also know that in him is no sin. 7 Wherefore, being it is so necessary to believe the original holiness of our human nature in the person

---

1. Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum in loco et habitu tanta felicitatis admissionem est, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ita dixerim, radicaliter, totum genus humanum damaretur, non solvitur ac diluitur, nisi per unum Mediatorum Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, qui solus potuit ita nasci, ut ei opus non esset renasci." —S. AUGUST. Enchir. cap. 48.

2. Rom. viii. 3.

3. 2 Cor. v. 21.

4. 1 Peter ii. 22.

5. 1 Peter i. 19.


7. "In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit afferre peccatum. Nam si esset in illis peccatum, afferendum esset illis, non ipse afferret." —S. AUGUST. i. John iii. 5.
of our Saviour, it is as necessary to acknowledge that way by which we may be fully assured of that sanctity, his conception by the Holy Ghost.

9.—Again, it hath been observed,¹ that by this manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedom of the grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is he also called the gift of God; and therefore the human nature in its first original,² without any precedent merit, was formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to the Word, so that the grace was coexistent and in a manner connatural with it. The mystery of the incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy, and goodness of God. Through the tender mercy of our God the day-spring from on high hath visited us.³ In this the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared.⁴ And though these and such other scriptures speak properly of the love and mercy of God to man alone, offered unto him in the incarnation of our Saviour, and so directly exclude the merits of other men only; yet because they speak so generally with reference to God's mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all universally. Especially considering the impossibility of merit in Christ's humanity, in respect of his conception;⁵ because all desert necessarily preceded its reward, and Christ was not man before he was conceived, nor can that merit which is not.

10.—Thirdly, whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy; by this we learn from what foundation this holiness must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are we sanctified in the womb; but as he was sanctified at his conception, so are we at our regeneration. He was conceived not by man, but by the Holy Ghost; and we are not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.⁶ The same overshadowing power which formed his human nature, reformeth ours; and the same Spirit assureth us a remission of our sins,⁷ which caused in him an exemption from all sin. He

¹ By St. Augustin: “Ex hoc, quod de Spiritu Sancto est secundum hominem nativitas Christi, quid alio quam ipsa gratia demonstratur?”—Enchir. cap. 37.

² “Modus iste quo natus est Christus de Spiritu Sancto non sicut filius, et de Maria Virgine sicut filius, insinuat nobis gratiam Dei, qua homo, nullis precedentibus meritis, in ipsa exordio naturae seu quo esse cœpit, Verbo Dei copulaturur in tantam personam unitatem, ut idem ipse esset Filius Dei qui Filium Hominis, et Filius Hominis qui Filius Dei; ac sic in natura humana assumptione fieret quodammodo ipsa gratia naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum posset admittere. Quæ gratia propertea per Spiritum Sanctum fuerat significanda, quia ipse proprie sic est Deus, ut etiam dicatur Dei donum.”—S. August. Enchir. cap. 40.

³ Luke 1, 78. ⁴ Titus iii. 4. ⁵ “Cum ad naturam Dei non pertinent natura humana, ad personam tam Unigeniti Filii Dei per gratiam pertinent humana natura; et tantam gratiam ut nulla sit major, nulla prorsus equalis. Neque enim illam susceptionem hominis utra merita precesserunt, sed ab illa susceptione merita ejus cuncta coeperunt.”—S. August. Pract. 52 in Joan.

⁶ John 1, 13.

⁷ “Ea gratia fit ab initio fidei suæ home quæcumque Christianus, qua gratia hæc ille ab initio suo factus est Christus. De ipsa
which was born for us upon his incarnation, is born within us upon our regeneration. 1

11.—All which considered, we may now render a clear explication of this part of the article, whereby every person may understand what he is to profess, and express what is the object of his faith, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost. For hereby he ought to intend thus much; I assent unto this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that the only-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man, taking to himself the human nature, consisting of a soul and body, and conjoining it with the Divine in the unity of his person. I am fully assured that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that he was really and truly conceived in the womb of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by carnal copulation, not by the common way of human propagation, but by the singular, powerful, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a Virgin was beyond the law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER III.

Born of the Virgin Mary.

1.—The third person considerable in this third article is represented under a threefold description of her name, condition, and action. The first telleth us who it was, it was Mary; the second informeth us what she was, a Virgin; the third teacheth us what she did, she conceived and bare our Saviour, and brought forth the Son of God: which was born of the Virgin Mary.

2.—The Evangelist, relating the annunciation, taketh particular notice of this name; for, showing how an angel was sent unto a Virgin espoused to a man, he first observeth that his name was Joseph, and then that the Virgin's name was Mary. Not for any
peculiar excellency in the name itself, or any particular application to the Virgin arising from the origination of it, as some have conceived, but only to denote that singular person, which was then so well known to all men, being espoused unto Joseph, as appeareth by the question of his admiring countrymen, Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? Otherwise the name was common even at that time to many; to the sister of Lazarus, to the mother of James and Joses, to the wife of Cleophas, to the mother of John whose surname was Mark, to her which was of Magdal, in Galilee, to her who bestowed much labour on St. Paul. Nor is there any original distinction between the name of these and of the mother of our Lord. For as the name of Jesus was the
same with Josuah, so this of Mary was the same with Miriam.1 The first of which name recorded was the daughter of Amram, the sister of Moses and Aaron, a prophetess; to whom the bringing of Israel out of Egypt is attributed as well as to her brethren. For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, saith the Lord, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam.2 As she was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage; so was this Mary exalted to become the mother of that Saviour, who through the Red Sea of his blood hath wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type; and even with the confession of the lowliness of an handmaid she seems to bear that exaltation in her name.3

1 tivo; Ασποράγασαθα σιν Μαριαμ, (Luke ii. 5,) in the dative; Μὴ φοβηθης παραλογειν Μαριαμ, (Matt. i. 20,) in the accusative; and, Μὴ φοβου Μαριαμ, (Luke i. 30,) in the vocative, case. All which belong to the Virgin, who is never named Maria as none of the rest by any of the evangelists is ever called Maraμ. But notwithstanding this observation, we find the same Virgin's name declined: as, Μηκαστευδεσιν της μητρος αυτου Μαριας, (Matt. i. 18,) and, σων γυναικι και Μαρια τη μητρι του Ιησου, (Acts i. 14,) which both must come from the Greek termination Maria in recto. And, on the contrary, that Mary which St. Paul mentioneth hath the same Hebrew termination with the Virgin: Ασπασασθε Μαριαμ, ητος πολλα εκσασαν εις ημας. (Rom. xvi. 6.) Besides, the Syriac translation makes no difference between the name of these and of the Virgin; as.

2 Μενοιν Μου Μαριαμ εις την Μολυβον: (Mark xv. 40.) So, again: Μενοιν Μου Μαριαμ εις την Μολυβον: (Matthew xxviii. 1.) And therefore there can be no sufficient foundation for such a distinction.

3 For whereas we first read, Exod. xv. 20, מְרַיָּא, וְיָרֹד, the LXX translate it, Μαριαμ η προφητις, and the Vulgar Latin, Maria prophetissa. The Hebrew first was מִרְיָם, the Syriac, altering the pronunciation, not the letters, מִרְיָם; as for מְרַיָּא, וְיָרֹד, And because the Greek language admiteth no fοι consonant, they pronounced it Μαριαμ. Though sometimes, indeed, even the Greeks did use the barbarous pronunciation in the barbarous words, as Lucian with the Latins makes Ιουδαιος of three syllables:

'Ιουδαιος έτερων μιμον εκεδει λαβον. — Τραγοπ. 172.

Again: because no Greek word endeth in μ, to make it current in that language, it was necessary to alter the termination, according to their custom; as for Annibal 'Αργιβας, Ασνυδρειας, Αμιλικας, and Καιν, Καης. This was to be done sometimes by addition; as, Νυχ Ναγος, 'Αβελ, 'Αβελος, 'Αμεχ Λαμεγος, 'Ιαρε χ Ταμεδος, 'Ενως, 'Ενωσος, 'Σηθ Σηθος, 'Αδα 'Αδαμος, 'Αβρασ α 'Αβρααμος and 'Αβρααμης. And so for Μαρια, Μαριαμ, Μαριαμ, or Μαριαμη, Μαριαμ, the sister of Moses; whom in another place he calls αλεξαμν ουσ αυτου Μαριαυμ. Therefore he thought the name of Miriamme to be the same with Miriam. And as the Greeks were wont to add their own terminations to exotic words, so did they at other times leave out the exotic terminations, if thereby their own were left. As for Μαρια and Μην Αβια and 'Ανα, for Μαριι and Μην Αρα and Ζαρα, for Μαριαμ Μαρια. Wherefore from the Hebrew Miriam came, by variety of pronunciation, at first the Syriac Marjam; and from the Syriac Marjam, at first, only by variation of pronunciation, Μαριαμ, for the propriety of termination, Μαρια.
3.—Besides this name of the blessed Virgin, little hath been discovered to us. Christ, who commended the faith of the Centurion, the love of Mary Magdalene, the excellencies of John the Baptist, hath left not the least encomium of his mother. The Evangelists who have so punctually described the city, family, and genealogy of Joseph, make no express mention of her relations, only of her cousin Elizabeth, who was of the tribe of Levi, of the daughters of Aaron.  

1 Although it be of absolute necessity to believe that which he was born of her descended from the tribe of Judah and the family of David, yet hath not the scripture clearly expressed so much of her, nor have we any more than an obscure tradition of her parents Joacim and Anna. 

4.—Wherefore the title added to that name maketh the distinction; for as divers characters are given to several persons by which they are distinguished from all others of the same common nomination, as Jacob is called Israel, and Abraham the friend of God, or father of the faithful; so is this Mary sufficiently characterised by that inseparable companion of her name, the Virgin.  

5.—For the full explication whereof more cannot be required than that we show first that the Messias was to be born of a Virgin, according to the prediction of the prophets; secondly, that this Mary, of whom Christ was born, was really a virgin when she bare him, according to the relations of the Evangelists; thirdly, that being at once the mother of the Son of God and yet a virgin, she had not sex, or undergone any courses of generation, and therefore was not to be reckoned in the genealogies of men, or the series of ancestors; fourthly, that so free from all suspicion of the generation of her son, it was not necessary that she should be continually under the eyes of all men; and fifthly, that she was in her manner peculiar, in some sort the mother of God. For in that middle state between the sexes, she began to be a woman, and yet was not subject to the like infirmities; and she ended a virgin, and yet became the mother of God. 

1 Luke i. 5.  

2 I call this "a tradition," because not in the written word; and "obscure," because the first mention we find of it was in the fourth century. Epiphanius first informs us, who, speaking of Joseph, says he knew thus much: "Hic viris invenit Deum, qui dedicavit virginitatem."—Irenaeus, lib. vi. § 22. Again: "When he had grown, his mother betook herself to her parents, and there remained a virgin, and of a true generation."—Ibid. cap. ii. § 2. 

3 This point, if not in poêse genera, tenuilìque calvevi to ònomà Marias tis aigitas, and erro-tome mos ouk eiviths eis òpérkhe to, Paphlagon; 'Ez autou gar tov evpiptov ònomatos kai tis arêteis uopofainai the tekméria. "Axiwomatex auton gar ònomaios elaphiastein ou dikaios, kai ouk eiviths eis òpérkhe to, Paphlagon;"—S. Epiph. Hom. Ixxviii. § 6.
continued for ever in the same virginity, according to the tradition of the fathers and the constant doctrine of the church.

6.—The obdurate Jew, that he might more easily avoid the truth of the second, hath most irrationally denied the first; resolved rather not to understand Moses and the prophets, than to acknowledge the interpretation of the apostles. It will therefore be necessary, from those oracles which were committed unto them, to show the promised Messias was born after a miraculous manner, to be the son of a woman, not of a man. The first promise of him seems to speak no less, The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head; for as the name of seed is not generally or collectively to be taken for the generation of mankind, but determinately and individually for that one seed, which is Christ, so the woman is not to be understood with relation unto man, but particularly and determinately to that sex from which alone immediately that seed should come.

7.—According to this first evangelical promise followed that prediction of the prophet, The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man. That new creation of a man is therefore new, and therefore a creation, because wrought in a woman only, without a man, compassing a man. Which interpretation of the prophest is ancient, literal, and clear; and whatsoever the Jews have invented to elude it, is frivolous and forced. For while they force the phrase of compassing a man in the latter part of the prediction to anything else than a conception, they do not only wrest the scripture, but contradict the former part of the

1 Gen. iii. 15. 2 Jer. xxxi. 22.

And Kimchi testifieth that all words which come from the root בַּעַל signify “encompassing,” or “circumvention.” Therefore those words, בָּעָלִים, must literally import no less than that “a woman shall encompass, or enclose, a man,” which, with the addition of “a new creation,” may well bear the interpretation of a miraculous conception. Especially considering that the ancient Jews did acknowledge this sense, and did apply it determinately to the Messias: as appeareth in Bereshit Rabba Parashah 89, where, showing that God doth heal with that with which he woundeth, he saith, As he punished Israel in a virgin, so would he also heal them with a virgin, according to the prophet, “The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, A woman shall compass a man.” By the testimony of R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, and R. Josua the son of Levi, והם ימי יהושע הנביא "This is Messiah the King, of whom it is written, Psalm ii. 7, ‘This day have I begotten thee.’" And again, in Midrash Tillim, upon the second Psalm, R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, speaking of the sufferings of the Messiah, saith, That when his hour is come, God shall say, והם ימי יהושע הנביא "I must create him with a new creation.” And so (by virtue of that new creation) "he saith, ‘This day have I begotten thee.’" From whence it appeareth that this sense is of itself literally clear, and that the ancient rabbins did understand it of the Messias; whence it followeth that the later interpretations are but to avoid the truth which we profess, that Jesus was born of a virgin and therefore is the Christ.
promise, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easy to perform.

8.—But if this prophecy of Jeremy seem obscure, it will be sufficiently cleared by that of Isaiah, Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Emmanuel. The ancient Jews, immediately upon the promulgation of the gospel, understanding well how near this place did press them, gave three several answers to this text: First, denying that it spoke of a virgin at all: secondly, asserting that it could not belong to Jesus; thirdly, affirming that it was fully completed in the person of Hezekiah. Whereas the original word was translated a virgin by such interpreters as were Jews themselves, some hundred years before our Saviour's birth. And did not the notation of the word and frequent use thereof in the scriptures persuade it, the wonder of the sign given by the Lord himself would evince as much. But as for that conceit, that all should be fulfilled in Hezekiah, it is so manifestly and undoubtedly false, that nothing can make more for the confirmation of our faith. For this sign was given and this promise made (a virgin shall conceive and bear a son) at some time in the reign of Ahaz. This Ahaz reigned but sixteen years in Jerusalem; and Hezekiah his son, who succeeded him, was twenty and five years old when he began to reign, and therefore

1 Isal. vii. 14.
2 How soon these objections were made use of by the Jews will appear by Justin Martyr, the first writer which made any considerable explication and defence of the Christian religion; who, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, shows us what were the objections of the rabbins: 'Etipoi eis ymewes 
kal ois didaskalois ymaw tolymata leygen, ymde eiritha in ty prophyteia tov 'Hisaoiv, 'Iou, y parthenos in yastri xewi, 'Ili, 'Iou, y neawes in yastri xylwta, kai tegetai xwou: 
34; and Tertullian, whose works are full of the divinity of Justin: 'Si quando ad declarerius aliquos ab hac Divinae praelacione, vel convertere singulos simplex quoque gestitius, mentiri audetis, quasi non virginem, sed juvenculam, conceptram [et parituram] scriptura continent.'—Adv. Jud., cap. 9, et Adv. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 13.
3 And as they soon began, so did they go on, with this objection, "Hodie, toto jam credente mundo, argumentantur Judaei, Esaias docente de Maria et virginitate ejus, Ezce virgo in utero concepist, et partiet filiam, in Hebreo juvenculam scriptum esse, non virginem, Id est, halm, non bethua."
4 "Dictant Judaei, Provoceamus istam predicacionem Esaiam, et factamus comparationem, an Christo, qui jam venit, competat illi primo nomen quod Esaias predicavit, et insignia ejus que de eo nunciavit. Equi-

5 So Justin testifieth of the Jews, speaking to Trypho, and in him to them: 'Exegyeiste tin prophyteia ois eis 'Ezekiav ton genwmenon ymaw basilea.—Dial, cum Trypho, § 43. And Trypho replies again to Justin: "Iwomev ois ekewin ois Xarotiv ton iwmwteron apodekiesis eiritha: hmesis xap eis 'Ezekiav autwn leygena penpephstreiba.—Ibid. § 77.
6 The LXX., 'Iou, y parthenos in yastri xylwta. It is true, the rest of the interpreters, concurring with the objection of the Jews, translated it, 'Iou, y neawes, Id est, adolescentula, or juvencula. But as their antiquity, so their authority, is far short of the LXX., especially in this case. I shall not need to show how the origination of 

7 2 Kings xvi. 2. 8 2 Kings xviii. 2.
born several years before Ahaz was king, and consequently not now to be conceived when this sign was given. Thus while the ancient Jews name him only to fulfil the prophecy in whom it is impossible it should be fulfilled, they plainly show that, for any knowledge which they had, it was not fulfilled till our Saviour came; and therefore they cannot with any reason deny but that it belonged unto the Messias, as divers of the ancient Rabbins thought and confessed, and is yet more evident by their monstrous error, who therefore expected no Messias in Israel, because they thought whatsoever was spoken of him to have been completed in Hezekiah. Which is abundantly enough for our present purpose, being only to prove that the Messias promised by God, and expected by the people of God before and under the law, was to be conceived and born of a virgin.

9.—Secondly, as we are taught by the predictions of the prophets that a virgin was to be mother of the promised Messias, so are we assured by the infallible relations of the evangelists that this Mary, the mother of Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, was a virgin when she bare him, when she brought forth her first-born son. That she was a virgin when and after she was espoused unto Joseph, appeareth by the narration of St. Luke: For, the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph. After the salutation of that angel, that she still was so appeareth by her question, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? That she continued so after she conceived by the Holy Ghost is evident from the relation of St. Matthew: for when she was espoused unto Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.

10.—That she was a virgin not only while she was with child, but even when she had brought forth, is also evident out of his application of the prophecy: Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son. For by the same prediction it is as manifest that a virgin should bring forth, as conceive a son. Neither

1 It is the known saying of Hillel, recorded in Sanhedrin c. Chelek לאו לאו מיושה לישנא שבעה אל トラו רבי חכמים: "There is no Messias to the Israelites, because they have already enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah." Divers of the latter rabbins endeavour to mollify these words of Hillel by their several expositions, but in vain. And it, Joseph understood him better, who thought he took away all expectation of a Messias, and therefore fairly prayed for him, "Condonet Dominus hoc R. Hillel." Howeover, it appears that from two principles, whereof one was false he gathered that false conclusion. For, First, He thought those words in Isaiah were spoken of the Messias: which proposition was true. Secondly, He conceived that those words were spoken of Hezekiah, and fulfilled in him: which proposition was false. From hence he inferred, that the Israelites were not to expect a Messias after Hezekiah: which conclusion was also false.

2 Luke i. 27. 3 Matt. i. 18. 4 Verse 23.

was her act of parturition more contradictory to virginity than that former of conception.

11.—Thirdly, we believe the mother of our Lord to have been not only before and after her nativity, but also for ever, the most immaculate and blessed Virgin. For although it may be thought sufficient as to the mystery of the incarnation,\(^1\) that when our Saviour was conceived and born his mother was a virgin; though whatsoever should have followed after could have no reflective operation upon the first fruit of her womb; though there be no farther mention in the CREED than that he was born of the Virgin Mary: yet the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that mother, the special honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodness and piety of Joseph, to whom she was espoused, have persuaded the church of God in all ages to believe that she still continued in the same virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged the ever-Virgin Mary.\(^2\) As if the gate of the sanctuary in the prophet Ezekiel were to be understood of her:

This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.\(^3\)

12.—Many, indeed, have taken the boldness to deny this truth, because not recorded in the sacred writ; and not only so, but to assert the contrary as delivered in the scriptures; but with no success.\(^4\) For though, as they object, St. Matthew testified that

argued from the prophecy, and St. Augustin from the CREED: "Si vel per nascentem corruppeteretur ejus integritas, non jam ille de Virgine nasceretur; cunque falso, quod absit, de Virgine natum tota consciens ecclesia, quae, imitans ejus matrem, quotidie parit membra, et virgo est."—*Enchir. cap. 34.*

And St. Ambrose in the same Epistle: "Qua potuit Virgo concipere, potuit Virgo generare; quum semper conceptus praecedat, partus sequatur. Sed si dogmatis non credatur sacerdotium, credatur oraculis Christi, credatur monitis angelorum, credatur Symbolo Apostolorum, quod ecclesia Romana interemeratum semper custodit et servat." And St. Basil upon occasion of the same prophecy: "Hic autem non est poenas, et non est communis, et est in illa, quia praedidit illa, et praebens praevenit in eo, praevenita in eo."—*Homil. de Unitate Trin. cap. 10.*

1 Μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑπηρέτουσας ἀναγκαία ἡ παρθένες, τὸ δ’ εὐθεῖα ἀπολυτρωμένητα τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου καταλείψασθαι.—S. Basil. *Homil. de Nativ. Virg.*

2 For so the Greek church always called her ἀεὶπαρθένος, and from them the Latins semper Virgo.

3 Ezek. xlv. 2.

4 First we read in the time of Origen, that some did maintain the virginity of Mary no longer than to Christ's nativity. "In tantom nescio quis prorupit insaniam, ut asserez negatam fuisse Marlam a Salvatore, e quod post nativitatem illius juncta fuerit Joseph."—*Homil. 7, in Lucam.*

Tertullian himself was produced as an assenter of the same opinion; nor does St. Jerome deny it, though I think he might have done it. Apollinaris, or at least his followers, delivered the same, says Epiphanius; and Eunomius with his, τὸν Ἰουσίῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀφρατον κυριοφαίρην συνάπτεσθαι τῇ Παρθένῳ.—*Pho- tius out of Philostorgius.* Not that these words in Photius were the words of Philo- storgius; for he was clearly an Eunomian, and therefore would never express their opinions with an ὁ πεφρίκασα. And as he always commenced Eunomian, so was he not commended but by an Eunomian, that is, a man of his own sect. As that epigram,—

Εὐνομιανόι, Ἰστορίην ἐπεξετάσα Θεοῦ χαρίτεσσι σοφῆν.  

[ART. III.]
Chap. III.]

Born of the Virgin Mary.

Joseph knew not Mary until she had brought forth for her first-born son, from whence they would infer that afterwards he knew her; yet the manner of the scripture-language produceth no such inference.\(^2\) When God said to Jacob, \textit{I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of},\(^3\) it followeth not that when that was done the God of Jacob left him. When the conclusion of Deuteronomy was written, it was said of Moses, \textit{no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day};\(^4\) but it was a weak argument to

Which I therefore mention, because Gotofred hath made an unnecessary emendation in the verse, \textit{ἐγέλεσον} ἀδέσπ., and a worse interpretation in the inscription, taking the Eumonian to be a Catholic, and the name of the sect for the name of a man; and confirming this error by a greater mistake, saying Eumonianus was the name of a man twice spoken of in Suidas, once in Eumopian, and again in Eusebius. It is true indeed Suidas says expressly, \textit{Εὐμοιανός, ἁγίου κύριου,} and immediately adds these words, \textit{Τὸν ἐν Εὐμοιανόν ἐλώσαν Βελεστρὼς τὸ βέθον λυτρών,} as if Bellerius had baptized one whose name was Eumonianus. But the words are taken out of Procopius in \textit{Historia Arcana}, p. 2, from whence it appears that he who was baptized was by name Theodosius, and by sect an Eumonian. And whatsoever his name was who wrote that epitaph on the History of Philippostorgius he was certainly by sect an Eumonian. And that was intended in the inscription, written without question by some Catholic, who thought no man could commend the History of Philippostorgius but one of his own opinion. These contradictors of the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord afterwards increased to a greater number, whom Epiphanius calls by a general name, \textit{Antidicomarianites}. And from him St. Augustin: \textit{"Antidicomarianites appellati sunt heretici, qui Mariæ virginitati usque adeo contraducunt, ut affirmant cam post Christum natum viro suo fuisset committam."}

\textit{De Harres.} 56, condemned under that name by the sixth general council, \textit{Act. xi.} The same were called by the Latins, \textit{Helvidiani}, from Helvidius, (a disciple of Auxentius the Arian,) whose name is most made use of, because refuted by St. Jerome. He was followed by Jovinian, a monk of Milan, as St. Jerome testifieth; though St. Augustin delivereth his opinion otherwise: \textit{"Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisset corruptam."} And Bonosus, a bishop in Macedonia, referred by the council of Capua to the judgment of Anysius bishop of Thessalonica, was condemned for the same, as appeared by the seventy-ninth Epistle of St. Ambrose, written to Theophilus and Anysius: \textit{"Sane non possimus negare de Mariæ fills jure reprehensus, meritoque vestram sanctitatem abhorruisse, quod ex eodem uto virgo virginalem, ex quo secundum carnem Christi natus est, alias partus æffusus sit." This is the catalogue of those by the ancients accounted heretics for denying the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Matt. i. 25.

\(^2\) For in the word \textit{εἰς} there is no such force. \textit{To ὁ} ὀν πάντως ἀντίδιαίρεται τῷ μελλ., ἀλλὰ τὸ μέχρι μὲν τοῦδε τῆς ἡμέρας, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ ὁ ὄνασται.}—S. Chrys. \textit{Nat. Dom.} 30. \textit{Εὐδος τῇ γραφῇ τὴν μάρτιν ταύτην μη ἔπει διώρισμένον τιθέναι χρόνον.}—S. Chrysost. \textit{Eph.} 18. This is pol. and εἰς τοῦ δικενκος ἐν τῇ τειβο γραφῇ εὐρίσκομεν κείμενων.—ISidor. \textit{Peleus.} l. \textit{Epist.} 30. In this manner it is observed by the Greek grammarians of \textit{πρὶν}, that if any one declared that he did it not \textit{πρὶν}, \textit{"before"} such a thing were done, it followeth not that he did it when or after that thing was done. As when Helena saw and knew Úlysses a spy in Troy she promised upon oath that she would discover him to none till he was safely returned to the Grecian fleet:–

\textit{Καὶ ἂν ωμεσα καρτερων ὀρκον, Μην μὲν πρὶν Ὄδυσσα μετὰ Τρώοσο τάν ἀναφέρα. \textit{Πρὶν γε τὸν ἐς νήσας τς δεος κλίσιας τή ἀφίκεσαν.}—Odys. \textit{D.} 253.}

And yet it is not likely, says Eustathius, that Helena did ever discover Úlysses to the Trojans after he was returned. \textit{Ἐν δὲ τῷ, Μη πρὶν Ὄδυσσα Τρώων αναφέρα, πρὶν αὐτόν εἰς νήσας ἔκακαι, ἐπεὶ μη δοκεῖ παρανομάς τῆς ἐνδοτης τοῦ ἀναφηκεί διὰ τῶν Οὐδοσσών τοῦ Τρώου τοις Τρώοις, ἐνδυνάμως τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ, μη πρὶν ποίησαι τόδε τι πρὶν αὖ τόδε γένηται, ὅτε καὶ τῇ Α. Ῥαφοδίᾳ τῆς Ἰλιάδος κειται, καὶ φανέται ἐκεῖνη, ὥς οὖν εἰκὸς τῇ Ἐλενῇ εἶπεν τοὺς Ἡλεισὶ περὶ τοῦ Ὄδυσσεως οὐδὲ ὅτε εἰς νήσας καὶ κλίσιας ἀφίκετο αὐτός.} A negation antecedent \textit{π.} \textit{is or εἰς}, is no affirmation following them.\(^3\)

\(^3\) \textit{Gen. xxviii.} 15. \(^4\) \textit{Deut. xxxiv.} 6.
infer from thence that the sepulchre of Moses hath been known ever since. When Samuel had delivered a severe prediction unto Saul, he came no more to see him until the day of his death; but it were a strange collection to infer that he therefore gave him a visit after he was dead. Micah the daughter of Saul had no child until the day of her death; and yet it were a ridiculous stupidity to dream of any midwifery in the grave. Christ promised his presence to the apostles until the end of the world: who ever made so unhappy a construction as to infer from thence that for ever after he would be absent from them?

Again, it is true that Christ is termed the first-born son of Mary, from whence they infer she must needs have a second; but might as well conclude that wheresoever there is one there must be two. For in this particular the scripture notion of priority excludeth an antecedent, but inferreth not a consequent; it supposeth none to have gone before, but conclueth not any to follow after. Sanctify unto me, saith God, all the first-born; which was a firm and fixed law, immediately obliging upon the birth: whereas if the first-born had included a relation to a second, there could have been no present certainty, but a suspension of obedience; nor had the first-born been sanctified of itself, but the second birth had sanctified the first. And well might any sacrilegious Jew have kept back the price of redemption due unto the priest, nor could it have been required of him, till a second offspring had appeared; and so no redemption at all had been required for an only son. Whereas all such pretences were unheard of in the law because the original Hebrew word is not capable of any such construction, and in the law itself it carrieth with it a clear interpretation, Sanctify unto me all the first-born; whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast, it is mine. The aperture of the womb determineth the first-born, and the law of redemption excludeth all such tergiversation: Those that

1 1 Sam. xv. 35. 2 2 Sam. vi. 23. 3 Matt. xxviii. 20. 4 For I shall not deny that Christ was called the first-born in respect of his mother, though Epiphanius thought that a sufficient answer: Oui esten qoq egeyhnv tov prwto
tovon authd, allh ouk egnw auth uvs qtoq egeynh; tov Ytwv authd kal ouk eiste, tov prwto
tovon authd, allh tov prwto
tovon. "Esti men gvd toq Ytwv auths egeyhnh; e e auths kata stmarva gegevhnthau." Exod. viii. 17. As if her Son the first-born were not her first-born Son. Oi pantes o prwto
tov; prq tovou egeynemoun evxai tov syuvkris, allh o prwto
tov diavogwv mhtarv prwto
ntov tovomazetai.-S. Basil. Homil. De Nativ. Dom. "Primogenitus est non tantum post quem et alii, sed ante quem nullus."—S. Hieron. Adv. Helvid. It is observed by Servius, to that of Virgil's Ened. i. 5, Trojae qui primus ab oris, that primus is ante quem nullus. 5 Exod. xlii. 2. 6 Thus St. Jerome makes his plea: "Quid me in unius mensis stringis articulo? quid primogenitudines vocas, quem an fratres sequantur ignoras? Exspecta donee nascatur secundus: nihil debeo sacerdoti, nisi et ille fuerit procreatus, per quem is qui ante natus est incipiat esse primogenitus."—Adv. Helvid. 7 Exod. xii. 2. 8 Exodus xii. 2. 9 "Definitiv sermo Dei quid sit primogeni
tum: Omni, inquit, quod aperit vulvoa."—Idem, ibid.
are redeemed, from a month old thou shalt redeem; 1 no staying to make up the relation, no expecting another birth to perfect the redemption. Being then they brought our Saviour to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord: 2 it is evident he was called the first-born of Mary according to the notion of the law of Moses, and consequently that title inferreth no succession, nor proveth the mother to have any other offspring.

13.—Indeed, they thirdly object it cannot be denied but that we read expressly in the scriptures of the brethren of our Lord: He went down to Copernum, he, and his mother, and his brethren; and, While he talked unto the people, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. 3 But although his mother and his brethren be named together, yet they are never called the sons of his mother; and the question is not whether Christ had any brethren, but whether his mother brought forth any other children. It is possible Joseph might have children before Mary was espoused to him; and then, as he was reputed and called our Saviour's father, so might they well be accounted and called his brethren, as the ancient fathers, especially of the Greek church, have taught. 4

Nor need we thus assert that Joseph had any offspring, because the language of the Jews includeth in the name of brethren not only the strict relation of fraternity, but also the larger of consanguinity; and therefore it is sufficient satisfaction for that expression that there were such persons allied unto the blessed

1 Num. xviii. 16. 2 Luke ii. 22, 23. 3 John ii. 12; Matt. xii. 46. 4 Origen first delivereth it on St. Matthew; and Eusebius showeth his opinion, speaking of St. James the brother of our Lord, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 1: Tote oirta Kai 'Iakkwovs tov tov Kuriou legyomenon adeleioy, ououch de kai oynos tov 'Iowfi tnon oynymasto paiev tov de Xristov patir o 'Iowfi. So we read, as it is set forth by L. Stephanus; but in my book collated with an ancient ms., "Oti de kai oynos uvos pro tov 'Iowfi tov nymiomenon ouciv patro tov Xristov" which is much more plain; for tomoymasto paie is nothing so pertinent in this particular, as uvos yv. So St. Epiphanius: 'Hv gar o 'Iakkwos oynos uvos tov 'Iowfi ek gynaikeos tov 'Iowfi, ouc ap' hwarias.—Heres. xxix. § 4. And, speaking of the rest, he calls them, tovuv uvos 'Iowfi ek tis otnos autov allhj gynaikeos.—Heres. xiii. Refut. 12. Thus St. Hilary: "Homines pravisimni hine prasmum opinionis sue atacitoratem, quod domini nostri fratres tabulisse sit traditum, quasi Mariam illi pueritatem, et non potius Joseph ex priore confugio suscipit."—Com. in Matt. cap. 1. Thus also St. Ambrose De Virg., and generally all the fathers to that time, and the Greeks afterwards, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, Etymius, Theophylact, Cæcinus, and Nicophorus. These all seem to have followed an old tradition, which is partly still continued, in St. Epiphanius: "Eisxhe de oynos o 'Iowfi tov mev prwtoj autoj gynaikej ek tis phulhs 'Ioudaia, kai knykei autoj autoj paieos tov artrwv eis, tewpsara mev arrepan, thelieia de de ou.—Heres. lxviii. § 7. The first of these six children was James: Met autoj de ginetai paie 'Iowfi kaloiyvenos, eimi met autoj Symwv, epieta 'Ioudas kai dev vthxytete, h Maria, kai h 'Alywv kaloiyvenos.—Sect. 8. Thus had the Greeks a distinct relation of the sons and daughters of Joseph, and of the order of their generation, Whose authority I shall conclude with that of Jobitus: 'Exei paieos kai adelphiou epi y&s otopiasas tov apatovn ouc ek twn anwv tov anwv kai pynron tovtoj exelysta, allad twn en dikaiosunh diavamaivntos: tinwnous gar 'Iowfi, kai ou tovtoj paieos.—Econ. lib. ix. in Pont. Biblioth. 222. And that of Amphilochius Junior: 'Hsiothvnav de potek kai ou tov 'Iowfi uvos, kathos maupere o Eunymialwv, kai tis peira didaxivntos to alythvs, gegevphistvsev 'Iakkwos kai 'Ioudas panti tis orfus, Theov kai Kuriwv 'Iovtwv Xristov oivlousi eantwv elvai.—Orat. in Deip.
Virgin. We be brethren, said Abraham unto Lot; 1 when Abraham was the son of Terah, Lot of Horan, and consequently not his brother, but his nephew, and, as elsewhere properly styled, the son of his brother. 2 Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary; 3 whereas those brethren were Nadab and Abihu, the sons, not of Uzziel, but of Aaron. Jacob told Rachel that he was her father's brother, and that he was Rebekah's son; 4 whereas Rebekah was the sister of Rachel's father. It is sufficient, therefore, that the evangelists, according to the constant language of the Jews, call the kindred of the blessed Virgin the brethren and sisters of her only son; which, indeed, is something the later, but the most generally-approved, answer. 5

And yet this difficulty, though usually no farther considered, is not fully cleared; for they who impugned the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord urged it farther, pretending that as the scriptures called them the brethren of Christ, 6 so they also showed them to be the sons of Mary the mother of Christ. For first, the Jews express them particularly by their names, Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and

---

1 Gen. xiii. 8. 2 Gen. xii. 5. 3 Lev. x. 4. 4 Gen. xxix. 12. 5 The first, I conceive, who returned this answer, was St. Jerome, in a tractate written in his youth at Rome against Helvidius; whereas, after a long discourse of several exceptions of "brethren" in the scriptures, he thus concludes: "Restat igitur, ut fratres eos intelligas appellatos cognatione, non aucta, non gentis privilegio, non natura: quod modo Lot Abraham, quod modo Jacob Laban est appellatus frater." And as for the other opinion of those which went before him, says, it was grounded merely upon an apocryphal history: "Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxor est Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta apophyseorum, et quondam Escham mulierculam confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur, fratres Domini, non filios Joseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Marie liberos intelligimus materernae Domini, que esse dictur mater Jacobi Minoris et Joseph et Juade, quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legitimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis scriptura demonstratur."—S. Hieron. In Matt. xii. 49. After St. Jerome St. Augustin embraced this opinion: "Consanguinei Virginis Mariae fratres Domini diedabant. Erat enim consequendum scripturarum appellare fratres, quasiabet consanguineus et cognationis opinos propter quos."—Tract. 23 in Ioan.; item Tract. 10; et contra Faust. lib. xxii. cap. 33. Although therefore he seem to be indifferent in his exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians i. 15: "Jacobi Domini frater, vel ex filius Joseph de alia uxor, vel ex cognatione Mariae materis eius, debet intelligi;" yet because this exposition was written while he was a presbyter, and those before-mentioned after he was made a bishop, therefore the former was taken for his undoubted opinion, and upon his and St. Jerome's authority hath been generally since received in the Latin church.

6 Matt. xiii. 55.
Born of the Virgin Mary.

Judas? Therefore James and Joses were undoubtedly the brethren of Christ, and the same were also as unquestionably the sons of Mary: for among the women at the cross we find Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses. Again, this Mary they think can be no other than the mother of our Lord, because they find her early in the morning at the sepulchre, with Mary Magdalene and Salome; and it is not probable that any should have more care of the body of the son than the mother. She then who was certainly present at the cross was not probably absent from the sepulchre. Wherefore they conclude she was the mother of Christ, who was the mother of James and Joses, the brethren of Christ.

And now the urging of this argument will produce a greater clearness in the solution of the question. For if it appear that Mary the mother of James and Joses was different and distinguished from Mary the Virgin, then will it also be apparent that the brethren of our Lord were the sons of another mother, for James and Joses were so called. But we read in St. John that there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. In the rest of the evangelists we find at the same place Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joses; and again at the sepulchre Mary Magdalene and the other Mary: wherefore that other Mary by the conjuncture of these testimonies appeareth to be Mary the wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses; and consequently James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were not the sons of Mary his mother, but of the other Mary, and therefore called his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that the other Mary was the sister of his mother.

Notwithstanding, therefore, all these pretensions, there can be nothing found to raise the least suspicion of any interruption of the ever-blessed Mary's perpetual virginity. For as she was a virgin when she conceived, and after she brought forth our Saviour, so did she continue in the same state and condition, and was com-


4 Here Helvidius exclaiming triumphed, "Quam miserum erit et impium de Maria hoc sentire, ut cum alia femina curam sepulcrarum habuerint, matrem ejus dicamus absentem!"—S. Hieron. Adv. Helvid.

5 John xix. 25. 6 Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40. 7 Matt. xxviii. 1.

8 "Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, ut nonnulli existimant, Joseph ex alia uxore, ut autem mihi videtur, Maria sororis matris Domini, cuius Joannes in libro suo meminit, illius."—S. Hieron. in Catal. Script. Eccles. 2. "Sicut in sepulchro ubi postumum est corpus Domini, nec antea nec postea mortuus jacuit; sic eterum Maria nec antea nec postea quicquam mortale suscipit."—S. August. Tract. 28 in Joan.
mended by our Saviour to his beloved disciple as a mother only now of an adopted son.

14.—The third consideration belonging to this part of the article is, how this virgin was a mother, what the foundation was of her maternal relation to the Son of God, what is to be attributed unto her in this sacred nativity beside the immediate work of the power of the Highest, and the influence of the Holy Ghost. For we are here to remember again the most ancient form of this article, briefly thus delivered, *Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary:* as also that the word *born*¹ was not taken precisely for the nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatsoever belonged to his human generation: and when afterward the conception was attributed to the Spirit, the nativity to the Virgin, it was not so to be understood, as if the Spirit had conceived him, but the blessed Virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit.

15.—First, therefore, we must acknowledge a true, real, and proper conception, by which the Virgin did conceive of her own substance the true and real substance of our Saviour;² according to the prediction of the prophet, *Behold, a virgin shall conceive,*³ and the annunciation of the angel, *Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb.*⁴ From whence our Saviour is expressly termed by *Elisabeth, the fruit of her womb.*⁵

Secondly, as she did at first really and properly conceive, so did she also nourish and increase the same body of our Saviour, once conceived, by the true substance of her own; by which she was *found with child of the Holy Ghost,*⁶ and is described going with *Joseph to be taxed,* being great with child,⁷ and pronounced happy by that loud cry of the woman in the gospel, *Blessed is the womb that bore thee.*⁸

Thirdly, when *Christ* was thus conceived and grew in the womb of the blessed Virgin, she truly and really did bring forth her Son by a true and proper parturition; and *Christ* thereby was properly born by a true nativity.⁹ For as we read, *Elisabeth’s full time came that she should be delivered,* and she brought forth a son,¹⁰ so in the

---

1 Γεννήθηνα.
2 "Tantum ad nativitatem carnis ex se dedict, quantum ex se feminae edendorum corporum susceptis originibus impendunt."—
3 Hilarius, De Trinitate, lib. x. cap. 15.
4 That is, by a proper conception, *συνθέθειν εν γαστρί*; the Syriac in one word אָדִישׁ.
5 *ac si discere, renescere.* So the LXX. translated the simple יְזֵרָה, *אָנָּחָי שִׁלַּשֶּׁם.*
6 As therefore *אָנָּחָי שִׁלַּשֶּׁם* expresseth a proper gravidation, so *אָנָּחָי שִׁלַּשֶּׁם* a proper conception. According to that expression of Gregory Nazianzen, Θείας μεν, ότι χωρὶς ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρωποτοικώς εἶναι, ότι νόμῳ αὐτοῦ. — Epist. i. Ad Cleid. Luke i. 31.
7 Hcb. יְזֵרָה רַע Verse 42.
8 Matt. i. 18. Luke ii. 5. οὐσία ἐγκύψ.
10 Luke i. 57.
like simplicity of expression and propriety of speech the same evangelist speaks of Mary, The days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son.  

Wherefore from these three, a true conception, nutrition, and parturition, we must acknowledge that the blessed Virgin was truly and properly the mother of our Saviour.  

And so is she frequently styled the mother of Jesus in the language of the evangelists, and by Elisabeth particularly the mother of our Lord, as also by the general consent of the church (because he which was so born of her was God), the Deipara, which being a compound

1 Luke ii. 6, 7.  
2 "Veri et proprii filii quis nisi absurdissimus neget vere et proprie esse matrem?"—Facund. lib. i. cap. 4. "Hoc et ad credendum difficile, et dignum controversia videtur, utrum Deum illa Virgo genuerit: ceterum quod vere et proprii genituri, quidquid est ille quem genuit, nulli dignum discipulationis apparat."—Ibid.  
3 Πῶς γὰρ ὁ Θεότοκος ἢ Θεοῦ Υἱὸν ἔχουσα;—Tisch. Apoc. 4.  
4 This name was first in use in the Greek church, who, delighting in the happy compositions of that language, called the blessed Virgin Θεότοκος. From whence the Latins in imitation styled her Virginem Deiparam et Dei Genitricem. Meursius in His Glossary sets the original of this title in the time of Justinian: "Inditum hoc nomen est matri Domini ac Servatoris nostri Iesu Christi a synode V. Constantinopolitana tempore Justiniani." Whereas this was not the original, but the confirmation of that title, "in hac synode catholice est institutum, ut beat Maria semper-virgo Θεότοκος dicretur: quia, sicut catholica fides habet, non hominem solum, sed vere Deum et hominem, genuit."—Paul. Warnef. De Gen. Longobard. lib. vi. cap. 14. So speakest he of the same synod: and it is true, for the seventh canon of the same rumeth thus: Εἰ τες κατὰ ἁναφορὲν ἢ καταχρηστικῶς Θεότοκος λέγει τὴν ἁγίαν, ἐνδοξον, ἀειπαρθένον Μαριάν, ἀλλὰ μὴ κυρίως καὶ ἀλλήλων Θεότοκον αὐτὴν ὀνομαλογεῖ· ὁ τοιοῦτος αἰνεῖται ἔστω. Otherwise in this council was confirmed what had been determined and settled long before: and therefore Photius says thereof, (Epist. i.) Αὕτη ή [ἀγία καὶ οἰκουμενική] σύνοδος Νεοτοικίου πάλιν τὰ μιαρὰ παραφύ尼亚 αὐτὸμα εἰς το ταυτελα ἐξεθερίε: that "it zitterly cut off the heresy of Nestorius, which then began to grow up again." Now, part of the heresy of Nestorius was the denial of this Θεότοκος, and the whole was nothing else but the ground of that denial. And therefore being [seeing] he was condemned for denying of it, that title must be acknowledged authentic, which he denied, from the time of the council of Ephesus; in which those fathers, saith Photius express[.], for the πανάρχαρον καὶ ἀειπαρθένον (Χριστοῦ) Μητέρα κυρίως καὶ ἑδρῶς καλεῖσθαι καὶ ἀνενθημενίαθα Θεότοκον παραδιδῶκασι.—Epist. i. And that it was so then is manifest, because by the denial of this the Nestorian heresy was first discovered, not in Nestorius himself, but in his presbyter Anastasius, who first in a sermon magisterially delivered, Θεότοκον τὴν Μαρίαν καλεῖται μη- δείς.—Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 32; and Liberati Ercviar. cap. 4; as also Evagrius and Nicephorus. Upon which words arising a tumult, Nestorius took his presbyter’s part, teaching the same doctrine constantly in the church, and panted τὴν λέγου τοῦ Θεότοκος ἐκβαλλόν. And hierophant the tumult grew so great, that a general council for that reason was called by Theodosius Junior, τοῦ Νεστορίου τὴν ἁγίαν Μαρίαν εἶναι Θεότοκον ἄρωμαίνοι, as Justinian testifieth, Epist. ad V. Syn. In which, when all things seemed clearly to be carried against Nestorius and his faction, he hoped to have reconciled all by this feigned acknowledgment, λεγέσθω καὶ Θεότοκος ἡ Μαρία, καὶ παυτῇ τὰ ἀντίτρωπα.—Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 31; Liberati Ercviar. cap. 6. It is plain, then, that the council of Ephesus, which condemned Nestorius, confirmed this title Θεότοκος: I say, confirmed it; for it is evident that it was first used in the church, by the tumult which arose at the first denial of it by Anastasius; and so confirmed it as received before, because they approved the Epistles of St. Cyril, who proved it by the usage of those fathers which preceded him. Where, by the way, it is observable, that while St. Cyril produceth nine several fathers for the most part, and yet, and both before and after he produced them, affirmeth that they all did use it, there are but three of them who expressly mention it, Athanasius, Antiopus, and Annon, Epist. ad Reginas. And it is something to be admired that he should so name the other six, and recite those places out of them which had it not, when there were before him so many beside them that used it. As Gregory Nazianzen: Εἰ τις οὖ Θεότοκον τὴν Μαρίαν υποσταθημεν; χάριν τῶν Θεοτόκων (Epist. i. Ad Cledon.?) and in the first citation De Filio, speaking of the difference of his generation from that of others: Ποῦ γὰρ εὐ τοῖς τοσί ἐγὼς Θεότοκος Παρθένοι; Alio St. Basil asserteth, μη καταδέχεσθαι τῶν φιλοχριστῶν τὴν ἁκον, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαιστε
On the Creed.

16. —The necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be born of


1 Although Θεοτόκος may be extended to signify as much as "the mother of God," because τίκτειν both sometimes denote as much as γεννᾶν, and therefore it hath been translated Dei Genitrix as well as Deipara; yet those ancient Greeks which called the Virgin Θεοτόκος, did not call her Μητέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ. But the Latins translating Θεοτόκος, Dei Genitrix, and the Greeks translating Dei Genitrix, Θεοῦ Μητέρα, they both at last called her plainly "the mother of God." The first which the Greeks observed to style her so was Leo the Great, as was observed by Ephraim patriarch of Theopolis, whose words have been very much mistaken by two learned men, Dionysius Petavius and Leo Allatius, who have produced them to prove that he thought Leo Magnus was the first man which ever used the word Θεοτόκος. A strange error this must needs appear in so great a person as a patriarch, and that of the Greek church; and indeed not imaginable, considering how well he was versed in those controversies, and how he compared the words of Leo with those of the ancient Greek fathers, and particularly of St. Cyril. His words are these in his Epistle ad Zenobium: Πρῶτος ἐν ἀγίοις Λεών ιδίκως εἶπεν αὐτὸς λέξεσιν, ὡς Μήτηρ Θεοῦ ἐστίν ἡ ἁγία Θεοτόκος, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πατέρων διαπροσώπως ἐμικαῖ πάντως φαμένων. That is, "Leo was the first who in plain terms called the Θεοτόκος," (that is, Mary) "the mother of God; whereas the fathers before him spoke not the same in express words." Petavius and Allatius have clearly mistaken the proposition, making the subject the predicate, and the predicate the subject, as if he had first called "the mother of God," Θεοτόκος, whereas he is said first to call the Θεοτόκος, "mother of God," as appeareth by the article added to the subject, not to the predicate. But if that be not sufficient, his meaning will appear by another passage to the same purpose, in his Epistle ad Symeliticas: ὡς Μητέρα Θεοῦ πρῶτος μὲν ἦν ἡ Ἐλλοβατίκαι ανέκειντο, ἐν οἷς λέγει, καὶ πάντες μοι ἄλλῳ, οἷς μὴ τοῦ Κυρίου μου ἐθύμα πρὸς με; Σα- φήτερον δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ ταῦτα τῆς λείψεως πρῶτος ὁ ὁσίος Λεών ὁ πάπας προῆγεν. Therefore as he took "the Lord," and "God," to be synonymous; so he thought Elisabeth first styled Mary "the mother of God," because she called her "the mother of her Lord;" and after Elisabeth, Leo was the first who plainly styled her so, that is, "the mother of God." And that we may be yet farther assured of his mind, he produceth the words of Leo the pope in his Epistle to Leo the emperor: Ἀναθείμασεν ἡ Νεστορίου, ὡς τὴν μακραίνω καὶ Θεοτοκίαν ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ νομίσματι πάσης εἰς μητέρα. The sentence which he writes this: "Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatam Virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo, credidit gentericam." —Epist. xvii. cap. 1. Where plainly genitiris Dei is translated Μητέρα Θεοῦ, and Θεοτóκoς is added by Ephraim out of context in the subject, and otherwise not at all in Leo's words. It is therefore certain that first in the Greek church they termed the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος, and the Latins from them Dei Genitrix and Mater Dei, and the Greeks from them again Μητέρα Θεοῦ, upon the authority of Leo, not taking notice of other Latins who styled her so before him.
the Virgin Mary will appear both in respect of her who was the mother, and of him who was the son.

In respect of her it was therefore necessary, that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person proportionable to so high a dignity. It was her own prediction, From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed;1 but the obligation is ours to call her, to esteem her so. If Elisabeth cried out with so loud a voice, Blessed art thou among women,2 when Christ was but newly conceived in her womb, what expressions of honour and admiration can we think sufficient now that Christ is in heaven, and that mother with him? Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted her, which is incommunicable to any other.3 We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive church: Let her be honoured and esteemed, let him be worshipped and adored.4

17 a.—In respect of him it was necessary, first, that we might be assured he was made, or begotten, of a woman, and consequently that he had from her the true nature of man. For he took not on him the nature of angels,5 and therefore saved none of them who, for want of a Redeemer, are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.6 And man once fallen had been, as deservedly, so irrevocably, condemned to the same condition, but that he took upon him the seed of Abraham. For being we are partakers of flesh and blood, we could expect no redemption but by him who likewise took part of the same.7 We could look for no Redeemer but such a one who by consanguinity was our brother.8 And being there is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus,9 we cannot be assured that he was the Christ, or is our Jesus, except we be first assured that he was a

---


3 "Abisit ut quiescum S. Mariam divinae gratiae privilegium, ut speculati gloria, fraudare conceatur."

4 "H Maria in timet, o Kýrios proskeu- 

5 exóth. Ei timi éstote Maria, o dé Patér, 

6 kai Yios, kai Ó Agnou Pneúmá proskeuësíthw 

7 twn Márion merdeis proskeuëwto.—S. Eirihi, 

8 Hieres. Ixxix, § 7. Ei kallósthi h Maria, 

9 kai ágia, kai tetemíghi, állo sou éis to 

10 proskeuëwthai.—Probl. Hímeis dé twn mónon 

11 drósménoni theológoymen oðólo twn dé ákath 

12 twn tóv én árété diapréphtmata ós anbía- 

13 pou arístous genviropému múon dé twn tóv 

14 õdous proskeuëwmen Thèn kai Patérh, kai 

15 twn ékínu ge Agón, kai tó Pánaygnov 


5 Heb. ii. 16. 6 Jude 6. 7 Heb. ii. 14.

8 Under that notion did the ancient Jews expect him, as appeareth by the Targum, Cantic. viii. 1:

10:20 ὅταν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπιτίθεντο τῷ Μεσσίᾳ τῷ μὲν Ἰσραήλ τῷ δὲ τῶν ἀλλήλων: "When the Messiah shall reveal himself, the sons of Israel shall say unto him, Thou shalt be unto us a brother."
man. Thus our Redeemer, the man Christ Jesus, was born of a woman, that he might redeem both men and women, 1 that both sexes might rely upon him, who was of the one and from the other.

b.—Secondly, it was necessary we should believe our Saviour conceived and born of such a woman as was a most pure and immaculate virgin. For as it behoved him in all things to be made like unto us, so in that great similitude a dissimilitude was necessary, that he should be without sin. 2 Our passover is slain, 3 and behold the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world; 4 but the Lamb of the passover must be without blemish. 5 Whereas then we draw something of corruption and contamination by our seminal traduction from the first Adam; our Saviour hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination, because born of a Virgin without any seminal traduction. Our High-Priest is separate from sinners 6 not only in the actions of his life, but in the production of his nature. For as Levi was in the loins of Abraham, 7 and paid tithes in him, 8 and yet Christ, though the son of Abraham, did not pay tithes in him, but receive them in Melchizedek; so though we being in the loins of Adam may be all said to sin in him, yet Christ, who descended from the same Adam according to the flesh, was not partaker of that sin, but an expiation for it. For he which is contained in the seminal virtue of his parent is some way under his natural power, and therefore may be in some manner concerned in his actions; but he who is only from him by his natural substance, according to a passive or obediential power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, cannot be so included in him as to be obliged by his actions, or obnoxious to his demerits.

c.—Thirdly, it was necessary that we should believe Christ born of that person, that Virgin Mary which was espoused unto Joseph; that thereby we might be assured that he was of the family of

---

1 “Hominis liberatio in utroque sexu de-  

buit apparete. Ergo, quia virum oportebat  
suscipere, qui sexus honorabilius est, con-  
veniens erat ut feminid sexus liberatio hinc  
apparet, quod illa vir de femina natus est.”  
—S. AUG. Lib. de divers. Quest. Ixxiiii.  
quest. 11. “Nolite vos ipsos contemnere,  
viri, Filius Dei virum suscipit; nolite vos  
ipsas contemnere, feminam, Filius Dei natus  
2 “Non eum in peccatis mater ejus in  
utero aluit; quem virgo concepit, virgo  
peperit.” —S. AUG. Serm. 4 in Joam.  
“Ergo Ecce Agnus Dei. Non habet iste  
traducem de Adam; earnem tantum sumpsit  
de Adam, peccatum non assumptit.” —Ibid.  
3 “Verbum caro factum in similitudine carnis  
peccata omnia nostra suscepit, nullum reatus  
vitium ferens ex traduce provarationis  
exortum.” —JOAN. IV. Epist. ad Constant.  
Heb. iv. 15.  
4 John i. 20.  
5 Exod. xii. 5.  
6 Heb. vii. 28.  
7 “Levi in lumbis Abraham fuit secundum  
concipientiam carnalem, Christus autem  
secundum solam substantiam corporalem  
Cum enim sit in semine et visibilibus cor- 
puentia et invisibilibus ratio, utrumque cueurit  
ex Abraham, vel etiam ex ipso Adam, usque  
ad corpus Mariae, quia et ipsum eo modo  
conceptum et exortum est: Christus autem  
visibilibem carnem substantiam de carne Vir-
ginis sumpsit; ratio vero conceptionis ejus  
ona semine virili, sed longe alter ac desu-
per venit.” —S. AUG. Serm. 4 in Genas. ad  
Lut. lib. x. cap. 20.  
8 Verses 9, 10.
David. For whatsoever promises were made of the Messias were appropriated unto him. As the seed of the woman was first contracted to the seed of Abraham, so the seed of Abraham was next appropriated to the son of David. He was to be called the son of the Highest, and the Lord God was to give unto him the throne of his father David. When Jesus asked the Pharisees, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? they said unto him, The son of David. When Herod demanded of the chief priests and scribes where Christ should be born, they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea; because that was the city of David, whithers Joseph went up with Mary his espoused wife, because he was of the house and lineage of David. After John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, was born, Zacharias blessed the Lord God of Israel, who had raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David. The woman of Canaan, the blind men sitting by the way, and those other blind that followed him, cried out, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of David. The very children out of whose mouths God perfected praise were crying in the Temple, and saying, Hosannah to the son of David. And when the blind and dumb both spake and saw, all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? Thus by the public and concurrent testimonies of all the Jews, the promised Messias was to come of the house and lineage of David; for God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne. It was, therefore, necessary we should believe that our Saviour was made of the seed of David according to the flesh: of which we are assured, because he was born of that Virgin Mary who descended from him, and was espoused unto Joseph, who descended from the same, that thereby his genealogy might be known.

18.—The consideration of all which will at last lead us to a clear explication of this latter branch of the article, whereby every Christian may inform himself what he is bound to profess, and being informed fully express what is the object of his faith in this particular, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary. For hereby he is conceived to intend thus much: I assent unto this as a most certain and infallible truth, that there was a certain woman, known by the name of Mary, espoused unto Joseph of Nazareth, which before and after her espousals was a pure and unspotted virgin, and being and con-

1 Luke i. 32.  2 Matt. xxii. 42.  3 Matt. ii. 4, 5.  4 Luke ii. 4.  5 Luke i. 67-69.  6 Matt. xv. 22; xx. 30; lx. 27.  7 Matt. xxii. 15, 16.  8 Matt. xii. 23.  9 * Atquin hinc magis Christum intimere gere debitis ex David deputatum carnali genere, ob Mariae Virginis censum. De hoc enim promisso jurator in Psalmo ad David, Ex fructu ventris tuorum coelo ad supernum tuum."—TERTULLIANUS Adversus Marcanum, lib. iii. c. p. 29. Acts ii. 30.  10 Rom. i. 3.
continuing in the same virginity, did by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost conceive within her womb the only-begotten Son of God, and after the natural time of other women brought him forth as her first-born Son, continuing still a most pure and immaculate virgin, whereby the Saviour of the world was born of a woman under the law, without the least pretence of any original corruption, that he might deliver us from the guilt of sin; born of that Virgin which was of the house and lineage of David, that he might sit upon his throne and rule for evermore. And in this latitude I profess to believe in Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary.

ARTICLE IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.

CHAPTER I.

1. THIS Article hath also received some accession in the particular expressions of Christ's humiliation. For the first word of it, now generally speaking of his passion, in the most ancient creeds was no way distinguished from his crucifixion; for as we say, suffered and crucified, they only, crucified under Pontius Pilate: nor was his crucifixion distinguished from his death, but where we read, crucified, dead, and buried, they only, crucified and buried. Because the chief of his sufferings were on the cross, and

"qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus."—Mss. Armach. And beside these, a witness without exception, Leo the Great: "Uuiigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur."
—Epist. x. cap. 5. Afterwards the passion was expressed: "Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, et sepultus."—Ethiserus Uxam.
And the death: "Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus."—Auctor. Lib. De Symb. ad Catechum. Not but both these were expressed before in the rule of faith by Tertullian, but without particular mention of the crucifixion: "Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, et sepultum."—Adv. Prax. cap. 2. As Optatus: "Passus, mortuus, et sepultus resurrexit."—Lib. i. "Passus, sepultus, et tertia die resurrexit."—Capital. Caroli 62. And generally the ancients did understand determinately his crucifying by that more comprehensive name of his "suffering." For as Marcellus and St. Cyril have staurosiveta kai tafoeta, Eusebius and the Nicene council to the same purpose have padoanta only in their creeds, As St. Clemens Alexandrinus: Tov eiw tov Theou pioston, tov eiw tov padoantiv omologian.—Pedl. lib. ii. cap. 3. Which was farther enlarged afterwards by the council of Constantinople into staurosiveta, kai padoanta, kai tafoeta.
he gave up the ghost there, therefore his whole passion and his death were comprehended in his crucifixion.

But, again, being he suffered not only on the cross; being it was possible he might have been affixed to that cursed tree, and yet not have died; therefore the church thought fit to add the rest of his sufferings, as antecedent, and his death, as consequent, to his crucifixion.

To begin then with his passion in general. In those words, he **suffered under Pontius Pilate**, we are to consider part as substantial, part as circumstantial. The substance of this part of the article consisteth in our Saviour's passion, he **suffered**: the circumstance of time is added, declared by the present governor, **under Pontius Pilate**.

2.—Now for the explication of our Saviour's passion as distinct from those particulars which follow in the article, more I conceive cannot be required than that we show, who it was that suffered, how he suffered, what it was he suffered.

3.—First, if we would clearly understand him that suffered in his full relation to his passion, we must consider him both in his office, and his person, as **Jesus Christ**, and as the only-begotten Son of God. In respect of his office, we believe that he which was the **Christ** did suffer; and so we make profession to be saved by faith in a suffering **Messias**. Of which that we may give a just account, first, we must prove that the promised **Messias** was to suffer: for if he were not, then by professing that our **Jesus** suffered, we should declare he was not **Christ**. Secondly, we must show that **Jesus**, whom we believed to be the **Messias**, did really and truly suffer; for if he did not, then while we proved the true **Messias** was to suffer, we should conclude our **Jesus** was not that **Messias**. Thirdly, it will farther be advantageous, for the illustration of this truth, to manifest that the sufferings of the **Messias** were determined and foretold, as those by which he should be known. And fourthly, it will then be necessary to show that our **Jesus** did truly suffer whatsoever was determined and foretold. And more than this cannot be necessary to declare who it was that suffered, in relation to his office.

4.—For the first of these, that the promised **Messias** was to **suffer**, to all Christians it is unquestionable; because our Saviour did constantly instruct the apostles in this truth, both before his death, that they might expect it,¹ and after, that they might be confirmed by it.² And one part of the doctrine which **St. Paul** disseminated through the world was this, that **the Christ must needs have suffered**.³

---

But because these testimonies will satisfy only such as believe in Jesus, and our Saviour himself did refer the disbelieving Jews to the law and the prophets as those who testified of him, we will show from thence, even from the oracles committed to the Jews, how it was written of the Son of man that he must suffer many things, and how the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ.

The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is beyond all question a sad but clear description of a suffering person: A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, oppressed and afflicted, wounded and bruised, brought to the slaughter, and cut off out of the land of the living. But the person of whom that chapter treateth was certainly the Messiah, as we have formerly proved by the confession of the most ancient Jews, and may farther be evidenced both from them and from the place itself. For surely no man's soul can be made an offering for our sins but our Saviour's; nor hath God laid on any man the iniquity of us all but on our Redeemer. Upon no

1 Mark ix. 12. 2 1 Peter i. 11. 3 [In] p. 136 we showed, by the authority of the Targum, the Bereshith Rabba, and the Midrash upon Ruth, and by the confession of Solomon Jarchi and Moses Alshech, that the ancient rabbins did interpret that chapter of the Messias; which might seem a sufficient acknowledgment. But because this is the most considerable controversy between us and the Jews, it will not seem unnecessary to prove the same truth by farther testimonies. In the Talmud, Col. Sukedrin, to the question, *What is the name of the Messias?* It is answered, רしっה הרמש "The Leper." And the reason of the name is there rendered, ועשה אתו את "Because it is spoken in this, Isa. liii. 4: 'Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken,'" that is, בצרו בצרו. And because בצרו is used of the leprosy, Lev. xiii. 13; therefore from בצרו they concluded his name to be "a Leper," and consequently did interpret that place of the Messias. In the Pesikta it is written פסוק במלתו מessian "God produced the soul of the Messias, and said unto him, 'Wilt thou redeem my sons after six thousand years?' He answered, 'I will.' 'Wilt thou bear the chastisements, to take away their sins?'"
person but the Messias could the chastisement of our peace be, nor with any stripes could we be healed but his. It is sufficiently, then, demonstrated by the prophet that the suffering person whom he described was to be the Christ, in that he bare our griefs and carried our sorrows.

5.—This prediction is so clear, ever since the serpent was to bruise the heel of the woman’s seed, that the Jews, who were resolved to expect a Messias which should be only glorious, have been inforced to invent another, which should suffer. And then they answer us with a distinction of their own invention, that a Messias was to redeem us, and a Messias was to suffer for us; but the same Messias was not both to redeem us and to suffer for us. For they say that there are two several persons promised under the name of the Messias; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of the tribe of Judah; one the son of Joseph, the other the son of David; the one to precede, fight, and suffer death; the other to follow, conquer, reign, and never to die. If, then, our Saviour were a Christ, we must confess he was a suffering Messias, and consequently, according to their doctrine, not a Saviour. For if he were the son of David, then, say they, he was never to die; or if he ever died, he was not that Messias which was promised to sit upon the throne of David. And while we confess our Saviour died, and withal assert his descent from the house of David, we do, in their opinion, involve ourselves in a contradiction.

But this distinction of a double Messias is far from prevailing over our belief: first, because it is in itself false, and therefore of no validity against us; secondly, because it was first invented to counterfeit the truth, and so very advantageous to us.

6.—That it is in itself false will appear, because the scripture never mention any Messias of the tribe of Ephraim; neither was

1 So indeed the Jews expect a double Messias, one, מֵסִיָּהּ בְּיַעַר בֹּדְיָהּ "Messias the son of Joseph,” the other, מֵסִיָּהּ בְּיַעַר בֹּדְיָהּ "Messias the son of David.” So the Targum expressly upon Canticles iv. 5:

נָרַר פֶּרֶךְ עְיַהְעַיִּים לַעֲפַרְפָּר עִיָּד מֵסִיָּהּ "Two are thy deliverers which shall deliver thee,—Messias the son of David, and Messias the son of Ephraim;” and in the same manner, chap. vii. 3. This that paraphrast, nothing so ancient as the rest, is conceived to have taken out of the Talmud in Masscheth Succa, where, cap. 5, inscribed הָלֵאל, God saith to Messias the son of David, מַגֵּל מַגְּל הָשָׁמָיִם "Ask what thou wilt,” (according to the second Psalm,) “and I will give it thee.”

יִוֶּהָל לְמִשְׁתַּחַת בָּתָא: יִוְּמֶשְׁחַת "Who, seeing Messias the son of Joseph which was slain, asked of God nothing but life.” Thus from the Talmud and the later Targum the rabbins have generally taught a double Messias, one the son of David, the other of Joseph. As Solomon Jarchi, Isai. xxiv. 18; Zech. xii. 10: Aben Ezra, Zech. ix. 9; Mal. iii. 1: Kimchi, Zech. xii. 10; whom the later Jews constantly follow. And this Marcion the heretic seems to have learned of the Jews, and to have taught with some alteration in favour of his own opinion. “Constituit Marcion alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporeibus a Deo quondam ignoto revelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium; alium, qui a Deo Creator in restitutionem Judaei status sit destinatus, quandoque venturus.” — Terrul. Adv. Marcion. lib. iv cap. 6.
there ever any promise of that nature made to any of the sons or offspring of Joseph. Besides, as we acknowledge but one Mediator between God and man, so the scriptures never mention any Messias but one. Under whatsoever title he is represented to us, there can be no pretence for a double person. Whether the seed of the woman, or the seed of Abraham, whether Shiloh, or the son of David, still one person promised; and the style of the ancient Jews before our Saviour was, not they, but he which is to come. The question which was asked him, when he professed himself to be Christ, was, whether it was he which was to come, or whether they were to look for another; not that they could look for him and for another also. The objection then was that Elias was not yet come, and therefore they expected no Messias till Elias came. Nor can the difference of the Messiah's condition be any true reason of imagining a double person, because in the same place the prophets, speaking of the same person, indifferently represent him in either condition. Being then, by the confession of all the Jews, one Messias was to be the son of David, whom Elias was to precede; being by the tenour of the scriptures there was never promise made of more Christs than one, and never the least mention of the tribe of Ephraim with any such relation; it followeth that that distinction is in itself false.

7.—Again, that the same distinction, framed and contrived against us, must needs be in any different person's judgment advantageous to us, will appear, because the very invention of a double person is a plain confession of a twofold condition; and the different relations, which they prove not, are a convincing argument for the distinct economies, which they deny not. Why should they pretend to expect one to die, and another to triumph, but that the true Messias was both to triumph and to die, to be humbled and to be exalted, to put on the rags of our infirmity before the robe of majesty and immortality? Why should they tell us of one Mediator to be conquered, and the other to be victorious, but that the serpent was to bruise the heel of the seed of the woman, and the same seed to bruise his head? Thus even while they endeavour to elude, they confirm our faith; and as if they were still under the cloud, their error is but as a shadow to give a lustre to our truth. And so our first assertion remaineth firm, the Messias was to suffer.

8.—Secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be Christ, did suffer, we shall not need to prove, because it is freely confessed by all his enemies. The Gentiles acknowledged it, the Jews triumphed at it. And we may well take that for granted, which is so far from being

1 Zech. ix. 9; Isa. lx. 6.
denied, that it is objected. If hunger and thirst, if revilings and contempt, if sorrows and agonies, if stripes and buffetings, if condemnation and crucifixion, be sufferings, Jesus suffered. If the infirmities of our nature, if the weight of our sins, if the malice of man, if the machinations of Satan, if the hand of God could make him suffer, our Saviour suffered. If the annals of times, if the writings of his apostles, if the death of his martyrs, if the confession of the Gentiles, if the scoffs of the Jews, be testimonies, Jesus suffered. Nor was there ever any which thought he did not really and truly suffer, but such as withal irrationally pretended he was not really and truly man. 1

9.—Thirdly, to come yet nearer to the particular acknowledgment of this truth, we shall farther show that the promised Messiah was not only engaged to suffer for us, but by a certain and express agreement betwixt him and the Father, the measure and manner of his sufferings were determined, in order to the redemption itself which was thereby to be wrought; and what was so resolved was before his coming in the flesh revealed to the prophets, and written by them, in order to the reception of the Messias, and the acceptance of the benefits to be procured by his sufferings.

That what the Messias was to undergo for us was predetermined and decreed, appeareth by the timely acknowledgment of the

1 Those which were called by the Greeks Δοκυται and Φαντασισται, who taught that Christ was man only putative, and came into the world only in phantasme, and consequently that he did only putative pati. These were called Δοκυται, not from their author, but from their opinion, that Christ did all things only εν δοκιμε, “in appearance,” not reality. As Clemens Alexandrinus: Των αἱρέσεων αι μὲν ἀπὸ δοκυτῶν ἔδασον τῶν προσαγορευότων, ὡς ἡ τῶν Δοκυτῶν.—Strom. lib. vii. Viz. οἱ δοκηται Χριστον φαντασίσασθαι ὑπέλαβον.—Idem, lib. vi. “Neque in phantasia, id est, absque carne, scit Valentinus asserit, neque de thesi, putative imaginatum, sed verum corpus.”—Gennad. De Eccles. Dogm. cap. 2. Where, for de thesi, I suppose, we should read δοκιμε. The original of this train of heretics is to be fetched from Simon Magus, whose assertion was, “Christum nec venisse, nec a Judaeis quicquam pertulisse.”—S. August. Hier. 1. Wherefore making himself the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he affirmed, καὶ in Pilit pseuδη πατεται επαρατιτυς, and so that he suffered as the Son amongst the Jews; ἀληθεία μὴ πεσονθια δε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμε μόνον.—Dama. De Hier. Now, what Simon Magus said of himself, when he made himself the Son, that those who followed affirmed of Christ. As Saturninus, who taught “Christum in substantia corporis non fuisse, et phantasmate tantum quasi passum fuisse.”—Tertullian De Præscr. Adv. Haeret. cap. 46. Vidi Epiph. muti- lum, Hier. xxii. § 1. And Basilides, who delivered, εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν φαντασίαν εν τῇ φαντασίᾳ, μὴ εἶναι δὲ ἐνθριασμῷ, μηδὲ σαρκα εἰκονείαν—οὐγά Ἰσχαδέος ὁμοιον πενθενήναι, ἀλλὰ Σώματα τὸν Κυρίον.—S. Epiph. Hier. xxiv. § 3. “A Judais non credunt Christum crucifixum, sed Simonem Cyrenensem, qui angariatus sustulit crucem ejus.”—S. August. Hier. 4. Thus the Valentinians, particularly Marcus, the father of the Marcoban heretics: “Marcus etiam nescio quis haresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, et Christum non vere, sed putative passum asseverans.”—S. August. Hier. 14. Thus Cerdon: “Christum in substantia carnis negat, in phantasmate solo fuisse pronunciavit, nec omnilno passum, sed quasi passum.”—Ephraim. De Prœscr. Haeret. cap. 51. “Christum ipsum neque natum ex femina, neque habuisse carnem, nec vere mortuum vel quicquam passum, sed simulasse passionem.”—S. August. Hier. 21. And the Manichees, who taught, “Christum non fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatae speciem carnis luditicandis humannis sensibus praebuisse; ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem, mentiretur.”—Idem. Hier. 46. Whom therefore Vincentius Lirinensis calls phantasia praedicta est cap. 20.
On the Creed.

church unto the Father: Of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together; for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.\(^1\) For as when the two goats were presented before the Lord, that goat was to be offered for a sin-offering upon which the lot of the Lord should fall, and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the high-priest and then laid upon the head of the goat which was to die;\(^2\) so the hand of God is said to have determined what should be done unto our Saviour, whose passion was typified by that sin-offering. And well may we say that the hand of God as well as his counsel determined his passion, because he was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.\(^3\)

10.—And this determination of God’s counsel was thus made upon a covenant or agreement between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by them both what he should suffer, what he should receive. For beside the covenant made by God with man, confirmed by the blood of Christ, we must consider and acknowledge another covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son, which partly is expressed, If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days;\(^4\) partly by the apostle, Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.\(^5\) In the condition of making his soul an offering for sin, we see propounded whatsoever he suffered; in the acceptance, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God, we see undertaken whatsoever was propounded. The determination, therefore, of our Saviour’s passion was made by covenant of the Father who sent, and the Son who suffered.

11.—And as the sufferings of the Messias were thus agreed on by consent, and determined by the counsel of God, so they were revealed by the Spirit of God unto the prophets, and by them delivered to the church; they were involved in the types, and acted in the sacrifices. Whether, therefore, we consider the prophecies spoken by God in the mouths of men, they clearly relate unto his sufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the ceremonial performances, they exhibit the same by an active representation. St. Paul’s apology was clear, that he said none other things but those which the prophets and Moses did say should come, that Christ should suffer.\(^6\) The prophets said in express terms that the Messias, whom they foretold, should suffer: Moses said so in those ceremonies which were instituted by his ministry. When he caused the passover to be slain, he said that Shiloh was

---
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the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world. When he set the brazen serpent up in the wilderness, he said the Son of man should be lifted up upon the cross. When he commanded all the sacrifices for sin, he said, without effusion of blood there was no remission, and therefore the Son of God must die for the sins of men. When he appointed Aaron to go into the holy of holies on the day of atonement, he said Christ, our High-priest, should never enter through the veil into the highest heavens to make expiation for us but by his own blood. If, then, we look upon the fountain, the eternal counsel of the will of God; if we look upon the revelation of that counsel, either in express predictions or ceremonial representations; we shall clearly see the truth of our third assertion, that the sufferings of the promised Messias were predetermined and foretold.

12.—Now all these sufferings which were thus agreed, determined, and revealed as belonging to the true Messias, were undergone by that Jesus of Nazareth, whom we believe to be the true Christ. Never was there any suffering type which he out-went not, never prediction of any passion which he fulfilled not, never any expression of grief and sorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approached he said to his apostles, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished.¹ When he delivered them the blessed sacrament, the commemoration of his death, he said, Truly the Son of man goeth as it was determined.² After his resurrection he chastised the dulness of his disciples, who were so overwhelmed with his passion that they could not look back upon the antecedent predictions, saying unto them, O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?³ After his ascension St. Peter made this profession before the Jews, who had those prophecies and saw his sufferings, Those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.⁴ Whatever, therefore, was determined by the counsel of God, whatsoever was revealed by the prophets, concerning the sufferings of the Messias, was all fulfilled by that Jesus whom we believe to be and worship as the Christ. Which is the fourth and last assertion propounded to express our Saviour’s passion in relation to his office.

13.—Having considered him that suffered in his office, we are next to consider him in his person. And being in all this article there is no person expressly named or described, we must look

back upon the former till we find his description and his name. The article immediately preceding leaves us in the same suspension, but for our satisfaction refers us to the former, where we find him named Jesus, and described the only-begotten Son of God.

14.—Now this Son of God we have already showed to be therefore truly called the only-begotten, because he was from all eternity generated of the essence of the Father, and therefore is, as the eternal Son, so also the eternal God. Wherefore by the immediate coherence of the articles, and necessary consequence of the CREED, it plainly appeareth that the eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried. For it was no other person which suffered under Pontius Pilate than he which was born of the Virgin Mary, he which was born of the Virgin Mary was no other person than he which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, he which was conceived by the Holy Ghost was no other person than our Lord, and that our Lord no other than the only Son of God: therefore by the immediate coherence of the articles it followeth that the only Son of God, our Lord, suffered under Pontius Pilate. That Word which was in the beginning, which then was with God, and was God, in the fulness of time being made flesh did suffer. For the prince of this world crucified the Lord of glory, and God purchased his church with his own blood. That person which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the Lord of glory and most truly God, took upon him the nature of man, and in that nature, being still the same person which before he was, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry than that Son of God which made the world; when he sat down weary by the well, there was no other person felt that thirst but he which was eternally begotten of the Father, the fountain of the Deity; when he was buffeted and scourged, there was no other person sensible of those pains than that eternal Word which before all worlds was impassible; when he was crucified and died, there was no other person which gave up the ghost but the Son of him, and so of the same nature with him, who only hath immortality. And thus we conclude our first consideration propounded, viz., who it was which suffered; affirming that, in respect of his office, it was the Messias, in respect of his person, it was God the Son.

15.—But the perfect probation and illustration of this truth

1 This is that inseparabilis connexio in the Creed, which Cassianus urgeth so much against Nestorius, De Incarn. lib. vi.
2 "Dominum passum Symboli tenet authores, et apostolus tradidit, dicens, Si enim cognosissent, nunquam Dominum gloriam crucifixissent."—Vigilius Adversus Eutych. lib. ii. 1 Cor. ii. 8.
3 Acts xx. 28 1 Tim. vi. 16.
requireth first a view of the second particular propounded, how, or in what, he suffered. For while we prove the person suffering to be God, we may seem to deny the passion, of which the perfection of the Godhead is incapable. The divine nature is of infinite and eternal happiness, never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our assertion as to deny that the divine nature of our Saviour suffered. For being the divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had been the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffered. Wherefore as we ascribe the passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that nature which is his alone, that is, the human. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit will appear to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is man, and so capable of suffering.

16.—Whereas then the humanity of Christ consisteth of a soul and body, these were the proper subject of his passion; nor could he suffer anything but in both or either of these two. For as the Word was made flesh, though the Word was never made (as being in the beginning God), but the flesh, that is, the humanity, was made, and the Word assuming it became flesh; so saith St. Peter, Christ suffered for us in the flesh, in that nature of man which he took upon him; and so God the Son did suffer, not in that nature in which he was begotten of the Father before all worlds, but in that flesh which by his incarnation he became. For he was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit; suffered in the weakness of his humanity, but rose by the power of his divinity. As he was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, in the language of St. Paul, so was he put to death in the flesh, in the language of St. Peter: and as he was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness so was he quickened by the Spirit. Thus the proper subject and recipient of our Saviour’s passion, which he underwent for us, was that nature which he took from us.

17.—Far be it, therefore, from us to think that the deity, which is immutable, could suffer; which only hath immortality, could die. The conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection
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upon the divinity; nor can that infinite nature by any external acquisition be any way changed in its intrinsical and essential perfections.\textsuperscript{1} If the bright rays of the sun are thought to insinuate into the most noisome bodies without any pollution of themselves,\textsuperscript{2} how can that spiritual essence contract the least finnerness by any union with humanity? We must neither harbour so low an estimation of the divine nature as to conceive it capable of any diminution; nor so mean esteem of the essence of the Word as to imagine it subject to the sufferings of the flesh he took; nor yet so groundless an estimation of the great mystery of the incarnation as to make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with the other. These were the wild collections of the Arian and Apollinarian heretics,\textsuperscript{3} whom the church hath long since silenced by a sound and sober assertion that all the sufferings of our mediator were subject in his human nature.

18.—And now the only difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the person suffering with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the Godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit an easy solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the divine and human nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For hereby those attributes which properly belong unto the one are given to the other, and that upon good reason.\textsuperscript{4} For being the

\textsuperscript{1} Τὸ γὰρ φύσει ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον ἐις τοιοῦτον ἐστιν, οὐ συναναλοίωσεν τῇ ταπείνῃ φύσει, ὅταν ἐν ἐκείνῃ καὶ ὀκουμενω ἔγνυται. — S. GREG. NYS. Epist. ad Eustathium.

\textsuperscript{2} Οὓς οὖν ἡλικοῦ φωτὸν πάθος γένεται ἀ ἀκτίνες τὰ πάντα πληρούσαι, καὶ σωμάτων νεκρῶν καὶ οὐ καθαρῶν ἐσώτερον, πολὺ πλέον ἡ ἀσύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις οὐτ ὁ πάθος τὴν υἱότητα, οὐτ ὁ ἀληθεία σώματος ἀσύματος ἐπαφωμένην. — EUSEB. Dem. Evang. lib. iv. cap. 13.

\textsuperscript{3} This danger is the rather to be unfolded, because it is not generally understood. The heresy of Arians, as it was condemned by the council of Nice, is known to all. But that he made the nature of the Word to suffer in the flesh, is not so frequently or plainly delivered. This Phoeadius (the first of the Latin church who wrote against the Arians) chargeth them with: "Duplicem hunc statum, non conjunctum, sed confusum, vultis videri; ut etiam unius vestrum, id est, Epistola Potami, quae ad Orientem et Occidentem transmissa est, qua asserit, carne et spiritu Christi coagulatus per sanguinem Mariae, et in unum corpus redactus, passibilem Deum factum. Ideo ideo, ne quis illum ex eo crederet, quem impossiblism satis constat."—Liber Adv. Arianos, cap. 7. And again: "Non ergo est spiritus caro, nec caro spiritus, quod istu volunt egregii doctores, ut factus sit scilicet Dominus et Deus noster ex hac substantiarum permixtione passibilis. Ideo autem passibilis voluit dicri, ne ex impossible credatur." — Cap. 3. Matthew on Ἀρείου φιλοτεχνον τὸν ἀνελθέντα τῷ Σωτηρίῳ, τὴν δὲ ταύταις νόησις ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαθεῖ θεότητας ἀνάφεροντες ἀσέβεσιν. — S. ATHANAS. De Incarna. Dom. cont. Apol. lib. i. cap. 15. Of this St. Hilary is to be understood: "Sed eorum omnis hic sensus [est], ut opulentur memet mortis in Dei Filium incidisse, qui assent non de asternerit prolatum, neque de infinitate paternae substantiae exsistisse, sed ex nullo ilium qui omnia creavit effectum; ut assumptas ex nihil sit, et captus ex opere, et confirmatus ex tempor. Et Ideo in eos doloris anxietas, Ideo spiritus passio cum corporis passione."—Com. in Matt. cap. 31. Where clearly he argues against the Arians. The right understanding whereof is the only true way to reconcile those harsh sayings of his, which so troubled the Master of the Sentences, and the whole Schools ever since.

\textsuperscript{4} "Per indissolubilum unitatem Verbi et carnis, omnia quae carnis sunt ascribuntur et Verbo, quoniam et quod Verbi sunt prae dicatur in carne." — Oeca. in Epist. ad Rom. lib. i. cap. 1. "Día τὴν ἀκραὶ ὑπόστας τῆς το προσληψηθήσεις σαρκος, καὶ τὴς προσλαμβανής Θεότητος, ἀντιμεθίσταται τὰ ὅνωματα ὥστε καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τῆ
same individual person is by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man really and truly both God and man; it necessarily followeth that it is true to say God is man, and as true a man is God; because in this particular he which is man is God, and he which is God is man. Again, being by reason of the incarnation it is proper to say God is man, it followeth unavoidably that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the human nature may be spoken of God; otherwise there would be a man to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And being by virtue of the same incarnation it is also proper to say a man is God, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge that all the essential attributes of the divine nature may truly be spoken of that man; otherwise there would be one truly and properly God to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancy. Again, if the properties of the divine nature may be truly attributed to that man which is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And being the properties of the human nature may be also attributed to the eternal Son of God, those actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly possible and mortal; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly die. And this is the only true communication of properties.

19.—Not that the essential properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the divinity of Christ were possible and mortal, or his humanity of original omnipotence and omnipresence; but because the same God the Son was also the Son of man, he was at the same time both mortal and eternal: mortal, as the Son of man, in respect of his humanity; eternal, as the Son of God, in respect of his divinity. The sufferings, therefore, of the Messias were the sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the sufferings of his deity, as of which that was incapable, but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For although the human nature was conjoined to the divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the divine as little suffered as if it had not been conjoined; because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the person suffering is reconciled to the subject of his passion:

1 Called by the Schools ordinarily communicatio idiomatum; by the ancient Greek divines àπφδοςεις, and sometimes àπτιετα στασις.
for God the Son being not only God, but also man, suffered, though not in his deity, by reason of which he is truly God, yet in his humanity, by which he who is truly God is as truly man. And thus we conclude our two first disquisitions: who it was that suffered; in respect of his office, the Messias: in respect of his person, God the Son: how it was he suffered; not in his deity, which is impassible, but in his humanity, which he assumed clothed with our infirmities.

20.—Our next inquiry is, what this God the Son did suffer as the Son of man; not in the latitude of all his sufferings, but so far as they are comprehended in this article: which first prescindeth all the antecedent part by the expression of time under Pontius Pilate, who was not governor of Judaea long before our Saviour's baptism; and then takes off his concluding passion, by adding his crucifixion and his death. Looking, then, upon the sufferings of our Saviour in the time of his preaching the gospel, and especially before his death, we shall best understand them by considering them in relation to the subject or recipient of them. And being we have already showed his passion was wholly subjected in his human nature; being that nature consisteth of two parts, the soul and body; it will be necessary to declare what he suffered in the body, what in the soul.

21.—For the first, as we believe the Son of God took upon him the nature of man, of which the body is a part, so we acknowledge that he took a true and real body, so as to become flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. This body of Christ, really and truly human, was also frail and mortal, as being accompanied with all those natural properties which necessarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortal body; and though now the same body, exalted above the highest heavens, by virtue of its glorification be put beyond all possibility of passion, yet in the time of his humiliation it was clothed with no such glorious perfection; but as it was subject unto, so it felt, weariness, hunger, and thirst. Nor was it only liable to those internal weaknesses and natural infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impressions. As all our corporal pain consists in that sense which ariseth from the solution of that continuity which is connatural to the parts of our body, so no parts of his sacred body were injuriously violated by any outward impression, but he was truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from that violation. Deep was that sense and grievous was that pain which those scourges produced, when the ploughers ploughed upon his back and made long their furrows: the dilaceration of those nervous parts created a most sharp and dolorous sensation. The

1 Psalm cxix. 3.
coronary thorns did not only express the scorn of the imposers, by that figure into which they were contrived, but did also pierce his tender and sacred temples to a multiplicity of pains by their numerous acuminations. That spear directed by an impertinent malice which opened his side, though it brought forth water and blood, caused no dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead; but the nails which pierced his hands and feet made another kind of impression while it was yet alive and highly sensible. Thus did the body of the Son of man truly suffer the bitterness of corporal pains and torments inflicted by violent external impressions.

22.—And as our Saviour took upon him both parts of the nature of man, so he suffered in them both, that he might be a Saviour of the whole. In what sense the soul is capable of suffering, in that he was subject to animal passion. Evil apprehended to come tormented his soul with fear, which was as truly in him in respect of what he was to suffer, as hope in reference to the recompence of a reward to come after and for his sufferings. Evil apprehended as present tormented the same with sadness, sorrow, and anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented to us by the prophet as a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and the proper subject of that grief he hath fully expressed who alone felt it, saying unto his disciples, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.

23.—We ought not, therefore, to question whether he suffered in his soul or no, but rather to endeavour to reach, if it were possible, the knowledge how far and in what degree he suffered; how bitter that grief, how great that sorrow and anguish was. Which though we can never fully and exactly measure, yet we may infallibly know thus much, both from the expressions of the Spirit of God and from the occasion of his sufferings, that the griefs and sorrows which he felt, and the anguish which he underwent, were most incomparably far beyond all sorrows of which any person here was sensible or capable.

The evangelists have in such language expressed his agony, as cannot but raise in us the highest admiration at the bitterness of that passion. He began to be sorrowful, saith St. Matthew; He began to be sore amazed, saith St. Mark; and to be very heavy, say both: and yet these words in our translation come far short of the original expression, which render him suddenly, upon a present

1 "Cui suscepit animam, suscepit animae passione." — S. Ambros. De Fide, lib. ii. cap. 3. 2 Isai. lili. 3. 3 Matt. xxvi. 38. 4 Matt. xxvi. 37. 5 Mark xiv. 33. 6 The words in the original are three, ἀπεκρίσατο, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, and ἀδύνατον. ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, the first, is of a known and ordinary signification; but in this case it is to be raised to the highest degree of its possible
and immediate apprehension, possessed with fear, horror, and amazement, encompassed with grief and overwhelmed with sorrow, pressed down with consternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and disquietude of spirit.

This he first expressed to his disciples, saying, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful;* and, lest they should not fully apprehend the excess, adding, *even unto death;* as if the pangs of death had already encompassed him, and, as the Psalmist speaks, the pains of hell had got hold upon him. He went but a little farther before

significancy, as appears by the words which follow, *PeriΛυντος ἡστὶν ἡ ψυχή μου.* For, as the ancient grammarians observe, "II (peri) prótheis épistasan δηλοι: and again, "II (peri) prótheis λαμβανεται αυτί τῆς (upté) κατὰ λόγων ὑπερβέσεως και περιττόγγος: and therefore prókutoos of itself must signify a man possessed with an excessive grief; as in Ἀσχιλύς, περίβαον κρός, that is, according to the scholiast, περισσὸς βαρὸς. But beside this Greek notation, here is to be observed a reference to the words of David, Psalm xlii. 5: ἵστατι περίκυπτος εἰ, ἡ ψυχή μου; ὡς ἥν ἵναντι οδηγήσων So that it doth not only signify an excess of sorrow surrounding and encompassing the soul; but also such as brings a consternation and dejection of mind, bowing the soul under the pressure and burden of it. And if neither the notation of the word, nor the relation to that place in the Psalms, did express that sense, yet the following part of our Saviour's words would sufficiently evidence it: ὥς θανάτον, it was a sorrow which like the "pangs of death compassed" him, and like "the pains of hell gat hold upon" him. (Psalm cxvi. 3.) The second word, used by St. Mark alone, is ἐκσφεθεισά, which with the Vulgar Latin is paveire, but in the language of the Greeks bears a higher sense, Oμίδος σημαίνει τὴν ἐκπλήξιν, says Etymologus: and Ἑσυχιασμὸς, Thaúμα, μαρμάρινι, ἐκπλήξει. Gloss. Vt.: Θαῦμα, τοίῳ. Philoponus, preserved by Eustathius, Π. Μ.: οὕμορος µὲν ἡ ἐκπλῆξις: θαῦμα δὲ κατ' ἄδειαν τάχαν ὁ ἐκπληγείς. From whence the verb θαῦμαθεῖν, in termination active, in signification passive, perceiustum esse, in Homer, Π. Λ. 199: θαῦμαθεῖς ἢ Ἀχλείως, where it is the observation of Eustathius, ἃ ἐκσφε- θεισάν ἐνεργητικόν ἡ νεωτέρα χρήσις ὑπὸ ἔχει: θαυμαζόμενον γὰρ, καὶ θαυμάζομαι, καὶ τεθαυμάζω, φασίν οἰ μὲν Ῥαμοῖν: but not universally true. For "as to our purpose" we have both the use and sense of this word in the Old Testament. As 1 Samuel xiv. 15: ἵνα δολαρῇ Καὶ θαυμάθην ἡ γῆ "And the earth quaked," And, Psalm xviii. 5: Ἰλααὶ Αἰγύπτις, ἐκσφεθεῖσαν: Symmachus, eκπλήξησαν as, Psalm xxxi. 22: Ἔγις δὲ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκφάτωσιν μου Ἀγυπτία, τθαυμάζεσε, Symmachus, eκπλήξεις. The like is also in the passive termination: as Daniel expresses his fear in a vision ἔθαυμαθεῖσαι, καὶ πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσοφοι σου (Dan. viii. 17) and the wicked are described by the Wise Man, θαυμαζόμενος δεισικῶς, καὶ ἐδόθησαν ἐκσφεθήσομαι. (Sup. xvii. 3.) From whence it appeared that they comprehended a high degree of fear, horror, and amazement. Euth. Trp. rt: ἄφιε τε, ἀφεσε.—Gloss. Vt. And by the addition of the preposition ἐγ, the significatio is augmented. Ἑσυχ. ἔκσφεθαμος, ἐκπληκτος, passively: Ὠμῖος—θαυμάζων, καὶ ἐκσφεθάμοι, Dan. vii. 7, actively, that is, ἐκπληκτοῖς. Such an augmentation in this word is justifiable by that rule left us in Euth. ad II. E. ἡ (ἐγ) πρόθεσις οὗ μόνον τὴν ἐξος δηλοι σχέσιν, αλλά υπὸ καταλήξεις σημαίνει. Of which he gives an example in ἐκφοραῖς, used by Aristophanes in Πλάτω, though not named by him. And again, ad II. N.: ἡ (ἐγ) πρόθεσις ἐπίσταν δηλοι, ὅσιαν καὶ τὸ μάλιστα. Ἐκσφεθεισάθα therefore is μάλιστα ταμβεθεισάθα, "to be surprised with horror in the highest degree, even unto stupefaction." Ἐκσφεθαμοῖς, odstupere.—Gloss. Vt. The third word is ἄδομονες Vulg. Lat.: (überere, in St. Mark; in seint esse, in St. Matthew; but it hath yet a farther sense. ἄδομονι, ἄκηδοι, ἀγωνίω, says Hesychius, ἄδομον, τὸ λίαν λυπο- ταί.—Suidas. It significeth therefore grief and anguish in excess; as appeareth also by the origination of it. For, as Eustathius observes, ὄτι ἄδομοινειν πρωτότυπον ἄδομον Αὐτίκος, ὁ ἐκ λύπης ὡς οἷα καὶ τινὸς κύρος, ὃς ἄδος λέγεται, ἀναπτυξόμενον—Π. Λ. ἄδος, ἄδος, ἄδομον, from ἄδομον, ἄδομοιο. It hath therefore in it the signification of ἄδος or λύπη, "salyte," or "extremity." From whence it is ordinarily so expanded, as if it contained the consequence of the greatest fear or sorrow, that is, anxiety of mind, disquietude, and restlessnes. ἄδο- μονειν, ἀλειπνειν καὶ ἀπορεινειν, ὄχρεοι.—Etymol. As Antony is Antony, after the loss of eight thousand men, being in want of all things necessary for the rest, Kleopatráν perieµενεν, καὶ βραυδοῦνος ἄδομονειν ἂνα. Vit. Anton. cap. 51. So where the Heb. דַּבֵּנ יִבְּרָנ is by LXX. translated ἐκφάτωσιν, by Symmachus it is rendered ἄδομων ὑπεύγεις. (Eccles. vii. 16.)

1 Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 34.
2 Psalm cxvi. 3.
he expressed the same to his Father, falling on his face and praying, even with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death.\(^1\) Nor were his cries or tears sufficient evidences of his inward sufferings, nor could the sorrows of his breast be poured forth either at his lips or eyes; the innumerable pores of all his body must give a passage to more lively representations of the bitter anguish of his soul; and therefore while he prayed more earnestly, in that agony his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.\(^2\) As the Psalmist had before declared, I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels.\(^3\) The heart of our Saviour was as it were melted with fear and astonishment, and all the parts of his body at the same time inflamed with anguish and agony: well, then, might that melting produce a sweat, and that inflamed and rarefied blood force a passage through the numerous pores.

24.—And as the evangelists' expressions, so the occasion of the grief will manifest the height and bitterness thereof. For God laid on his own Son the iniquities of us all; \(^4\) and as we are obliged to be sorry for our particular sins, so was he grieved for the sins of us all. If, then, we consider the perfection and latitude of his knowledge; he understood all the sins of men for which he suffered, all the evil and the guilt, all the offence against the majesty, and ingratitude against the goodness, of God, which was contained in all those sins. If we look upon his absolute conformity to the will of God; he was inflamed with most ardent love, he was most zealous of his glory, and most studious to preserve that right which was so highly violated by those sins. If we look upon his relation to the sons of men; he loved them all far more than any did themselves, he knew those sins were of themselves sufficient to bring eternal destruction on their souls and bodies, he considered them whom he so much loved as lying under the wrath of God whom he so truly worshipped. If we reflect upon those graces which were without measure diffused through his soul, and caused him with the greatest habitual detestation to abhor all sin: if we consider all these circumstances, we cannot wonder at that grief and sorrow. For if the true contrition of one single sinner, bleeding under the sting of the law only for his own iniquities, all which notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterness of sorrow and remorse, what bounds can we set unto that grief, what measures to that anguish, which proceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so many millions of sinners?\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Heb. v. 7. 
\(^2\) Luke xxii. 44. 
\(^3\) Psalm xxii. 14. 
\(^4\) Isai. liii. 6.
Add unto all these present apprehensions the immediate hand of God pressing upon him all this load, laying on his shoulders at once an heap of all the sorrows which can happen unto any of the saints of God, that he, being touched with the feeling of our infirmities, might become a merciful High-priest, able and willing to succour them that are tempted. 1 Thus may we behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto that sorrow which was done unto him, where-with the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce anger. 2 And from hence we may and must conclude that the Saviour of man, as he took the whole nature of man, so he suffered in whatsoever he took: in his body, by internal infirmities and external injuries; in his soul, by fears and sorrows, by unknown and inexpressible anguishes. Which shows us fully (if it can be shown) the third particular propounded, what our Saviour suffered.

25 a.—That our Saviour did thus suffer, is most necessary to believe. First, that thereby we may be assured of the verity of his human nature. For if he were not man, then could not man be redeemed by him; and if that nature in which he appeared were not truly human, then could he not be truly man. But we may be well assured that he took on him our nature when we see him subject unto our infirmities. We know the Godhead is of infinite perfection, and therefore is exalted far above all possibility of molestation. When, therefore, we see our Saviour truly suffer, we know his divine essence suffered not, and thence acknowledge the addition of his human nature as the proper subject of his passion. And from hence we may infallibly conclude, surely that mediator between God and man was truly man, as we are men, who when he fasted was an hungry, when he travelled was thirsty and weary as we are, who being grieved wept, being in an agony sweat, being scourged bled, and being crucified died.

b.—Secondly, it was necessary Christ should suffer for the redemption of lapsed men, and their reconciliation unto God; which was not otherwise to be performed than by a plenary satisfaction to his will. He, therefore, was by all his sufferings made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our sins. For salvation is impossible unto sinners without remission of sin, and remission in the decree of God impossible without effusion of blood. Our redemption, therefore, could not be wrought but by the blood of the Redeemer, but by a Lamb slain, but by a suffering Saviour.

c.—Thirdly, it behoved Christ to suffer, that he might purchase thereby eternal happiness in the heavens both for himself the head, and for the members of his body. He drank of the brook in the way, therefore hath he lift up his head. 3 Ought not Christ to

---

1 Heb. iv. 15; ii. 17, 18
2 Lam. i. 12.
3 Psalm cx. 7.
And doth he not, by the same right by which he entered into it, confer that glory upon us? The recompence of the reward was set before him, and through an intuion of it he cheerfully underwent whatsoever was laid upon him. He must therefore necessarily suffer to obtain that happiness, who is therefore happy because he suffered.

d.—Fourthly, it was necessary Christ should suffer, that we might be assured that he is truly affected with a most tender compassion of our afflictions. For this end was he subjected to misery, that he might become prone unto mercy: for this purpose was he made a sacrifice, that he might be a compassionate High-priest, and therefore was he most unmerciful to himself, that he might be most merciful unto us.

e.—Fifthly, it was necessary the Son of man should suffer, thereby to show us that we are to suffer, and to teach us how we are to suffer. For if these things were done to the green tree, what shall be done to the dry? Nay, if God spared not his natural, his eternal, his only-begotten Son, how shall he spare his adopted sons, who are best known to be children because they are chastised, and appear to be in his paternal affection because they lie under his fatherly correction? We are therefore heirs only because coheirs with Christ; and we shall be kings only because we shall reign together with him. It is a certain and infallible consequence, If Christ be risen, then shall we also rise; and we must look for as strong a coherence in this other, If Christ hath suffered then must we expect to suffer. And as he taught the necessity of, so he left us the direction in, our sufferings. Great was the example of Job, but far short of absolute perfection: the pattern beyond all exception is alone our Saviour, who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable humility, perfect patience, and absolute submission unto the will of God.

26.—And now we may perceive the full importance of this part of the article, and every Christian may thereby understand what he is to believe, and what he is conceived to profess, when he makes this confession of his faith, He suffered. For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much: I am really persuaded within myself, and do make a sincere profession of this as a most necessary, certain, and infallible truth, That the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father and of the same essence with the Father, did for the redemption of mankind really and truly suffer; not in his divinity, which was impassible, but in his humanity, which in the days of his humiliation was subject unto our infirmities: That as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so he was a com

plete sufferer in the whole; in his body, by such dolorous infirmities as arise internally from human frailties, and by such pains as are inflicted by external injuries; in his soul, by fearful apprehensions, by unknown sorrows, by anguish unexpressible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour suffered.

---------------------------------

CHAPTER II.

Under Pontius Pilate.

1.—AFTER: the substance of this part of the article, consisting in our Saviour's passion, He suffered, followeth the circumstance of time, declared by the present governor, under Pontius Pilate. Which, though the name of a stranger to the commonwealth of Israel and the church of Christ, is well preserved to eternal memory in the sacred articles of our CREED. For as the Son of God by his determinate counsel was sent into the world to die in the fulness of time, so it concerns the church to be assured of the time in which he died. And because the ancient custom of the world was to make their computations by their governors, and refer their historical relations to the respective times of their government, therefore, that we might be properly assured of the actions of our Saviour which he did, and of his sufferings (that is, the actions which others did to him), the present governor is named in that form of speech which is proper to such historical or chronological narrations, when we affirm that he suffered under Pontius Pilate.1

1 'Επὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου. Which words are capable of a double construction. First, as they are used by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 13: 'Ισραήλ, τοῦ μαρτυρεσάντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, "Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession:" that is, standing before him as before a judge. As of the same person, Matt. xxvii. 14: Καὶ ἐὰν ἀκοουθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, "If this come to be tried before the procurator." Thus Festus propounded it to St. Paul, Acts xxv. 9: Θελεῖς — κρίνεσθαι ἐν ' ἐμοὶ; and St. Paul answered in the same propriety of speech, 'Επὶ τοῦ βηθατος Καίσαρος ἐστώς εἰμι. Τὁς Χριστὸς tells his apostles, Mark xiii. 9: Ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσετε. And in this sense ἐπὶ is often used by the Greeks. Secondly, Ἐπὶ Πιλάτου is "under Pilate," that is, in the time of his government, when and while he was procurator of Judea: as, ἐν ἀρχιερέων Ἀρνω καὶ Καῖφα, (Luke iii. 2) and, ἐπὶ Ἀβαδὰρ τοῦ ἀρχιερεῖος. (Mark ii. 26.) Which is also according to the custom and language of the Greeks: as, Κατακλυσμὸς ἐπὶ Δακαλίων ἦγενατο.—Marm. Arundel. Οὔτοι ἦσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ Δαυμέδαντος ἐξαναστάν τῶν Τρώων.—ΠΛΑΤΩΝ Ἐπίστ. ad Architaum. And, ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεύοντος, "in this king's reign," is the common phrase of Pausanias. Thus the Athenians among their time ἄρχοντας had one who was called ἐφώνυμος, because his name was used for the denomination of that year; and the phrase was usually, ἐπὶ τοῦ δείμα, or ἐπὶ τοῦ δείμα ἄρχοντος, as I find it thrice in one place: ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Ἰσοκράτης) ἐπὶ Δυσημαχοῦ, ΠΛΑΤΩΝ δὲ ἐπὶ 'Αμενίου γέγονεν, ἐδ' οὐ Περικλῆς ἐτελεύτησεν. — Dio. Lib. iv. in Platone. In the same manner did the
2.—And because he not only suffered under him as the present governor, but also was arraigned and condemned by him as a judge; therefore it will be necessary, for the illustration of the manner and confirmation of the truth of our Saviour’s sufferings, to declare what hath been left and derived to our knowledge both concerning his person and his office.

For the first, we find him described by two names; nor is any other name of his extant, although, according to the general custom of the Romans, he should have three. The first of these two is Pontius, the name descended to him from the original of his family, which was very ancient; the second Pilatus, as a cognominal addition distinguishing from the rest descending from the same original.

Laedagonians make their historical accounts by their ephor, and the Argivi by the priestesses of Juno: "Επί Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἀργεί τότε πεντήκοντα δύον ἄταν ἡ τερματική, καὶ Αὐγισθίου ἐφοροῦ ἐν Ἁρρήν, καὶ Ποδοδάρων ἐτί διὸ μίμης ἄρχοντος Ληθείας."—Thucyd. lib. ii. cap. 2. And as the Greeks thus referred all actions to the times of these governors, so did the Jews under the Roman government to the procurators of Judea; as appeareth by Josephus, who, mentioning the first of that office, Cocconius, presently relates the insurrection of Judas Galilaeus in this manner: "Επί τούτου (Κωτωνίου) τῆς ἀνήρ Γαλαλαίας, Ιουδαίων νομίμων, εἰς ἀπόστασιν εὑρήκειν τοὺς ἄνωτρους.—De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 12; then names his successor Ambivius ἐφ’ οὗ Σαλωμίν τὴν καταλήψει: after him Rufus, Εὑρ’ ὕπ’ ἐκ τελευταίας Καίσαρος.—Antiq. Jud. lib. xviii. cap. 3. And in the same manner in the Creed, ἀπὸ Πύτου ἡ Πιλατά, our Saviour "suffered under Pontius Pilate;" that is, at the time when he was procurator of Judea; as Ignatius fully, ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Πυτῶν Πιλατῶν. —Epist. ad Magnesios. 1

1 Pausanias, speaking of the Romans, [saith,] Τρίπο ὡστό ἡ διάγεια, καὶ ἐτί πλέον ὄντων ἐκάκτω ἐτέντα.—Achae. cap. 7. And although Pindar’s and Plutarch have observed, that even among the Romans there were some εἵμαρ, yet the praenomen was never omitted, as Priscian affirmed: "Ex illo tempore consacrato tenuit, ut nemo Romanus sit absque praenomine."—Lib. ii.

2 Pontius and Pilatus were his nomen and cognomen, in the same manner as Julius and Caesar are described by Suetonius: "Non Cesar et Bibulo, sed Julio et Cesar, Coz., actum scriberent, his eundem praenomina, nominis est cognomine."—Lib. i. cap. 20. Thus without a praenomen or cognomen, he is only known to us by his nomen properly called, and his cognomen. The nature of which two is thus described by the ancients: "Nomen proprium est gentilitium, id est, quod origine gentis vel familiae declarat, ut Portius, Cornelius; cognomen est quod uniuscujusque proprium, et nominibus gentililis subjungitur, ut Cato, Scipio."—Dion. De Orat. lib. i. "Nomen, quod familiae origine declarat, ut Cornelius; cognomen, quod nominis subjungitur, ut Scipio."—Cic. lib. ii. The first of these Dionysius calls τὸ συγγενικὸν καὶ πατρωμυλίκον, Plutarch, οἰκίας ἡ γένους κοινων, and καὶνὸν ἀπὸ συγγενειας the second he calls πρωτογερικον ἐς ἑπτάθον. Thus Pontius was his nomen gentilis, and Pilatus his cognomen. As therefore Pontius Agila, Pontius Cominius, Pontius Herennius, Pontius Paulinus, &c., so also Pontius Pilatus. Wherefore in vain have some of the ancients endeavoured to give an etymology of these names, as they do of Greek and Hebrew names in the scripture, and think thereby to express the nature or actions of them that bare the names. As Isidorus Hispalensis, (Orig. lib. vii. cap. 10: "Pontius, declinans consilium, utique Judeorum; accepta enim aqua lavit manus suas, dicens, Innocens ego sum a sanguine hujus justi.") And Eutychius patriarch of Alexandria deduced Pontius from an island called Ponta, near to Rome. And St. Jerome: "Quod significat nomen Pilati, id est, Malleatoris, id est, qui domat ferreas gentes."—Ad Matt. ex. "Pilatus, Os Malleatoris; quia dum Christum ore suo et justificat et condemnat, more malleatoris utrinque ferit."—Isidor. ibid. "Pontius, declinans consilium; Pilatus, Os malleatoris."

—S. Hieron. De Nom. Hebraicis, in Luca, et versus in Actis. Where he lets us understand that these etymologies were made from the Hebrew language; and makes an excuse, because the letter P is here taken for the Hebrew ב, to which the Latin L more properly answers; "Sed sciemus est quod apud Hebraeos P litera non habetur, nec ullum nomen est quod hoc elementum solnet: abusive litigat accliplenda, quasi per F literam scripta sit." Thus did they vainly strive to find an Hebrew original, and that such an one as should represent
3.—He was by birth a Roman, by degree of the equestrian order, sent by Tiberius, the emperor, to be a governor of Judaea. For about three score years before our Saviour’s birth the Jews by Pompey the Great were made tributary to the Romans. And although during the life of Hyrcanus, the high-priest, the reign of Herod and his son Archelaus, the Roman state suffered the Jews to be ruled by their own laws and governors; yet when Archelaus was banished by Augustus, they received their governors from the Roman emperor, being made a part of the province of Syria belonging to his care.¹ In the life of Augustus there was a succession of three, Coponius, Ambivius, and Rufus. At the beginning of the reign of Tiberius they were governed by Valerius Gracchus, and at his departure by Pontius Pilate.

4.—The office which this Pilate bare was the procuratorship of Judæa, as is most evident out of the history both of the Romans, from whom he received his authority, and of the Jews, over whom he exercised his dominion.² But what was the office of a procurator in those times,³ though necessary for our present purpose,
Under Pontius Pilate.

is not so easy to determine, because it was but newly introduced into the Roman government. For before the dominion of that city was changed from a commonwealth into an empire, there was no such public office in any of the provinces, and particularly in Judaea none till after the banishment of Archelaus, some years after our Saviour's birth. When Augustus divided the provinces of the empire into two parts, one of which he kept for his own care and left the other to the inspection of the senate, he sent, together with the president of each province, as the governor in chief of the province, a procurator, whose office was to take an account of all the tribute, and whatsoever was due to the emperor, and to order and dispose of the same for his advantage. Neither was there at the first institution of this office any other act belonging properly to their jurisdiction but such a care and disposal of the imperial revenue, which they exercised as inferior and subordinate to the president, always supreme provincial officer.

5.—Now Judaea being made part of the province of Syria, and consequently under the care of the president of that province, according to this institution a particular procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the emperor's revenue. And because the nation of the Jews were always suspected of a rebellious disposition against the Roman state, and the president of Syria, who had the power of the sword, was forced to attend upon the other parts of his province, therefore the procurator of Judaea was furnished with power of life and death,¹ and so administered all the

the Romans he is a procurator which undertakes to manage the business of another man. "Procurator si negotium suscipiit," saith Asconius in Divinat.; and Sex. Pompeius, lib. iii.: "Procurator absens nomine actor fit;" he to whom the care of another man's estate or affairs was committed. 'Etvolē, commissum, et étvoleis, procurator.—Gloss. Vet. In correspondence to these procurators of the affairs and estates of private persons, there were made such as did take care in every province of the imperial revenue; who, in respect of the person whom they served, were called procuratores (Caesaris or Augustales; in respect of the countries where they served, were termed procuratores provinciales. Their office is best described by Dion, Hist. lib. liii. cap. 15: Τοὺς ἐπιτρόπους, οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς τος τας κοινὰς προσόδους ἐκλέγοντας, καὶ προστεταγμένα σφίςαν αναλίκοντας, ἄνωμαζεν. "We call," says he, "those ἐπιτρόπους," that is, procuratores, "which receive the public revenues, and dispose of them according to the commands received from the emperor." For they acted in his name, and what was done by them was accounted as done by the emperor himself. "Quae acta gesta sunt a procuratore Cesarii, sic ab eo comprobari ac si a Cessare gesta essent."—ULPIAN, lib. i. ff. As we read in Tacitus of the emperor Claudius: "Seipius auditata vox principis, parum vms rerum habendam a procuratoribus suis judicataram, ac si ipse statuisset."—ANNAI, lib. xil. cap. 60. And in Suetonius: "Ut rata essent que procuratores sui in judicando statuissent, a senatu precario exigit."—Lib. v, cap. 12. The proper office therefore of the provincial procurator was, to receive the imperial revenue, and dispose of it as the emperor commanded, and to all intents and purposes to do such things as were necessary thereunto, with such authority as if the emperor himself had done them.

¹ This appeareth by Coponius, the first procurator of Judaea, who was brought in by Quirinus, procurator of Syria, when he came to dispose of the goods of Archelaus, and to reduce Judaea into the form of a province, and adjust it to Syria. Of this Coponius, Josephus writeth after this manner: Καπωνίου τε ἐν οὕτω (Κυρρίνιο) συγκαταπέμ- πετας τάγματος τον ιωάνα ζησάμινον
power of the president, which was, as to the Jews, supreme. Which
is very observable, as an eminent act of the providence of God, by
which the full power of judicature in Judæa was left in the hands
of the resident procurator.

6.—For by this means it came to pass that Christ, who by the
determinate counsel of God was to die, and by the prediction of
the prophets was to suffer in a manner not prescribed by the
law of Moses, should be delivered up to a foreign power, and to
suffer death after the customs of that nation to whose power he
was delivered. The malice of the obstinate Jew was high to accuse
and prosecute him, but the power of the Jews was not so high as
judicially to condemn him. For although the chief priests and
the elders and the scribes condemned him guilty of death, yet they
could not condemn him to die, or pronounce the sentence of death
upon him, but delivered him up unto Pilate:¹ and when he refusing
said unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law;
they immediately returned, It is not lawful for us to put any man
to death.² The power of life and death was not in any court of the
Jews, but in the Roman governor alone as supreme, and therefore
they answered him, it was not lawful;³ not in respect of the law

¹ tounaçov τὴν ἐπὶ πάσιν ἐξουσίαν: "That,
being of the equestrian order, he was sent
with Quirinus to govern the Jews with the
cap. 1. And yet more expressly as to the
time, occasion, and extent of his power: Τής
de Ἀρχελαύν χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγρα-
φείσας, ἐπίτροπες τις ἑπικής παρὰ Ῥω-
μαίους τάξεως, Κωπώνιος πεμπτευ, μέχρι
tου κτεινεὶ λαβων παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐξου-
σίαν.—Idem, De Bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 11.
"When those parts which were under the
command of Archelaus were reduced into a
province, Coponius was sent thither by the
emperor, and furnished with power of life
and death." For although in the proconsular
provinces the procurator of the emperor had
no power but in those things which belonged
to the exchequer, yet in those provinces
which were properly præsidales, the procu-
ratore was often loco præsidis. From whence
in the ancient inscriptions we read of the
same person, procurator et præses Aflipum,
procurator et præses provinciarum per Ori-
centum, procurator et præses provincie Sar-
diniae. It was often therefore so, that
the procurator did præsidis partibus fungit; as
Aflipum: "In provinciam enim præsidum
provinciarum, nec alter procuratororum Casarisi
hæc cognitio injungitur, quam præsidis part-
tibus in provincia fungitur."—Lib. viii. De
Officio Proconsul. And this is very neces-
sary to be observed, because a procurator
barely such, not armed with the power of
the præses provinciae, had not the power of
the sword. —As Antoninus to Valerius:
"Procurator mens, qui vice præsidis non
fungebatur, exiliit tibi prænem non potuit
irrogare."—Lib. ix. Cod. de Pontis. And
to Heliodorus: "Procurator mens, qui vice
præsidis provinciae non fungitur, scier exi-
gere prænem desertæ accusationis non potest,
it judicare ut ea inferatur sententia sua
non potest."—Lib. iii. Cod. "Ubi cause." This
was plain in the case of Lucilius Capito, procurator of Asia Minor, who
was called in question for exceeding his power, and deserted therein by Tiberius: "Pro-
curator Asiae Lucilius Capito, accusante pro-
vincia, causam dixit, magna cum adeve-
ratone principis, non se jus nisi in servitia
et pecunias familiares dedisse; quod si vim
pratoris usurpasset, manubrique militum
usus foret, spreta in co mandata sua, audin-
rent socios."—Tacl. Annal. lib. iv. cap. 15.
And Dio, upon the said example, observes in general, that the procurators
had no such power: Οὐ γὰρ ἔδω τοις τα
ἀυτοκρατορικὰ χρήματα διοικουσί πλεῖον
οὐδὲν ποιεῖ, ἤ τὰς νομισματικὰς προσδοκίας
ἐκλέγει καὶ πέρι τῶν διαφορῶν ἐν γε
τῇ ἐξήγερσι καὶ κατὰ τοὺς τόμους εἰς ἡν τοῖς
ἰδιωτῶν δικαίωσιν.—Hist. lib. lvi. cap. 23.
But although the ordinary procurators had
no other power but to dispose of the revenue,
and determine private causes; yet he which
was vice præsidis had the power of the
præses: and such a procurator was Pontius
Pilate in Judea, as the others who preceded
him also were. ¹ Mark xiv. 64; xx. 1.
² John xviii. 30, 31.
³ I say, Therefore the Jews answered
that it was not lawful for them to put any
man to death, because that power was taken
of Moses, which gave them both sufficient power and absolute command to punish divers offenders with death, but in relation to the Roman empire, which had taken all that dominion from them. Forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews themselves acknowledge that they lost their power, which is sufficient to show that they had it not when our Saviour suffered; and it is as true that they lost it twenty years before, at the relegation of Archelaus, and the coming of Coponius, the procurator, with full power of life and death. Wherefore our Saviour was delivered unto Pilate as the supreme judge over the nation of the Jews, that he might pronounce the sentence of death upon him.

7.—But how this judge could be persuaded to an act of so much injustice and impiety, is not yet easy to be seen. The numerous controversies of the religion of the Jews did not concern the Roman governors, nor were they moved with the frequent quarrels arising from the different sects. Pilate knew well it was for envy that the chief priests delivered him; and when he had examined him, he found no fault touching those things whereof they accused him. Three times did he challenge the nation of the Jews, Why? what evil hath he done? three times did he make that clear profession, I have found no cause of death in him. His own wife, admonished in a dream, sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man; and when he heard that he made himself the Son of God, he was more afraid and yet, notwithstanding these apprehensions and professions, he condemned and crucified him.

8.—Here we must look upon the nature and disposition of Pilate, which inclined and betrayed him to so foul an act. He was a man of an high, rough, untractable, and irreconcilable spirit, as he is described by the Jews, and appeareth from the beginning of his government, when he brought the bucklers stamped with the pictures of Caesar into Jerusalem (which was an abomination to the Jews), and could neither be moved by the blood of many, nor persuaded by the most humble applications and submit intreaties of the whole nation, to remove them, till he received a sharp reprehension and severe command from the emperor out of their hands. For although St. Augustin think they thought it not lawful in respect of the passover: "Inteligendum est eos dixisse, non sibi licere interficere quernquam, proper dicti festi sanctitatem, quem celebrate iam expectant:" Tract. 14 in Joan.; and St. Cyril be of the same opinion; yet others of the ancients deliver the true cause why they applied themselves to Pilate, to be their want of power; as Ammonius most expressly: Τίνος ἐκεῖνον αὐτῷ οὐκ ἀνέλειν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν Πιλάτου ἱγανόν; Μάλιστα μὲν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ὑπετέμενο, λοιπὸν ὑπὸ Ἐρωμαίων τῶν πραγμάτων κειμένων: and upon those words in St. John: 'Ος ἐκπέσοντες τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἦταν γὰρ ὑπὸ Ἐρωμαίων, εἶτον τούτῳ. So Theophylact: Ἀγούσιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ προηρατόν, ὥστε γὰρ εἴχεν αὐτοί. Ἐξουσίαν ἀνέλειν, ἀτε τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὸ Ἐρωμαίων κείμενων.—Com. in Joan. xxvii. 18. And, before him, St. Chrysostom. — 1 Matt. xxvii. 12. 2 Luke xxvii. 14. 3 Verse 22. 4 Matt. xxvii. 19. 5 John xix. 7, 8. 6 So Philo testifieth of him: 'Ἡν γὰρ τὴν φυσιν ἀκαιμής, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ αὐθαίδεου ἀμει
Tiberius. After that he seized on the Corban, that sacred treasury, and spent it upon an aqueduct; nor could all their religious and importunate petitions divert his intentions, but his resolution went through their blood to bring it in water. When the Galilaeans came up to Jerusalem to worship God at his own temple, he mingled their blood with their sacrifices. 1 Add this to the untractable and irreconcilable spirit, by which he had so often exasperated the Jews, an avaricious and rapacious disposition, which prompted him as much to please them, and we may easily perceive what moved him to condemn that person to death whom he declared innocent. The evangelist telleth us that Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus to be crucified. 2 They accused him at Rome for all the insolencies and rapines which he had committed, and by this act he thought to pacify them. 3

9.—It was thus necessary to express the person under whom our Saviour suffered, first, that we might for ever be assured of the time in which he suffered. 4 The enemies of Christianity began first to unsettle the time of his passion, that thereby they might at last deny the passion itself, and the rest of their falsehood was detected by the discovery of their false chronology. 5 Some fixed it to the seventh year of the reign of Tiberius: 6 whereas it is certain Pontius Pilate was not then procurator in Judea, and as certain that our Saviour was baptized eight years after, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar. 7 Some of the Jews, lest the destruction of Jerusalem might seem to follow upon and for our Saviour’s crucifixion, have removed it near threescore and more years.

1 Luke xii. 1. 2 Mark xv. 15.
3 For that which is observed by Philo upon the dedication of the shields at the first entrance into his government, must needs be much more true at this time of our Saviour’s passion, when he had committed so many more insolencies; namely, that he feared the Jews should complain of him to Tiberius. Telo teluetaion touto maliosta auton exeprarchun kateiastisa μη τη ωνι πρεσβευταικαι και της άλλης αυτον επιτροπης εξελεγωσι τας ωδοφοκιας, τας οθρειας, τας άρπαγας, τας αικιας, τας επιτειριας, τους ακριτους και επαλληλους φονους, την ανιμιτον και αργαλεωτην γνωσηται xexelaivgetes. De Legat. ad Caian.
4 “Cautissime qui Symbolum tradierunt, etiam tempus, quo haec sub Pontio Pilato gesta sunt, designarunt, ne ex aliqua parte veult vaga et incerta gestorum traditione vacillaret.”—Reffin. In Symb. “Credimus itaque in euum qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus. Addendum enim erat judicis nomen propter temporum cognitionem.”—S. Augustin. De Fide et Symb. cap. 5.

Pilatus judex erat in illo tempore ab imperatore positus in Judea, sub quo Dominus passus est; curum mecum ad temporis significationem, non ad personae illius pertinent dignitatem.”—Serm. 131 de Temp. Ireneus, speaking of St. Paul: “Evangelizat Patrum Dei Christum Jesum, qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est.”—Liber v. caput 12. And to make the more certain character of time, Ignatius added to the name of Pilate that of Herod: ‘Aληθως επι Πωνιον Πιλατου και Πρασων του τετραγου καθηλωνεσθην υπερ ημων εν σαρκι.”—Epist. ad Smyrn.
5 So Eusebius detected some of those which lived not long before him: Ουκουν σαφως απεληγεγρατο τα πλασμα των κατα του Σωτηρος ημων υπομνηματα χθες και πρων διεξεωκοιν, εν ποτε πρωτος αυτος της παραγωγιος των πεπλακατων ολεθρεν γε το υβιδον. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9.
6 Επτ’ ετος της τεταρτης δ’ ον υπατειας Τιμεριου, η γεγονεν ετους εβδομον της βασιλειας αυτου, τα περι του σωτηρος αυτον παθος τολμηθηται περιεχει καθ δε δεικνυται χρονον, μηδε επιστατο πω τη Ιουδαια Πιλατος.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9.
7 Luke iii. 1.
backward yet, placing his death in the beginning of Herod’s reign, who was not born till toward the death of the same king. Others have removed it farther yet near twenty years, and so vainly tell us how he died under Aristobulus, above fifty years before his birth in Bethlehem. This they do teach their proselytes, to this end, that they may not believe so much as the least historical part of the blessed evangelists. As, therefore, they deny the time of our Saviour’s passion, in design to destroy his doctrine, so, that we might establish the substance of the gospel depending on his death, it was necessary we should retain a perfect remembrance of the time in which he died. Nor need we be ashamed that the Christian religion, which we profess, should have so known an epocha, and so late an original. Christ came not into the world in the beginning of it, but in the fulness of time.

Secondly, it was thought necessary to include the name of Pilate in our Creed, as of one who gave a most powerful external testimony to the certainty of our Saviour’s death, and the innocency of his life. He did not only profess, to the condemnation of the Jews, that he found nothing worthy of death in Christ, but left the same written to the Gentiles of the Roman empire. Two ways he is related to have given most ample testimony to the truth: first by an express written to Tiberius, and by him presented to the senate; secondly, by records written in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his government.

1 Divers of the Jews place the passion of Christ in the year of their account 3724, which is sixty-nine years before our common account of the year in which he truly suffered. This invention of their own, grounded upon no foundation, and backed with not so much as the least probability, they deliver as a tradition among them, continued in this rhythm—
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that is,—

1. In the year 3724 he of Nazareth was taken, And in the year 532 he was crucified on a tree.

Not that they thought him taken in one year, and crucified in another; but these two unequal numbers signify the same year; the lesser number being a period of years which seven times numbered equalleth the greater. So that their meaning is, that, after seven periods consisting of 532 years, in the year of the world 3724, Jesus of Nazareth was crucified.

2 Others of the Jews pretend another account, namely, that Jesus was born in the year 3671, which was the fourth of Jannaus, and crucified in the year 3707, which was the third of Aristobulus; making him the disciple of R. Josuah the son of Peracliah, according to that usual phrase of theirs;

כבר יוסי ב פריכיה ירדהו ל׳א

Vide Sepher Tuschacin.

3 Gal. iv. 4.

4 "Nota quod in Pilato et uxore ejus, justum Dominum confitentibus, Gentiles populi testimonium est."—S. Hieronymus in Matt. xxvii.

5 That Pontius Pilate wrote unto Tiberius of the death and resurrection of our Saviour is testified by Tertullian, who was best acquainted with the Roman history: "Ex omnibus super Christo Pilatus, a ipso jam pro sua conscionae Christianus, Cassare tune Tiberio nuncivat."—Apolog. cap. 21. And again: "Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nominem Christianum in seculum introivit, annunciat sibi ex Syria Palæstina, quae veritatem illius (Christi) Divinitatis revelament, dutulit ad senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui."—Ibid. cap. 5. This is related by Eusebius out of Tertullian in his Ecclesiastical History, lib. ii. cap. 2, and referred to the two-and-twentieth year of Tiberius in his Chronicon: "Pilato de Christianorum dogmate ad Tiberium referente, Tiberius retulit ad senatum, ut inter cateca sacra reciperetur." The authority of this express is gravitated.
Thirdly, it behoved us to take notice of the Roman governor in the expression of our Saviour's passion, that thereby we might understand how it came to pass that Christ should suffer according to the scriptures. The prophets had foretold his death, but after such a manner as was not to be performed by the Jews, according to whose law and custom no man amongst them ever did so. Being then so great a prophet could not die but in Jerusalem, being the death he was to suffer was not agreeable to the laws and customs of the Jews: it was necessary a Roman governor should condemn him, that so the counsel of the will of God might be fulfilled, by the malice of the one and the customs of the other.

10.—And now the advantage of this discovery is discovered, every one may express the importance of it in this manner. I am fully persuaded of this truth, as beyond all possibility of contradiction, that in the fulness of time God sent his Son, and that the eternal Son of God so sent by him did suffer for the sins of men, after the fifteenth year of Tiberius, the Roman emperor, and before his death, in the time of Pontius Pilate, the Cæsarean procurator of Judæa, who, to please the nation of the Jews, did con-
demn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him, according to the custom of that empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the prophecies, to die a painful and shameful death upon the cross. And thus I believe in Christ that suffered under Pontius Pilate.

CHAPTER III.

Was Crucified.

1.—FROM the general consideration of our Saviour’s passion, we proceed to the most remarkable particular, his crucifixion, standing between his passion, which it concludeth, and his death, which it introduceth. For the explanation whereof it will be necessary, first, to prove that the promised Messiah was to be crucified, that he which was designed to die for our sins was to suffer upon the cross; secondly, to show that our Jesus, whom we worship, was certainly and truly crucified, and did suffer whatsoever was foretold upon the cross; thirdly, to discover what is the nature of crucifixion, what peculiarities of suffering are contained in dying on the cross.

2.—That the Messiah was to be crucified, appeareth both by types which did apparently foreshow it and by prophecies which did plainly foretel it. For though all those representations and predictions which the forward zeal of some ancient fathers gathered out of the law and the prophets cannot be said to signify

---

1 The ancient fathers, following the steps of the apostles, to prove all the particulars of our Saviour’s death out of the Old Testament, have made use of those types and prophecies which did really and truly foreshow it; but together with them, partly out of their own conceptions, partly out of too much credit to the translations, have urged those places which the Jews may most easily evade, and we can produce but with small or no pretence. As for the extending of the hands of Moses, they conceive it to be a perfect type; and Barnabas tells us the Spirit commanded Moses that he should make the similitude of a cross: ὅτε δέ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Μωσῆς τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸῦτον σταυρόν καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν. —BARNABE, Epist. cap. 12. But the text assures us no more than that Moses held up his hand, which might be without any similitude of a cross; and when both were lifted up by Aaron and Hur, the representation is not certain. And yet, after Barnabas, Justin tells us that Moses represented the cross, τὰς χεῖρας ἑκατέρως ἐκπέτασα — Dial. c. 318

Tryph. § 90. And Tertullian calls it “habitum crucis.” Ado. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 13. In the same manner with the strange Indian statue, which is described by Bardians as ἀνδρίας ἐστών ὀρθός, ἑκὼν τὰς χεῖρας ἡπλωμένας ἐν τῶν σταυρῶν.—PORPHYRIUS De Styge. With less probability did they gather both the name of Jesus, and the cross of Christ, from the three hundred and eighteene servants of Abraham. 'Ἰωρὰ δεκα, ἷτα δεκα, ἵτε ἴησον' ἐτι δὲ σταυρός ἐν τῷ Τ. ἐμαλλὰν ἤκιν ἐν τῷ χρίστος, λέγει γάρ τους τριακοσίοντις διόλοις οὐν τὸν μὲν ἴησον ἐν τοῖς δυντι γράμμασι, καὶ ἐν τίνι τῶν σταυρῶν. —BARNABE Epistol. cap. 9. As if III stood for Jesus, and T for the cross. And yet Clemens Alexanderinus follows him: Φασίν οὖν εἶναι τοῦ μὲν Κυνικοῦ στημείου τύπων κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ τριακοσίοντος στοιχεῖον τὸ δὲ Ἰωρὰ καὶ τὸ Ἱωρὰ τούτοις στημάτιοι τὸ σωτῆρος.—Strom. lib. vi. As also St. Ambrose: “Nam et Abraham 318 duxit ad bellum, et ex innumeris trophiana hostibus repertavit, signoque Dominici crucis et nominis,” &c.—Profl. ad lib. i. De Fide. “Ex
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so much, yet in many types was the crucifixion of Christ represented, and by some prophesies foretold. This was the true and unremovable stumbling-block to the Jews;¹ nor could they ever be brought to confess the Messias should die that death upon a tree to which the curse of the law belonged:² and yet we need no other oracles than such as are committed to those Jews to prove that Christ was so to suffer.

3.—A clearer type can scarce be conceived of the Saviour of the world, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed, than Isaac was; nor can God the Father, who gave his only-begotten Son, be better expressed than by that patriarch in his readiness to sacrifice his son, his only son Isaac, whom he loved.³ Now when that grand act of obedience was to be performed, we find Isaac walking to the mountain of Moriah with the wood on his shoulders, and saying, Here is the wood, but where is the sacrifice?⁴ while in the command of God, and the intention and resolution of Abraham, Isaac is the sacrifice who bears the wood. And the Christ, who was to be the most perfect sacrifice, the person in whom all nations were perfectly to be blessed, could die no other death in which the wood was to be carried; and being to die upon the cross was, by the formal custom used in that kind of death,⁵ certainly to carry

¹ Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue with Justin Martyr, when he had confessed many of the Christian doctrines, would by no means be brought to this: Ei δὲ καὶ αἵτινος οὗτος σταυρωθηναι τὸν Χριστόν (subaud. έδει), ἀπορούμεν. ἐπικατάρατος γάρ ὁ σταυρωθήναι κατὰ τὸ νόμον λέγεται εἶναι: ώστε πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν αἰκίμην δυσείστατον. Σεκτ. 89. And afterwards, granting his passion, urgeth him to prove his crucifixion: Ψεδε γὰρ οὗτος εἶναι τούτων ἐλεῖν δυνάμεις. Ibid. So Tertullian describes the Jews, negantes passionem crucis in Christum predicatum, et argumentantes insuper non esse credendum, ut ad id genus mortis exponeret Deus Filium ssum, quod ipsedixit, Maleficatus omnis homo qui peependit in ligno.—Adv. Jud. cap. 10. ² Gen. xxii. 1. ³ Verse 7. ⁴ This custom is very considerable as to the explication of this type; and is to be therefore confirmed by the testimonies of the ancients, which are most express. Βασταζέως των ταφάλων χωνός—κακοφύρου μέν ἱδρυτι σταυρόν αὐτῷ σημαίνει. ἔοικε νὰρ ὁ σταυρός θανάτος, καὶ οἱ μέλλων προσθέλων θαυμάζω αὐτὸν βασταζέως.—Antemiconos, Οπετονος, lib. ii. cap. 61. Τῷ μὲν σώματι τῶν κολαζουμένων ἐκάστον τῶν κακούργου—ἀνεβάλει τὸν αὐτούς σταυρόν.—Plutarch. De his qui sero a Numine puniuntur. So these not long after our Saviour's death; and, much before it, Plautus in Car bonario:

"Patibulum ferat per urbern, detinde affigatur cruci."
it. Therefore Isaac bearing the wood did signify Christ bearing the cross. 1

When the fiery serpents bit the Israelites, and much people died, Moses, by the command of God, made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole: and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived. 2 Now, if there were no expresser promise of the Messiah than the seed of the woman which should bruise the serpent’s head; 3 if he were to perform that promise by the virtue of his death; if no death could be so perfectly represented by the hanging on the pole as that of crucifixion: then was that manifestly foretold which Christ himself informed Nicodemus, As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up. 4

The paschal lamb did plainly typify that Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, and the preparing of it did not only represent the cross, 5 but the command or ordinance of the passover did foretel as much. For while it is said, ye shall not break a bone thereof, 6 it was thereby intimated that the Saviour of the world should suffer that death to which the breaking of the bones belonged (and that, according to the constant custom, was the punishment of crucifixion 7); but only in that death should by the providence of God be so particularly preserved, as that not one bone of his should be touched. And thus the crucifixion of the Messiah in several types was represented.

---

1 This is not only the observation of the Christians, but the Jews themselves have referred this type unto that custom. For upon Gen. xxii. 6, “And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon Isaac his son,” the lesser Bereshith hath this note: "As a man carries his cross upon his shoulders.”
2 Num. xxxi. 6, 9. 3 Gen. iii. 15. 4 The common phrase by which that death was expressed, “In crucem tolli.” —Paulus, lib. v. Sentent. tit. 22, 23, 25. As in the Chaldee תורפים, by origination elevatio, by use is particularly crucifixio. John iii. 14. 5 Justin Martyr shows how the manner of the roasting of the paschal lamb did represent the affixing of a man unto the cross, and thereby was a type of Christ: "To κελευσθεν προβατον έκεινον οπταν θλν γινεσαι, του παθους του σταιου, δι ου πασχειν δημελεί ο Χριστος, σύμβολον ηι το γαρ οστωμεν προβατον, σχηματιζομεν ρυκοιος του σχηματι του σταιου οπτατα. Ει γαρ άρθρος οβελικου διαπεροναι ειπ των κατω τατο και μερον μεχρι της κεφαλῆς, και εις παλ-λων κατα το μεταφρεν, ο προσοροντα ται άν χυρω του προβατον. —Dial. cum Tychai 40. To which Arnoldus Cypri-
4.—Nor was it only thus prefigured and involved in these typical resemblances, but also clearly spoken by the prophets in their particular and express predictions. Nor shall we need the accession of any lost or additional prophetical expressions, which some of the ancients have made use of:1 those which are still preserved even among the Jews will yield this truth sufficient testimonies. When God foretells by the prophet Zachary what he should suffer from the sons of men, he says expressly,2 They shall look upon me whom they have pierced;3 and therefore shows that he speaks of the Son of God, which was to be the Son of man, and by our nature liable to vulnerability; and withal foretells the piercing of his body:

although the LXX. have made another sense, 'Επιβάλλοντα πρὸς με, ἀνήθων καταφύγιον, by translating ἵνα, ἀνήθων σοι quod; as also the Chaldee paraphrase with the Arabic version; and the Syriac another yet, by rendering it per eum quem. as if they should look upon one, and pierce another: yet the plain construction of ΤΗΣ οὐ μὴν is nothing else but quem, relating to the person in the affix of the precedent τῆς, who, being the same with him who immediately before promised to pour upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the Jews might avoid, they read it not τῆς, but την, not "on me," but "on him," to distinguish him whom they were to pierce, from him who was to give the Spirit of grace. But this fraud is easily detected, because it is against the Hebrew copies, the Septuagint, and Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac and Arabic translations. Nor can the rabbins shift this place, because it was anciently by the Jews interpreted of the Messias, as themselves confess. So R. Solomon Jarchi upon the place.

1 As Barnabas cites one of the prophets whom we know not: ὅμοιοι πάλιν περί τοῦ σταυροῦ δρέτε ἐν ἄλλω προφήτῃ λέγοντι, Καὶ πάτε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται; Καὶ λέγει Κύριος, ὅσαι ἔξων κληθῇ καὶ ἀναστή, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ἔξων αἴμα στάξῃ.—Epist. cap. 12. Which words are not to be found in any of the prophets. Thus Justin Martyr, to prove ὅτι μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι βασιλεύει ὁ Χριστός, produceth a prophecy out of Psalm xxvi. in these words: Ο Κύριος ἔβασιλεύεσκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔξων.—Dial. cum Tryph. § 73. And Tertullian, who advances all his conceptions: "Age nunc, si legisti penes prophetam in Psalmis, Dominius regnavit a lignio; exspecto quid intelligas, ne forte lignarium illum regem significari putetis, et non Christum, qui exinde a passione Christi" legit crucis, for he himself hath it ligni, Adv. Marciion., lib. III. cap. 19. "superae morte regnavit."—Adv. Jud. cap. 10. And in the place cited, against Marciion: "Et si enim mors ab Adam regnavit usque ad Christum, cur Christus non regnasse dicitur a ligno, ex quo crucis ligno mortuus, regnum mortis exclusit." Thus they and some after them, make use of these words, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔξω, a lignio, which are not to be found either in the Greek or Latin translation, from whence they seem to produce them; nor is there anything like them in the original or any translation extant, nor the least mention or footstep of them in the Catena Graecorum Patrum. Justin Martyr indeed accused the Jews for raising the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔξω out of the text: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔξω· κατέστατο, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔξω· εἰρήμενος γὰρ τοῦ λόγου, ἐπί τοὺς ἐπίσκοπους, ὁ Κύριος ἔβασιλεύεσκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔξω, ἀδικίκα. Ἐπί τοὺς ἐπίσκοπους, ὁ Κύριος ἔβασιλεύεσκον.—Ibid. But, First, he doth not accuse them for raising it out of the original Hebrew, for his discourse is only to show that they abused the LXX. Secondly. Though the Jews had rased it out of their own, it appeareth not how they should have got it out of the Bibles in the Christians' hands, in which those words are not to be found.

2 These words of Zachary are clear in the original, although the LXX. have made another sense, 'Επιβάλλονται πρὸς με, ἀνήθων καταφύγιον, by translating Ών, ἀνήθων, so quad; as also the Chaldee paraphrase with the Arabic version; and the Syriac another yet, by rendering it per eum quem. as if they should look upon one, and pierce another: yet the plain construction of ΤΗΣ οὐ μὴν is nothing else but quem, relating to the person in the affix of the precedent τῆς, who, being the same with him who immediately before promised to pour upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the Jews might avoid, they read it not τῆς, but την, not "on me," but "on him," to distinguish him whom they were to pierce, from him who was to give the Spirit of grace. But this fraud is easily detected, because it is against the Hebrew copies, the Septuagint, and Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac and Arabic translations. Nor can the rabbins shift this place, because it was anciently by the Jews interpreted of the Messias, as themselves confess. So R. Solomon Jarchi upon the place.

3 These words of Zachary are clear in the original, although the LXX. have made another sense, 'Επιβάλλονται πρὸς με, ἀνήθων καταφύγιον, by translating Ών, ἀνήθων, so quad; as also the Chaldee paraphrase with the Arabic version; and the Syriac another yet, by rendering it per eum quem. as if they should look upon one, and pierce another: yet the plain construction of ΤΗΣ οὐ μὴν is nothing else but quem, relating to the person in the affix of the precedent τῆς, who, being the same with him who immediately before promised to pour upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the Jews might avoid, they read it not τῆς, but την, not "on me," but "on him," to distinguish him whom they were to pierce, from him who was to give the Spirit of grace. But this fraud is easily detected, because it is against the Hebrew copies, the Septuagint, and Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac and Arabic translations. Nor can the rabbins shift this place, because it was anciently by the Jews interpreted of the Messias, as themselves confess. So R. Solomon Jarchi upon the place.

4. "Our masters have expounded this of the Messias the son of Joseph." That they interpreted it, therefore, of the Messias, is granted by them; that any Messias was to be the son of Joseph, is already denied and refuted: it remaineth therefore that the ancient Jews did interpret it of the true Messias, and that St. John did apply it to our Saviour according to the acknowledged exposition. And in Bereith Rabbba, we are clearly taught thus much: for unto that question, "Who art thou, O great mountain?" (Zech. iv. 7,) he answereth, "(roš הגר הגר הוא מושאה בני רם "The great mountain is the Messias the son of David." And he proves it from "Grace, grace unto it," "because he giveth grace and supplications; as it is written, Zech. xii. 10," "ותלמיד ותתל미ו בני רם ותתלמי "Our masters have expounded this of the Messias the son of Joseph." That they interpreted it, therefore, of the Messias, is granted by them; that any Messias was to be the son of Joseph, is already denied and refuted: it remaineth therefore that the ancient Jews did interpret it of the true Messias, and that St. John did apply it to our Saviour according to the acknowledged exposition. And in Bereith Rabbba, we are clearly taught thus much: for unto that question, "Who art thou, O great mountain?" (Zech. iv. 7,) he answereth, "("The great mountain is the Messias the son of David." And he proves it from "Grace, grace unto it," "because he giveth grace and supplications; as it is written, Zech. xii. 10," "ות툴תי ותתלמיי בני רם ותתלמיי "Our masters have expounded this of the Messias the son of Joseph." That they interpreted it, therefore, of the Messias, is granted by them; that any Messias was to be the son of Joseph, is already denied and refuted: it remaineth therefore that the ancient Jews did interpret it of the true Messias, and that St. John did apply it to our Saviour according to the acknowledged exposition. And in Bereith Rabbba, we are clearly taught thus much: for unto that question, "Who art thou, O great mountain?" (Zech. iv. 7,) he answereth, "")
which being added to that prediction in the Psalms, *They pierced my hands and my feet,* clearly representeth and foretelleth to us the death upon the cross, to which the hands and feet of the person crucified were affixed with nails. And because these prophecies appeared so particular and clear, and were so properly applied by that disciple whom our Saviour loved, and to whom he made a singular application even upon the cross, therefore the *Jews* have used more than ordinary industry and artifice to elude these two predictions, but in vain. For these two prophets, *David* and *Zachary,* manifestly did foretel the particular punishment of crucifixion.

5.—It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by types, and promulgated by prophecies, that the promised *Messias* was to be crucified. And it is as certain that our *Jesus,* the Christ whom we worship, and from whence we receive that honour to be named *Christians,* was really and truly crucified. It was first the wicked design of *Judas,* who betrayed him to that death: it was the malicious cry of the obdurate *Jews,* *Crucify him, crucify him.* He was actually condemned and delivered to that death by *Pilate,* who gave sentence that it should be as they required: he was given into the hands of the soldiers, the instruments commonly used in inflicting that punishment, who led him away to crucify him. He underwent those previous pains which customarily antecedeth that suffering, as flagellation and bearing of the cross: for *Pilate,*

1 This translation indeed seems something different from the Hebrew text as now we read it, *Sicut leo, manus meas et pedes meas.* But it was not always read as now it is. For R. Jacob the son of Chajim, in *Massoreth magna,* 

2 For the *Masorah* in several places confesseth, that eighteen places in the scriptures have been altered by the scribes; and when they come to reckon the places, they mention but sixteen; the other two without question are those concerning the crucifixion of the *Messias,* Psalm xxi. 16, and *Zechariah,* xii. 10. For that of Zachary, a Jew confessed it to *Mercurius,* and that of *David,* we showed before to be the other.

3 Matt. xxvi. 2. 4 John xix. 15.
5 That the soldiers did execute the sentence of death given by the Roman magistrates in their provinces, and not only in the camp, is evident out of the historians of that nation.
6 Schidend est Romanis Pilatum legibus ministrasse, quibus sanctum est, ut

"Obsconas pelagi ferro xedare volucres."

—*Eneas* iii. 241.

and the old Syriac, which translated it *transfacerunt;* but also by the less, or marginal, *Masorah,* which noteth that the word *יְהִי נָא* is found written alike in two places, this and Isaiah xxxviii. 13, but in diverse significations: wherefore being [see-hg] in Isaiah it manifestly signifieth *sicut leo,* it must not signify the same in this; and being [seen] the Jews themselves pretend to nothing else, it followeth that it be still read as it was *יְהִי נָא* and translated *fodarunt.* From whence it also appeareth, that this was one of the eighteen places which were altered by the scribes. *Psalm* xxii. 16.
when he had scourged Jesus, delivered him to be crucified; and he bearing his cross went forth into Golgotha. They carried him forth out of the city, as by custom in that kind of death they were wont to do, and there between two malefactors, usually by the Romans condemned to that punishment, they crucified him. And that he was truly fastened to the cross, appears by the satisfaction given to doubting Thomas, who said, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, I will not believe: and our Saviour said unto him, Reacht hither thy finger, and behold my hands: whereby he satisfied the apostle that he was the Christ, and us that the Christ was truly crucified, against that fond heresy, which made Simon the Cyrenian not only bear the cross, but endure crucifixion, for our Saviour. We, therefore, infer this second conclusion from the undoubted testimonies of his followers and unfeigned confessions of his enemies, that our Jesus was certainly and truly crucified, and did really undergo those sufferings, which were pretypified and foretold, upon the cross.

6.—Being thus fully assured that the Messias was to be, and

qui crucifixitnr prins flagellis verbearerut."—S. HIEBONYM. ad Matt. xxi. 23. To which Lucian alludes in his own condemnation: "Eiis moéi anevsokelilía shnesi dokei åvun, Fv Dla, moastxelónta ge próterov.—LUCIANS, in Piscatorv, cap. 2. "Mults oceis, multi capiti, alli verberati crucibus affixi!"—Liv. lib. xxxviii. cap. 36. "Ad pulmis deligatus, laceraò viris tergo, cervicem crucem Romanam subjiciam."—Lib. xxi. cap. 13. So Curtius reports of Alexander: "Onmes verbieribus affectos sub ipsis radiibus petris crucium jussit affigiri."—Lib. vii. cap. 11. Thus were the Jews themselves used, who caused our Saviour to be scourged and crucified: Μαστιγωμένου καὶ προσβαλωμένου τού θανάτου πάντων αἰκίας, ἀνέσταυρων.—JOSEPHUS, De Bell, Jud. lib. v. cap. 28. 1 Matt. xxvi. 23. 2 John xix. 17. 3 This was observed both by the Jews and Romans that their capital punishments were inflicted without their cities: and that particularly was observed in the punishment of crucifixion. Plautus: —

"Credo ego istuc, extemplo tibi esse eundum nactus extra portam, Dispessis manibus, palatinum cum habibis." —Miles Glor. act. ii. sc. 4.

Tully: "Cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem in via Lepida."—Lib. v. In Fam. cap. 66.

4 Thieves and robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death. Thus Caesar used his pirates: Τους ἄρστας ἄνατος ἀνέσταυρωσ.—Plutarchus in Vita, cap. 2. "Imperator provincie jussit latrones crucibus affigii."—PETRON. Satyr. 

"Latronem istum, miserorum pignorum meorum peremptorem, cruci affligiis."—APUL. De Auv. Asin. lib. iii. "Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? Ut suspendatur."—SKE. Epist. vii. Where suspendi is as much as crucifi, and is so to be understood in all Latin authors which wrote before the days of Constantine. "Famosos latrones, in his locis ubi grassati sunt, furca figendos compluribus placuit."—CALIST. lib. xxxviii. De Parnis. Where furca figendos is for crucifi; being so altered by Tribonianus, who, because Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also the name out of the law.

5 John xx. 25, 27.

6 This was the peculiar heresy of Basillides, a man so ancient, that he boasted to follow Glaci as his master, who was the disciple of St. Peter. And Irenaus hath declared this particularity of his: "Quapropter neque passum eum: et Simonom quendam Cyrenaeum angariatum portasse crucem ejus pro eo; et hunc secundum ignorantium et errorem crucifixum, transfigurationem ab eo, uti putaretur ipse esse Jesus; et ipsum autem Jesus Simones accipisse formam, et stantem irississe eos."—Ado. Haeres. lib. i. cap. 23. And Tertullian, of the same Basillides: "Hunc (Christum) passum a Judaeis non esse, sed vice ipsius Simonem crucifixum esse: unde nee in eum credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, ne quis confiteatur in Simonem credidisse."—De Praescr. ado. Haeret. cap. 46. From these is the same delivered by Ephiphanus, Haeres. xxiv. § 3, and by St. Augustin, Haeres. 4.
that our Christ was truly, crucified; it thirdly concerns us to understand what was the nature of crucifixion, what the particularities of suffering which he endured on the cross. Nor is this now so easily understood as once it was. For being a Roman punishment, it was continued in that empire while it remained heathen; but when the emperors themselves received Christianity, and the towering eagles resigned the flags unto the cross, this punishment was forbidden by the supreme authority,1 out of a due respect and pious honour to the death of Christ. From whence it came to pass, that since it hath been disused universally for so many hundred years, it hath not been so rightly conceived as it was before, when the general practice of the world did so frequently represent it to the Christians’ eyes. Indeed if the word which is used to denote that punishment did sufficiently represent or express it, it were enough to say that Christ was crucified: but being the most usual or original word doth not of itself declare the figure of the tree,2 or manner of the suffering; it would be necessary to

1 This is observed by St. Augustin, Serm. 18 De Verbis Dom.: "Quia υσε honoratu-

rūs crat fideles suos in fine hujus seculi, prius honoravit crucem in hoc seculo: ut terrarum principes creduentes in eum prohi-

berent aliquem nocumentum crucifié:” and, T.act. 36 in Joan., speaking of this particu-

lar punishment: “modo in pontis reorum non est apud Romanos: ubi enim Domini

credentes, est putatum est quod et resum honoraretur si crucigiféretur,” Whence ap-

pears, First, That in the days of St. Au-

gustine crucifixion was disused: Secondly, That it was prohibited by the secular

princes. But when it was first prohibited, or by whom, he showeth not. It is there-

fore to be observed, that it was first for-

bidden by the first Christian emperor, Con-

stantine the Great: of whom Sozomenus

gives this relation: ‘Mélele τον προτέρου

νεωμοιϊογενέντι Ρωμαίοις την του σταυρον τι-

μωριαν, νόμον ἀνέλε τῆς χρήσεως τῶν δίκαιο-

τηνων.’—Lib. i. cap. 8.

2 The original word in the New Testa-

ment for the tree on which our Saviour suf-

fered, is σταυρός, and the action or cruci-

fixion stauropoies, the active stauropov, and the passive stauropoiesen. Now stau-

ropos, from which the rest mentioned are mani-

festyly derived, hath of itself originally no

other signification than of a stález. As we

find it first used by Homer:

Σταυροὺς δ’ ἔκτεσιν ὑπάσσει διαμερεὺς ἐνθα καὶ

ἐνθα, Πικλίας καὶ ταμεῖας, τὸ μέλαν ὄρος ἄμφικε-

ἀστάς. —Od. Σ. 11. ‘Αμφι δὲ οἱ μεγάλην αὐλὴν πούσαν ἀνάκε

Σταυροῖς πυκνοῦσιν.—II. Ω. 453.

These are the same which Homer elsewhere
calls σκόλησες, and the ancient gramma-

rians render each by other. As Eustathius:

Σταυροί, ὥρθα καὶ ἀπωκειμένα ἔξιλα, οἱ δ’

αὐτοὶ καὶ σκόλησες λέγονται, ἀν’ ἐν τῷ

ἀνασκολοπίζεσθαι, καὶ ἀνασταυροῖναι’ so

he, expounding stauropos: and in the same

manner expounding σκόλησις: Λέγονται δὲ

οἱ τούτων σκόλησις καὶ σταυροί: έκ δὲ τούτω

τῶν το ἀνασκολοπίζειν, και ἀνασταυροῦν.

As when Homer describes the Phaeacian

walls,—

Τείχεα μακρα, Ὀψηλα σκολόπεσσιν ἀρηρότα. —

Od. Η. 44,

he gives this exposition: Σκόλησες δὲ καὶ

τῶν ἕξιλα ὥρθα, οἱ καὶ σταυροί. In the same

manner Hesychius: Σταυροί, οἱ καταπεπερ-

γότες σκόλησες, χάρακες: and, Σκόλησις,

ὥρθα (οἱ ὥρθα) καὶ δεξα ἕξιλα, σταυροὶ, χάρα-

κες: and again, Χάραξ, φραγμος, ὑδέτα

ἔξιλος: οἱ δὲ, καλάμους, οἱ δὲ, σταυροὶ.

Besides, they all agree in the same etymology,

ἀπ’ τοῦ ἑστασθαι, and therefore always take

it for a straight standing stake, pale, or

palisado. Thus κελλέωνες in Antiphon are

briefly rendered ὥρθα ἕξιλα: but more ex-

pressly, thus by Εὐμυλογείς, Κέλλουντες, κυ-

ρίων ὑοι ἱστοπόδες, καθαρτιστικος δὲ καὶ τὰ

καταπεπεργότα ἕξιλα, ὁ καὶ σταυροὶ κα-

λοῦσα. This is the undoubted signification
del of stauropos, in vain denied by Salmabius,

who will have it first to signify the same

with furca, and then with trux; first the

figure of Y, and then of T. Whereas all

antiquity renders it no other than as a

straight and sharp stake: in which signifi-

cation it came at first to denote this punis-

ment, the most simple and prime στραῖων

or ἀνασκολομέως being upon a single piece

of wood, a δεξιως κ τρεις τε υπερ δε τρεις.

And the Greeks which wrote the Roman

history used the word στραῖως as well as for

their
represent it by such expressions as we find partly in the evangelical relations, partly in such representations as are left us in those authors whose eyes were daily witnesses of such executions.

7.—The form, then, of the cross on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple, but a compounded, figure, according to the custom of the Romans, by whose procurator he was condemned to die. In which there was not only a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, but also a transverse beam fastened unto that towards the top thereof, and beside these two cutting each

**palus** as their *crux*. As when Antony beheaded Antigonus the king of the Jews, Dion thus begins to describe his execution: "Antigonus εμαυτίαν τοιούτος σταυρού προσδύθησα.—Hist. Rom. lib. xlx. cap. 22. Not that he crucified him, as Baronius mistakes: but that he put him to another death after the Roman custom, as those died in Livy, "Deigit ad palum, virente casu, et secundum persecutionem."—Lib. xlviii. cap. 29. So that *σταυρός προσ-δείκνυσιν, is ad palum deligeris. Thus were the heads of men said *ἀνάστατορυθμηκαί, as of Niger and Albinus in Dion, lib. lxxiv. cap. 8, et lib. lxxv. cap. 7; and Herodian, lib. iii. cap. 21; which cannot be meant but of a single *palus*: and we read in Ctesias how Amytis put Inaros to death, *ἀνάστασις μὲν ἔπι τριῶν σταυρῶν*—not that he crucified him upon three crosses, but pierced his body with three stakes fastened in the ground, and sharped at the upper end; as appears by the ike Persian punishment inflicted by Parysatis on Mesabates, as delivered by Plutarch in *Artaxerxes*, cap. 17: *Προστάσεων ἐκκείρει τοὺς κατὰ τὸ μὲν σώμα πλάγια διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀναντίησα, τὸ δὲ δέρμα χώρας διαπαταλεύσα*; which the Latin translator renders in *tres sustolli crucias*; (a thing impossible;) whereas it was to be transversely fastened to three stakes, piercing the body lying and thrust down upon them; which in the *Excerpta* of Ctesias is delivered only in the word *ἀναστατουργήθη*. *Σταυρὸς therefore is no more originally than *σκόλος*, a single stake, or an erect piece of wood, upon which many suffered who were said *ἀνάστατορυθμήκαι* and *ἀναστατοποιήκασιν*. And when other transverse or prominent parts were added in a perfect cross, it retained still the original name, not only of *σταυρός*, but also of *σκόλος*: as, *Πρέμλην εἰς ἐπίδεξεν θεατήτος ἀπὸ τοῦ σκόλους γνων εὐθὺς ἀράχης γενεσθαι, εκ... Τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ σκόλους αὐτοῦ φωνὴν ᾗ ἀπέπνισε...*—Ctesias apud Obia, lib. ii. Thus in that long, or rather too long, verse written by Audax to St. Augstin., *Epist. 139:—*"Exspectat quos plena frades Christi de stipite pendens."

1 That the figure and parts of a Roman cross, such as that was on which our Saviour suffered, may be known, we must begin with the first composition in the frame or structure of it: and that is the conjunction of the two beams, the one erect, the other transverse; the first to which the body was fastened, the second to which the hands were fastened. These two, as the chief parts of the cross, are several ways expressed: first, by the Jews, who had no one word in their language particularly to express that punishment, (as being not mentioned in the law, or at all in usanance them,) and therefore call it by a double name, expressing the conjunction of these beams *βυμνη ρύπιε stamen et subegmen*, "the warp and the woof." The Greeks express the same by the letter Ταυ, as partly appears by what is already spoken of the number 300, and is yet more evident by the testimony of Lucian, who makes mankind complain of the letter Ταυ, because tyrants in imitation of that first made the cross: Τῷ γὰρ τούτῳ σώματι βασιν των τυράννων ἀκολουθησάμηκας, καὶ μικραμώνων τὸ πλάσμα, ἐπεκτείναμε τοιούτω ξύλω τεκτόναυς, ἀνθρώπως ἀνασκολοπιέων ἐπὶ θαυμάσεται.—Jud. Vocal. cap. 12. "Ipsa est enim litera Gracorum Taui, nostra autem T, species crucis."—Terent. Ada. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 22. St. Jerome affirms the same of the Samaritan Tau: but there is no similitude to be found in that which is now in use, or any other Oriental, only in the Coptic alphabet Selbat, that is, the cross Di. These two parts of the cross are otherwise expressed by the mast and yard of a ship, So Justin Martyr: Θάλασσα μὲν γὰρ οὐ τίμημεθα, ἦν μὲν τούτῳ τὸ πτοσσαίον, ἐκαλεσαί τι ιστόν, ἐν τῷ νησί σωός μείνη.—Apollo i. § 55. And Tertullian: "Antenna navis crucis pars est."—Ada. Marcion. lib. iii. cap. 18. And Minutius Felix: "Signum saeculis naturaliter visus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur." And Maximus Taurinensis: "Cum a nantlis scinditur mare, prata arbor erigitur, velum distenditur, ut cruce Domini facta aquarum fluentia rampuntur." Now because the extremities of the antenna are a kind of κέφαλα, (as Virgil, that great master of propertie, ś)—"Coruna velatarum obvortimus antennamm."—Ened. iii. 549.) therefore in Greek κεραία is antenna: and from thence the Greek fathers applied the words of our Saviour, Matt. v. 18, Ἡγεμών ἤ γεμών, οὐ ἡ κεραία, οὐ μὴ παρελθή ὧν τού νόμου, ἦν ἐν πάντα γένεται, to the Cross of Christ: Τοῦ γὰρ σταυροῦ ἤτοι ἐστι τὸ ὄρθον ἐξελθείν.
other transversely at right angles (so that the erected part extended itself above the transverse), there was also another piece of wood infixed into,¹ and standing out from, that which was erected and

¹ Beside the direct and transverse parts of the cross, with their four extremities, which only usually are considered, and represented in the figures, we must find yet another part, and a fifth extremity, Irenaeus, giving several examples of the number five, delivers it plainly thus: "Ipse habitus crucis fines ct summittates habet quinque, duos in longitudine, duo in latitudine, et unus in medio; ubi requiescit qui clavis afflictur." — Adv. Hæres. lib. ii. cap. 42. Beside therefore the four extremities of the direct and transverse beams, there was a fifth ákron in medio, (namely, of the erected palmis,) on which the crucified body rested. This fifth part of the cross fastened to the arrectarius stipes was, before Irenaeus, acknowledged and described by Justin Martyr, under the notion of the horn of the rhinoceros, taken to be a figure or type of the cross: Μονοκέφωσος γὰρ κέρατα ὁδὸνάς ἄλλου πράγματος ἢ σχῆμα ἐνέχει, ἐν τῷ εἶναι καὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐμ' ὑπὸ τοῦ τυποῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ διέκτων. Ὁρισθα γὰρ τὸ ἐν ἑστὶν ἄκρον, ἢ'/ο', ὡς ἐστὶν τὸ ἀνώτατον μέρος εἰς κέρας ἑπερίμενον, ὅταν τὸ ἄλλο ἄκρον προσαρμόσῃ, καὶ εὐκατέβεθεν ὡς κέρατα τῇ ἐν οἷς κέρατα παρεξεμένη τὰ ἄκρα φαίνεται καὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ προκῦνον, ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ ἑξέχων εστιν, εφ' ω' ἐποίητοτα εἰς σταυροῦ καὶ πεπηγήνεστε ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτῷ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις κέρασιν. Συνοχισμαισμενοι καὶ πεπηγήνεστε, Diad. cum Tryph. § 91. Where beside the ὁρίσθαν ἄκρον, or arrectarius stipes, and the ἄλλο ἄκρον, or transversarium lignum, there is a third, τὸ ἐν μέσῳ προκῦνον, "frequent in the middle; εφ' ω' ἐποίητοτα εἰς σταυροῦ καὶ πεπηγήνεστε, says he: ubi requiescit qui clavis afflictur," says Irenaeus. So Tertullian: "Pars crucis, et quidem major, est omne robur quod directa statione defigitur. Sed nobis tota crux imputatur, cum antenna silicet suam, et lfolio sedillis excessum." — Adv. Nat. lib. i. cap. 12. Where the excessus is the τὸ ἐξώφων, signifying the nature, as the sedillis signified the use, of the part. Which in another place, in imitation of Justinus, he refers unto the typical unicorn: "Nam et in antenna navis, quae crucis pars est, extominitates cornua vocantur; unicorns autem
straight up. To that erected piece was his body, being lifted up, applied, as Moses' serpent to the pole, and to the transverse beam his hands were nailed: upon the lower part coming out from the erected piece his sacred body rested, and his feet were transfixed and fastened with nails; his head, being pressed with a crown of thorns, was applied to that part of the erect which stood above the transverse beam, and above his head to that was fastened the table, on which was written,¹ in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin cha-

¹The text is a reference to the New Testament, specifically to the scene of Christ's crucifixion. The table was where Christ was laid after the crucifixion. The reference to Hebrew, Greek, and Latin indicates the languages in which the inscription was written.
racters, the accusation, according to the Roman custom, and the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS.

8.—Thus by the propriety of the punishment, and the titular inscription, we know what crime was then objected to the immaculate Lamb, and upon what accusation Pilate did at last proceed to pass the sentence of death upon him. It was not any opposition to the law of Moses, not any danger threatened to the temple, but pretended sedition and affectation of the crown objected, which moved Pilate to condemn him. The Jews did thus accuse him: We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that he himself is Christ a king. And when Pilate sought to release him, they cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar. This moved Pilate to pass sentence upon him, and, because that punishment of the cross was by the Roman custom used for that crime, to crucify him.

9.—Two things are most observable in this cross; the acerbity and the ignominy of the punishment: for of all the Roman ways of execution it was most painful and most shameful. First, the exquisite pains and torments in that death are manifest, in that the hands and feet, which of all the parts of the body are most nervous, and consequently most sensible, were pierced through with nails, which caused, not a sudden dispatch, but a lingering and tormenting death. Insomuch that the Romans, who most used this punishment, did in their language deduce their expressions of pains and cruciation from the cross. And the acerbity of this punishment appears, in that those who were of any merciful disposition would first cause such as were adjudged to the cross to be slain, and then to be crucified.

[6] Ubi dolores aceremi exagitatur, cruciatus vocatur, a cruce nominatus: pendentes in ligno crucifixi, clavis ad lignum pecitus manibusque confixi, producta morte necabantur. Non enim crucifixi hoc erat occidi; sed divi vivabatur in cruce: non quia longior vita eligebatur, sed quia mors ipsa pro nobis debetur, no dolor citius finiretur.”—S. August. Tract. 36 in Joan. To this etymology did Terence allude in those words:—

“Et illis crucibus, quae nos nostramque adolescentiam Habent desplectulat, et qui nos semper omniibus cruciant modis.”—Eunuch. act. ii. sec. 3, 91.

[7] As it was observed of Julius Caesar: “Piratas a quibus captus est, cum in ditonem redegisset, quantum sufflixurum se cruci ante juraverat, jugulari primum jussit, deinde se suffigit.”—Suet. lib. i. cap. 74.
also most infamous and full of ignominy. The Romans themselves accounted it a servile punishment,1 and inflicted it upon their slaves and fugitives. It was a high crime to put that dishonour upon any free-man, and the greatest indignity which the most undeserving Roman could possibly suffer in himself,2 or could be contrived to show their detestation to such creatures as were below human nature.3 And because when a man is beyond posi-

1 Vulciatus Gallicanus relatath of Avi-
dius Caius in the case of some centurions which had been prosperous, but in fighting without orders given: "Rapi eos jussit, et in crucem tollit, servilique supplicio aedit; quod exemplum non exstatbat."—Cap. 4. And Juvannel speaks with relation to this custom,—

"Pone crucem servo."—Sat. vi. 218.

So Palaestrin in Plautus:

"Nisi quidem illa nos volt, qui servit sumus, Propert amorem sum omnem crucibus cont-
tubernaes dari!"—Mil. Gor. act ii. sc. 2, 28.

And again:—

"Noli miliari; scio crucem futuram mihi popularem. Ibi mei magores sunt siti, pater, avus, pro-
avus, abavus."—Ibid. act ii. sc. 4, 19.

So in Terence:—


And Horace:—

"Si quis eum servum, patinam qui tollere
Jussus,
Semosis pisces tepidumque ligurrierit juscus,
In cruce suffigat."—Lib. i. Sat. 3, 80.

So Capitolinus of Pertinax: "In crucem sublatis talibus servis."—Cap. 9. And Her-
odian of Macrinus: Δοῦλοι, ὅσιοι δεσπότους κατηγγέλλων, ἀνέσκολοπτέθησαν.—Lib. v. cap. 2. This punishment of the cross did so properly belong to the slaves, that when servants and free-men were involved alike in the same crime, they were very careful to make a distinction in their death, according to their condition: "Ut quisque liber aut servus esset, suae fortunae a quoque summum supplicium est."—Liv. lib. iii. cap. 18. And then the servants were always crucified. As Servius observe among the Laced-
edemonians: "Servos patibulis sufflexerunt, filios strangulaver, nepotes fugaverunt."—Com. in Aen., iii. 551. "Noverce quidem perpetuum indictione exilium; servus vero patibulo suffigatur."—Arr. De Afr., Afr. lib. x. Thus in the combustion at Rome, upon the death of Julius Cesar: 'Ἀμνωνειν ἀγνηρήσαν ἔνιοι, καὶ σαλπηρ-

βιντες θεροι ἀρεκμαζότηρα, ὅσια βεραπότες ἤσαν, οἱ δὲ ἐλευθερόι κατὰ τοῦ κραμοῦ κατερπήσαν.—Appian. De Bell. Civil., lib. iii. "Ex nocte speculatorum prehensui servi tres et unus ex legione vernacula; servi

sunt in crucem sublati, milid servicia abs-
scas."—Hist. Lib. de Bell. Hispan. cap. 20. So Africanus: "Gravius in Romanos quam in Latinos transfigas animadvertit: illos enim, tanquam patriae fugitivos, cruci-

bus afixit; hos, tanquam peridos socios, securi percessit."—Valer. Max. lib. ii. cap. 7. This punishment of the cross was so proper unto servants, that servile supplicium in the language of the Romans signifies the same; and though in the words of Vulciatus before cited they go both together, as also in Capitolinus, "Nam et in crucem militis-
tulit, et servilibus supplicis semper afficit."—In Macrino, cap. 12: yet either is sufficient to express crucifixion: as in Tacitus: "Malam potentiam servil supplicio expla-
vit."—Hist. lib. iv. cap. 11: and again "Sumptum de eo supplicium in servilum modum."—Ibid. lib. ii. cap. 72. And therefore when any servants were made free, they were put out of fear of ever suffering this punishment. "An vero servos nostros ho-

rum suppliciorum omnium meta dominorum benignitas una vindicta liberavit? Nos a verberibus, ab uno, a cruces denique terrae, neque res gestae, neque acta atas, neque nostri honores vindicabunt?"—Ciceronis

Ovat. pro Rabir. cap. 5.

2 "Carnifex, et obducto capitis, et nomen ipsum crucis abisit, non modo a corpore vivere, sed etiam a cognitio-

ne, in civibus, auro, auribus. Harum enim omnium re-

rum non solum eventus atque perpasso, sed etiam condicio, expectatio, meutio ipsa dae-

quae, indigna civi Romano atque hominie li-

bero est."—Idem, ibid.

"Facinus est vin-
cire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, par-


3 As when the Capitol was betrayed by the silence of dogs, but preserved by the noise of geese; they preserved the memory by a solemn honouring of the one yearly, and dishonouring the other. "Fadem de causa supplicia annua canes pendunt inter aedem Juventatis et Summavi, vivi in furca

sambucea arboris fixi."—Plut., lib. xxix.

Cap. 4. Πολλοὶ μὲν υἱὸν ἐπὶ μνήμην τῶν συμβολῶν ἡ τύχη, καὶ μὲν ἀνθρω-

πομαζώμενοι, χῦν δὲ μάλα σφηνός ἐρυθρωμάτως πολυτελέως καὶ φωτεινό καθαρ-

νος.—Plutarch. De Fort. R. Rom.
sibility of suffering pain, he may still be sucht to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite torments some men have tasted the bitterness of death, after that, they have in their breathless corpses by virtue of this punishment suffered a kind of surviving shame. And the exposing the bodies of the dead to the view of the people on the cross hath been thought a sufficient ignominy to those which died, and terror to those which lived to see it. Yea, where the bodies of the dead have been out of the reach of their surviving enemies, they have thought it highly opprobrious to their ghosts to take their representations preserved in their pictures, and affix them to the cross. Thus may we be made sensible of the two grand aggravations of our Saviour’s sufferings, the bitterness of pain in the torments of his body, and the indignity of shame in the interpretation of his enemies.

10.—It is necessary we should thus profess faith in Christ crucified, as that punishment which he chose to undergo, as that way which he was pleased to die.

11.—First, because by this kind of death we may be assured that he hath taken upon himself, and consequently from us, the maladministration of the law. For we were all under the curse; because it is expressly written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them: and as it is certain none of us hath so continued, for the scripture hath concluded all under sin, which is nothing else but a breach of the law; therefore the curse must be acknowledged to remain upon all. But now Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; that is, he hath redeemed us from that general curse, which lay upon all men for the breach of any part of the law, by taking upon him that particular curse, laid only upon them which underwent a certain punishment of the law; for it was written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. Not that suspension was any of the capital punishments prescribed by

---

1 As Orates the Persian, when he had treacherously and cruelly murdered Polycrates the tyrant of Samos, ἀποκτείνας δὲ μὲν σικ ἄξιος ἀπηγγῆσαι ἄνεσταί ρε-—Πυθω-νος, lib. iii. cap. 125. So Antiochus first cut off the head of Achabus, and then fastened his body to a cross: Ἐδοξε πρώτον μὲν ἁρωτηρίας τὸν ταλαίπωρον μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτείματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταρρά-ψατο εἰς ὅνεον ἄσκον, ἀνασταύρωσα τὸ σῶμα.—Polyb. lib. viii. cap. 23.

2 This was the design of Tarquinus Priscus, when the extremity of labour which he laid upon his subjects made many lay violent hands upon themselves: “Passim conscita nee Quiritibus tedium fugientibus, novum et inexcogitatum anvs posteaque remedium invenit ille rex, ut omnium ita defuncturam figeret crucibus corpora spectanda civibus, simul et feris volucribusque laceranda.”—Ilinæus, lib. xxxvi. cap. 15, who makes this hardsome observation of it: “Quamobrem puder Romani nomines proprios, qui sape res perditas servavit in prudens, tune quoque subvenit: sed illo tempore imposuit, tum erubescentes cunm pudere vivos, tanquam pudiciturum esset extinctos.”

3 Thus they used Celsus, one of the thirty tyrants of Rome, as Trebellius Pollio testifieth: “Novo injuria genere imago in crucem subita, persultante vulgo, quasi patibulo ipse Celsus videretur afflux.”—Cap. 29.

4 Deut. xxvii. 26; Gal. iii. 10. 5 Verse 22.

5 Verse 13. 6 Deut. xxi. 23.
the law of Moses; not that by any tradition or custom of the Jews they were wont to punish malefactors with that death; but such as were punished with death according to the law or custom of the Jews, were for the enormity of their fact oft-times after death exposed to the ignominy of a gibbet, and those who being dead were so hanged on a tree were accursed by the law. Now though Christ was not to die by the sentence of the Jews, who had lost the supreme power in causes capital, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the law of Moses, yet the providence of God did so dispose it that he might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the legal curse belonged, which is, the hanging on a tree. For he which is crucified, as he is affixed to, so he hangeth on, the cross. And therefore true and formal crucifixion is often named by the general word suspension; and the Jews themselves do commonly call our blessed Saviour by that very name to which the curse is affixed by Moses, and generally have objected that he died a cursed death.

12.—Secondly, it was necessary to express our faith in Christ crucified, that we might be assured that he hath abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, which if he had

---

1 Deut. xxii. 22: "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree." In which words, "being put to death" precedeth "being hanged," but I confess, in our English translation it hath another sense, ("And he be to be put to death," as if he were to die by hanging: and so the Vulgar Latin, Et adjudicatus morti appensus fuerit patibulo, as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and so his sentence was suspension: and the Syriac yet more expressly, Et appendatur ligna alta interficiatur. But there is no such sentence contained in the original as the Vulgar, nor futurition of death as our English, translation mentioneth. The Hebrew is פָּרֹת וַיהי in Hopah, that is, interfector, occisus, morti factus fuerit; or, as the LXX, clearly translate it, καὶ ἀποθάνη, and

2 As we before noted on the words of Scripture. Thus the Greeks do often use κρεμαζω, for crucifigere. For Curtius, speaking of the taking of Tyre by Alexander, says, "Ihu millia—crucibus affixi per ingens littoris spatium pedenderunt."—Lib. iv. cap. 4. And Diodorus Siculus, relating the same, Τοὺς δὲ νέους πάντας ὄντας οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν δισ- χίλων ἑκράσας.—Lib. xvii. cap. 46. So the same Curtius testifieth that Musicanus was "in crucem sublatus;" (lib. ix. cap. 8;) of whom Arrianus speaks thus: Τοὺς κρεμαζόντας Αλέξανδρος κελεύς ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ—De Exped. Alex. lib. vi. cap. 17. Thus, in the language of the scriptures, εἰς τῶν κρεμαζόντων κακοίρων is "one of the crucified thieves;" (Luke xxiii. 39;) and the Jews are said to have slain our Saviour, κρεμαζόντας ἐπὶ ἕξιλου. (Acts v. 30; x. 39.) The Latins likewise often use the word suspendere for crucifigere. As Ausonius, in the Idyllium whose title is Capitla Crucifijxus, v. 59, describes him thus:—

"Hujus in excelsa suspensum stipite Amorem."

And when we read in Polybius, that they did αὐτοπαραστῆσαι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀχαίων; (lib. viii. cap. 23;) Ovid describes his punishment thus:

"More vel interea capit suspensus Achaei, Qui miser aurifera teste pependit aqua."

—Ibis, 301.

3 The words of Moses are, Deut. xxii. 23:

4 So Trypho the Jew objected to Justin Martyr: Οὗτος δὲ ὁ μέγατος λεγεμένος Χριστὸς ἀτιμοί καὶ ἄδεδος γέγονεν, ὥς καὶ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ κατάρα τῇ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ περιπετείων ὑποταύρωθη γάρ.—Dial. cum Tryph. § 32.

5 Eph. ii. 15.
not done, the strength and power of the whole law had still remained. For all the people had said Amen to the curse upon every one that kept not the whole law, and entered into a curse and into an oath to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord their God, and his judgments and his statutes. Which was in the nature of a bill, bond, or obligation, perpetually standing in force against them, ready to bring a forfeiture or penalty upon them, in case of non-performance of the condition. But the strongest obligations may be cancelled, and one ancient custom of cancelling bonds was by striking a nail through the writing; and thus God, by our crucified Saviour, blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.

13.—Thirdly, hereby we are to testify the power of the death of Christ working in us after the manner of crucifixion. For we are to be planted in the likeness of his death; and that we may be so, we must acknowledge and cause it to appear that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed. We must confess that they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts, and they which have not are not his. We must not glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor can we properly glory in that, except by it the world be crucified unto us, and we unto the world.

14.—Fourthly, by the acerbity of this passion we are taught to meditate on that bitter cup which our Saviour drank; and while we think on those nails which pierced his hands and feet, and never left that torturing activity till by their dolorous impressions they forced a most painful death, to acknowledge the bitterness of his sufferings for us, and to assure ourselves that by the worst of deaths he hath overcome all kinds of death, and with patience and cheerfulness to endure whatsoever he shall think fit to lay upon us, who with all readiness and desire suffered far more for us.

15.—Fifthly, by the ignominy of this punishment and universal
infamy of that death we are taught how far our Saviour descended for us, that while we were slaves and in bondage unto sin he might redeem us by a servile death: for he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant: and so he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross: teaching us the glorious doctrine of humility and patience in the most vile and abject condition which can befal us in this world, and encouraging us to imitate him, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame; and withal deterring us from that fearful sin of falling from him, lest we should crucify unto ourselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame, and so become worse than the Jews themselves, who crucified the Lord of life without the walls of Jerusalem, and for that unparalleled sin were delivered into the hands of the Romans, into whose hands they delivered him, and at the same walls in such multitudes were crucified, till there wanted room for crosses, and crosses for their bodies.

16.—Lastly, by the public visibility of this death, we are assured that our Saviour was truly dead, and that all his enemies were fully satisfied. He was crucified in the sight of all the Jews, who were made public witnesses that he gave up the ghost. There were many traditions among the heathen, of persons supposed for some time to be dead, to descend into hell, and afterwards to live again; but the death of these persons was never publicly seen or certainly known. It is easy for a man that liveth to say that he hath been dead; and, if he be of great authority, it is not difficult to persuade some credulous persons to believe it. But that which would make his present life truly miraculous must be the reality and certainty of his former death. The feigned histories of Pythagoras and Zamolxis, of Theseus and Hercules, of Orpheus and Protesilaus, made no certain mention of their deaths, and therefore were ridiculous in the assertion of their resurrection from death. Christ, as he appeared to certain witnesses after his resurrection, so he died before his enemies visibly on the cross, and gave up the ghost conspicuously in the sight of the world.

Phil. ii. 7, 8.

2 "Humilitatis enim magister est Chris-
tus, qui humiliavit sipsum, factus obediens
usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis."—S.
August. Tract. 51 in Johm.

3 Heb. xii. 2.

4 This is excellently observed and ex-
pressed by Origen, who returneth this an-
swer to the objection made by the Jew in
Celsus, of those fabulous returns from the
death: θείς παραστήσασθαι, ὃς οὐ δύναται τὸ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐστηθμόσιν ἐκ τεκνών ἐγνωσθαι τοιοῦτος παραβάλλεσθαι. Ἕκαςτος
μὲν γὰρ τῶν λεγόμενων κατὰ τοὺς τῶν ἱστοξ
βουλήσεως ἀν ἐνενιῆ ἐαυτὸν ὑπεκ-
κλέμας ἡς ὅμοιος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ πάλιν
κρίνας ἐπανελθέντι πρὸς οὐκ ἑαυτοῦς ἀνακαλεῖν.
Ἰησοῦν δὲ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ πάντων Ἰουδαῖ-
ων, καὶ καθαρευόντος αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ὑψεῖ τού δόμου αὐτοῦ, πῶς οὖν ταῦτα (τὰ μὲν

[Art. IV. On the Creed.]
17.—And now we have made this discovery of the true manner and nature of the cross on which our Saviour suffered, every one may understand what it is he professeth when he declareth his faith and saith, I believe in Christ crucified. For thereby he is understood and obliges to speak thus much: I am really persuaded and fully satisfied that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, Christ Jesus, that he might cancel the hand-writing which was against us, and take off the curse which was due unto us, did take upon him the form of a servant, and in that form did willingly and cheerfully submit himself unto the false accusation of the Jews, and unjust sentence of Pilate, by which he was condemned, according to the Roman custom, to the cross, and upon that did suffer servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain, and of the greatest ignominy, despising the shame. And thus I believe in Christ crucified.

CHAPTER IV.

Dead.

1.—Though crucifixion of itself involveth not in it certain death, and he which is fastened to a cross is so leisurely to die, as that he being taken from the same may live; though when the insulting Jews in a malicious derision called to our Saviour to save himself and come down from the cross; he might have come down from thence, and in saving himself have never saved us; yet it is certain that he felt the extremity of that punishment, and fulfilled the utmost intention of crucifixion: so that, as we acknowledge him crucified, we believe him dead.

2.—For the illustration of which part of the Article it will be necessary, First, to show that the Messias was to die; that no sufferings, howsoever shameful and painful, were sufficiently satisfactory to the determination and predictions divine, without a full dissolution and proper death: Secondly, to prove that our Jesus,
whom we believe to be the true Messias, did not only suffer torments intolerable and inexpressible in this life, but upon and by the same did finish this life by a true and proper death: Thirdly, to declare in what the nature and condition of the death of a person so totally singular did properly and peculiarly consist. And more than this cannot be necessary to show we believe that Christ was dead.

3.—First, then, we must consider what St. Paul delivered to the Corinthians first of all, and what also he received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;¹ that the Messias was the Lamb slain before the foundations of the world,² and that his death was severally represented and foretold. For though the sacrificing Isaac hath been acknowledged an express and lively type of the promised Messias; though, after he was bound and laid upon the wood, he was preserved from the fire and rescued from the religious cruelty of his father's knife; though Abraham be said to have offered up his only-begotten son,³ when Isaac died not; though by all this it might seem foretold that the true and great promised seed, the Christ, should be made a sacrifice for sin, should be fastened to the cross, and offered up to the Father, but not suffer death: yet being without effusion of blood there is no remission,⁴ without death no sacrifice for sin; being the saving of Isaac alive doth not deny the death of the antitype, but rather suppose and assert it, as presignifying his resurrection from the dead, from whence Abraham received him in a figure;⁵ we may safely affirm the ancient and legal types did represent a Christ which was to die. It was an essential part of the paschal law that the lamb should be slain; and in the sacrifices for sin, which presignified a Saviour to sanctify the people with his own blood, the bodies of the beasts were burnt without the camp, and their blood brought into the sanctuary.⁶

Nor did the types only require, but the prophecies also foretel, his death. For he was brought, saith Isaiah, as a Lamb to the slaughter: he was cut off out of the land of the living, saith the same prophet, and made his soul an offering for sin.⁷ Which are so plain and evident predictions, that the Jews show not the least appearance of probability in their evasions.⁸

¹ Cor. xv. 3. ² Rev. xiii. 8. ³ Heb. xi. 17. ⁴ Heb. ix. 22. ⁵ Heb. xi. 19. ⁶ Heb. xiii. 11, 12. ⁷ Isai. ii. 7, 8, 10. ⁸ That this place of Isaiah must be understood of the Messias, I have already proved against the Jews, out of the text, and their own traditions. Their objection particularly to these words is, that "the land of the living" is the land of Canaan. So Solomon Jarchi: "From the land of the living, that is, the land of Israel." And D. Kimchi endeavours to prove that exposition out of David.
Being then the obstinate Jews themselves acknowledge one Messias was to die, and that a violent death; being we have already proved there is but one Messias foretold by the prophets, and showed by those places which they will not acknowledge that he was to be slain (see above Art. IV., ch. I.); it followeth by their unwilling confessions and our plain probations that the promised Messias was ordained to die: which is our first assertion.

4.—Secondly, we affirm, correspondently to these types and prophecies, that Christ our Passover is slain,¹ that he whom we believe to be the true and only Messias did really and truly die. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain as being secure of any even the least denial. Jesus of Nazareth upon his crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they which wished, they which thirsted for his blood, they which obtained, which effected, which extorted, his death, even they believed it, even they were satisfied with it: the chief priests, the scribes and the Pharisees, the publicans and sinners, all were satisfied; the Sadducees most of all, who hugged their old opinion and loved their error the better because they thought him sure for ever rising up. But if they had denied or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the sun put on mourning? why were the graves opened, but for a funeral? Why did the earth quake? why were the rocks rent? why did the frame of nature shake, but because the God of nature died? Why did all the people who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such tragic spectacles, why did they beat upon their breasts and return, but that they were assured it was finished,² there was no more to be seen, all was done? It was not out of compassion that the merciless soldiers brake not his legs, but because they found him dead whom they came to dispatch; and being enraged that their cruelty should be thus prevented, with an impertinent villany they pierce his side and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man, thereby becoming stronger witnesses than they would, by being less the authors than they desired, of his death. For out of his sacred but wounded side came blood and water; both as evident signs of his present death, as certain seals of our future and

land of Canaan, because David professeth he will walk before the Lord in “the land of the living;” whereas there is no more in that phrase than that he will serve God while he liveth. As Psalm xxvii. 13: “I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living;” and Isai. xxxviii. 11: “I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living;” which is sufficiently interpreted by the words which follow: “I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world.” “The land of the living” then was not particularly the land of Canaan: nor can they persuade us that it could not refer to Christ, because he was never removed out of that land: but to be “cut off out of the land of the living” is certainly, to be taken away from them which live upon the earth; that is, to die.

¹ John x. 36.
² John x. 30.
eternal life. These are the two blessed sacraments of the spouse of Christ, each assuring her of the death of her beloved. The sacrament of baptism, the water through which we pass into the church of Christ, teacheth us that he died to whom we come. For know you not, saith St. Paul, that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death? 1 The sacrament of the Lord’s supper, the bread broken, and the wine poured forth, signify that he died which instituted it; and as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we show forth the Lord’s death till he come. 2

5.—Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the cross, and that not by a feigned or metaphorical but by a true and proper death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortal nature which the sons of Adam have, so did he undergo a true and proper death, in the same manner as we die. Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, motion and sensation; 3 and while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the life itself consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the original principle of them both, which we call the soul, and the intimate presence or union of that soul unto the body is the life thereof. The real distinction of which soul from the body in man our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition, Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell. 4 Now being death is nothing else but the privation or recession of life, 5 and we are then properly said to die when we cease to live; being life consisteth in the union of the soul unto the body, from whence, as from the fountain, flow motion, sensation, and whatsoever vital perfection; death can be nothing else but the solution of that vital union, or the actual separation of the soul, 6 before united to the body. As, therefore, when the

---

1 Rom. vi. 3. 2 1 Cor. xi. 26. 3 Τὸ ἐμφύσων δὴ τοῦ ἄρτου δύοις μέ-
λιστα διαφέρει δοκεῖ, κινήσει τε καὶ τῷ αἰσθάνεσθαι. Παρειλήφαμεν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν προγενεστέρων σχεδόν δύο ταῦτα περὶ ψυχῆς.— Aristot. De Anima, lib. i. cap. 2. 4 Πι διαφέρει τὰ ἐμφύσια (ἐδρ. ἐμφύσια) τῶν ἄρτων, τούτο ἐστὶν ψυχὴ: διαφέρει δὲ κινήσει, αἰσθήσει, φαντασίᾳ, νοήμε. — Sallust. De Ditis et Mundo, cap. 8. 5 Matt. x. 23. 6 As Secundus, Ψυχή καὶ ἄποκτησις βίου. 7 As the philosophers have anciently ex-
pressed it, especially Plato, who, by the advantage of an error in the original of souls, best understood the end of life: Τοῦτο γε θάνατος ὀνομάζεται, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος. — In Pha-
done. Again: 'O θάνατος τυρχαίει ὑπ’ ὧν ἐσμὲν δοκεῖ, ὁδὲν ἄλλο ἡ δύον πραγμά-
tον διάλυσις, τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος, ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων. — In Gorgia. And more 
plainly and fully yet: Ἡγούμεθα τι τοῦ θάνατον εἶναι; Τίνα γ’, ἐφθο υπολαβήνοι τὸ Ζήμμας. *Αρα μὴ ἄλλο τι η τῆς ψυ-
χῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπάλλαγεν; Καὶ εἰνό τούτο τεθνάναι, χωρίς μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπάλλαγεν αὐτὸ καθ’ ἑαυτὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπάλλαγεν αὐτὴν καθ’ αὐτὴν εἶναι; *Αρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ η τοῦ καθ’ ἱκο-
τοῦ, ὅριον ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπάλλαγεν αὐτὴν καθ’ αὐτὴν εἶναι; — In Pha-
done. Thus with four several words, λύσις, διάλυσις, χωρισ-
μός, and ἀπάλλαγη, both Plato express the separation of the soul from the body, and maketh death formally to consist of that separation. This solution is excellently expressed by Phocylides.–

Οὐ καλὸν ἄρμονήν ἀναλάβειν ἀνθρώπου. * * * *

Ψυχαι γάρ μίμωνοσ ἀκήριει ἐφ' ἱσμένουσιν
soul of man doth leave the habitation of its body, and being the sole fountain of vitality bereaves it of all vital activity, we say that body or that man is dead: so when we read that Christ our Saviour died, we must conceive that was a true and proper death, and consequently that his body was bereft of his soul, and of all vital influence from the same.

6.—Nor is this only our conception, or a doubtful truth; but we are as much assured of the propriety of his death as of the death itself. For that the unsptotted soul of our Jesus was really and actually separated from his body, that his flesh was bereft of natural life by the secession of that soul, appeareth by his own resignation, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; and by the evangelist's expression, and having said thus, he gave up the ghost. When he was to die, he resigned his soul; when he gave it up, he died; when it was delivered out of the body, then was the body dead: and so the eternal Son of God upon the cross did properly and truly die.

This reality and propriety of the death of Christ is yet farther

Πνεύμα γὰρ ἐστὶ Θεοῦ χρῆσις θυμοίσι καὶ εἰκόνι.
Σῶμα γὰρ ἐκ γαίης ἔχομεν, καὶ πάντες ἐς αὐτὸν
Λυφομένοι κἀνεὶς ἐμφανῶν ἄγα καὶ ἀνὰ πνεύμα
δεδεκαί.—Curt. Admon. 97.

So Tertullian: "Opus autem mortis in medio est, discretio corporis animaque."—De Anim. cap. 51. "Si mors non alius determinatur, quam disjunctio corporis animaque, contactum morti vita non alius definietur, quam conjunctio corporis animaque."—Ibid. cap. 27. This description of death is far more philosophical than the notion of Aristotle, who makes it to consist in the corruption of natural heat: Ἀνάγκη τοῖνν αἷμα τῷ τῷ ὑπάρχει καὶ τῷ τῇ θερμῇ φυσικῷ σωτηρίᾳ, καὶ τῷ καλοίσευσι θάνατον εἴναι τῷ τούτον ὕδατον.—Lib. de Devoe, et Senect. cap. 4: Inasmuch as the soul is not that natural heat, and the corruption of that heat followed, upon the separation of the soul.

1 This is expressed three ways, all signifying the separation of his soul from his body. St. Mark and St. Luke, ἐξεπένευε, which is of the same force with εἶδον. But because ἐκφένω doth not always signify an absolute expiration, but sometimes a lipothymany only; (as Hesychius, Ἐκφένων, λεπτοθυμοῦσι: so Hippocrates useth it, Εἰσὶ ἐν ἐνεφένα τῷ καιρῷ) οὕς ἡ ἐκφένωσεν δεῖ τῷ ὀφελησαί.—De Morbis, lib. 1. cap. 2; and again, Ἐκφένων ἐν διὰ τοῦ αἰματος τοῦ μεταφασίαν έκμεανος γενομένων) lest therefore we should take ἐξεπένευε in such an imperfect sense, St. Matthew hath it, ἀφέκε ἀν το πνεύμα, and St. John, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεύμα. Which is a full expression of the secession of the soul from the body, and consequently of death, which is, in the language of Secundus, πνεύματος ἀπόστασις. Luke xxiii. 46.

2 These three points or distinctions of time I have therefore noted, that I might occur to any objection which possibly might arise out of the ancient philosophical subtlety, which Aulus Gellius reports to be agitated at the table of Taurus. The question was propounded thus: "Quassitum est, quando moriens moreretur; cum jam in morte esset, an tum etiam cum in vita fuerat." Where Taurus admonisheth the rest, that this was no light question; for, says he, "Gravissimi philosophorum super hac re serio quassavere; et ali is morianti verbum atque momentum manente adhuc vita dixi atque fieri putaverunt; ali nihil in illo tempore vitae reliquerunt, totumque illud quod mori dicitur morti vendicatur." The ancient philosophers were divided; some saying a man died in the time of his life, others in the time of his death. But Plato observed a contradiction in both; for a man can neither be said to die while he is alive, nor when he is dead: "Et Idecirco peperit ipse [expresset] alium quoddam novum in confulo tempus, quod verbis propriis atque integris τὴν εὐφήσης φύσις appellavit:" which he thus describes in his Parmenides: Τὸ γὰρ εὐφήσης τοιοῦτον τὰ ἐνακε ζημαῖν, ὥς ἐκ ἕκεινον μεταβάλλον εἰς ἑτέρων. So Aulus Gellius, lib. vi. cap. 13: Thus when our Saviour commended his soul into the hands of the Father, he was yet alive; when the soldier pierced his side, he was already dead; and the instant in which he gave up the ghost was the τὸ εὐφήσης when he died.
illustrated from the cause immediately producing it, which was an external violence and cruciation, sufficient to dissolve that natural disposition of the body which is absolutely necessary to continue the vital union of the soul: the torments which he endured on the cross did bring to that state in which life could not longer be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernatural power, must necessarily follow.

7.—For Christ, who took upon him all our infirmities, sin only excepted, had in his nature not only a possibility and aptitude, but also a necessity of dying; and as to any extrinsical violence, able according to the common course of nature to destroy and extinguish in the body such an aptitude as is indispensably required to continue in union with the soul, he had no natural preservative; nor was it in the power of his soul to continue its vital conjunction unto his body bereft of a vital disposition.

8.—It is true that Christ did voluntarily die, as he said of himself, *No man taketh away my life from me,* but *I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* For it was in his power whether he would come into the power of his enemies; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of Pilate, and the nailing to the cross; it was in his power to have come down from the cross, when he was nailed to it: but when by an act of his will he had submitted to that death, when he had accepted and embraced those torments to the last, it was not in the power of his soul to continue any longer vitality to the body, whose vigour was totally exhausted. So not by a necessary compulsion, but voluntary election, he took upon him a necessity of dying.

It is true that Pilate marvelled he was dead so soon, and the two thieves lived longer to have their legs broken, and to die by the accession of another pain; but we read not of such long furrows on their backs as were made on his, nor had they such kind of agony as he was in the night before. What though *he cried with a loud voice,* and *gave up the ghost?* what though the Centurion, *when he saw it,* said, *Truly this man was the Son of God?* The miracle was not in the death, but in the voice; the strangeness was not that he should die, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud: he died not by, but with, a miracle.

9.—Should we imagine Christ to anticipate the time of death, and to subtract his soul from future torments necessary to cause an expiration, we might rationally say the Jews and Gentiles were guilty of his death, but we could not properly say they slew him: guilty they must be, because they inflicted those torments on which

---

1 John x. 18.  
2 Mark xv. 44  
3 Verses 37, 39.
m time death must necessarily follow; but slay him actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause and not from the wounds which they inflicted: whereas St. Peter expressly chargeth his enemies, Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain;\(^1\) and again, The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree.\(^2\) Thus was the Lamb properly slain, and the Jews authors of his death as well as of his crucifixion.

10.—Wherefore being Christ took upon himself our mortality in the highest sense, as it includeth a necessity of dying; being he voluntarily submitted himself to that bloody agony in the garden, to the hands of the ploughers who made long their furrows, and to the nails which fastened him to the cross: being these torments thus inflicted and continued did cause his death, and in this condition he gave up the ghost: it followeth, that the only-begotten Son of God, the true Messias promised of old, did die a true and proper death. Which is the second conclusion in this explication.

11.—But thirdly, because Christ was not only man, but also God, and there was not only an union between his soul and body while he lived, but also a conjunction of both natures, and an union in his person; it will be farther necessary, for the understanding of his death, to show what union was dissolved, what continued, that we may not make that separation either less or greater than it was.

12.—Whereas, then, there were two different substantial unions in Christ, one of the parts of his human nature each to other, in which his humanity did consist, and by which he was truly man; the other of his natures human and divine, by which it came to pass that God was man, and that man God: first, it is certain, as we have already showed, that the union of the parts of his human nature was dissolved on the cross, and a real separation made between his soul and body. As far, then, as humanity consists in the essential union of the parts of human nature, so far the humanity of Christ upon his death did cease to be, and consequently he ceased to be man. But secondly, the union of the natures remained still as to the parts, nor was the soul or body separated from the divinity, but still subsisted as they did before, by the subsistence of the second person of the Trinity.

13.—The truth of this assertion appeareth, first from the language of this very CREED.\(^3\) For, as we proved before, that

---

\(^1\) Acts ii. 23.

\(^2\) In both which places the original showeth more expressly, that by their crucifixion they slew him: in the former [Acts ii. 23] thus, Διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων προσπίθαντες ἁνείλετε. In the latter [Acts v. 30] thus, ὥσις διεκεφίσασθε κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου.

\(^3\) "Credimus certe non in solum Deum
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the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was conceived, and born, and suffered, and that the truth of these propositions relied upon the communion of properties, grounded upon the hypostatical union; so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same person, that he was buried and descended into hell, it showeth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his soul, in respect of which he was generally conceived to descend into hell, had lost that union.

14.—Again, as we believe that God redeemed us by his own blood, so also it hath been the constant language of the church, that God died for us; which cannot be true, except the soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the deity.

Indeed, being all the gifts of God are without repentance, nor doth he ever subtract his grace from any without their abuse of it, and a sinful demerit in themselves, we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ, who never offended, and that in the highest act of obedience and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.

It is true Christ cried upon the cross with a loud voice, saying, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? But if that dereliction should signify a solution of the former union of his natures, the separation had been made not at his death, but in his life.

Whereas, indeed, those words infer no more than that he was bereft of such joys and comforts from the deity as should assuage and mitigate the acerbity of his present torments.

15.—It remaineth, therefore, that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost he suffered only an external violence, and what was subject to such corporal force did yield unto those dolorous impressions. Being then such is the imbecility and frailty of our nature, that life cannot long subsist in exquisite torments; the disposition of his body failed the soul, and the soul deserted his body. But being no power hath any force against omnipotency, nor could any corporal or finite assumption work upon the union made

Patrem, sed et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus Unicem, Dominum nostrum. Modo totum dixi, in Jesum Christum Filium ejus Unicem, Dominum Nostrum. Totum ibi intellige, et Verbun, et animam, et carnem. Sed utique confiteris etiam illud quod habet eadem fides, in eum Christum te credere qui crucifixus est et sepultus. Ergo etiam sepultum Christum esse non negas; et tamen sola caro sepulta est. Si enim erat ibi anima, non erat mortuus; si autem vera mors erat, ut ejus vera sit resurrectio, sine anima fuerat in sepulchro; et tamen sepultus est Christus. Ergo Christus erat etiam sine anima caro,

quia non est sepulta nisi caro."—S. August. Tract. 47 in Joan.

1 Δια του αιματος ίδιου. Acis xx. 23.
2 Matt. xxvii. 46.
3 "Ολος του ανθρωπου του Θεου, δια της προς εαυτον ανακρασεως εις την θειαν φυσιν μετασκεπασαντος, ιν το καιρο της κατα το παθος οικονομιας ου θατερου μερους το άπαξ εγκαθεν ανεξωρθης αμεταμελητα γαι του Θεου τα χειρισματα άλλα της μην ψυχη του σωματος, η θεους εκουσως διεκενεν ειναι δε ει αμφοτεροις μενουσαι άνειας — S. Gregorius Nyss. De Christi Resur. Oral. 1.
with the Word; therefore that did still remain entire both to the soul and to the body. The Word was once, indeed, without either soul or body; but after it was made flesh it was never parted either from the one or from the other.\(^1\)

Thus Christ did really and truly die, according to the condition of death, to which the nature of man is subject; but although he was more than man, yet he died no more than man can die: a separation was made between his soul and body, but no disunion of them and his deity. They were disjoined one from another, but not from him that took them both together; rather by virtue of that remaining conjunction they were again united after their separation.\(^2\) And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

16.—The necessity of this part of the article is evident, in that the death of Christ is the most intimate and essential part of the mediatorship and that which most intrinsically concerns every office and function of the mediator, as he was prophet, priest, and king.

17.—First, it was necessary, as to the prophetic office, that Christ should die, to the end that the truth of all the doctrine which he delivered might be confirmed by his death. He was the true and faithful witness, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession.\(^3\) This is he that came by water and blood; and there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood.\(^4\) He preached unto us a new and better covenant, which was established upon better promises,\(^5\) and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the blood of the new testament,\(^6\) or everlasting covenant:\(^7\) for that covenant was also a testament; and where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.\(^8\)

Beside, Christ, as a prophet, taught us

---

\(^1\) This is the conclusion of St. Augustin "Ex quo Verbum caro factum est, ut habitaret in nobis, et susceptus est a Verbo hominis, id est totus homo, anima et caro; quid fecit passio, quid fecit mors, nisi corpus ab anima separavit? Animam vero a Verbo non separavit? Si cujus mortuus est Dominus,—sine dubiis caro ipsius expravit animam: ad tempus enim exigui anima descendit carmen, sed reducte anima resurrecturam. A Verbo autem animam separatam esse non dico. Latronis animae dixit, Hodie necum est in Paradiso. Tidem latronis animam non deserat, et deserat suam? Abit: sed illius ut Dominus custodivit, suam vero inseparabiliter habuit. Si autem dixerimus, quia ipsa se anima possit, et iterum ipsa se sumpsit, absurdisissimus sensus est: non enim qua a Verbo non erat separata, a Verbo potuit separari."—Tractatus 41 in Joann.


\(^3\) Rev. iii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 13.

\(^4\) 1 John v. 6, 8.

\(^5\) Heb. viii. 6.

\(^6\) Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 20; Heb. x. 23

\(^7\) Heb. xlii. 20.

\(^8\) Heb. ix. 16.
not only by word, but by example; and though every action of his life, who came to fulfil the law, be most worthy of our imitation, yet the most eminent example was in his death, in which he taught us much variety of Christian virtues. What example was that of faith in God, to lay down his life, that he might take it up again; 1 in the bitterness of his torments to commend his spirit into the hands of his Father; 2 and for the joy that was set before him, to endure the cross, and despise the shame? 3 What a pattern of meekness, patience, and humility, for the Son of man to come not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many; 4 to be led like a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the shearer, not to open his mouth; 5 to endure the contradictions of sinners against himself, 6 and to humble himself unto death, even the death of the cross? 7 What a precedent of obedience for the Son of God to learn obedience by the things that he suffered; 8 to be made under the law, 9 and, though he never broke the law, to become obedient unto death; 10 to go with cheerfulness to the cross upon this resolution, as my Father gave me commandment, even so I do? 11

What exemplar of charity, to die for us while we were yet sinners and enemies, 12 when greater love hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his friends; 13 to pray upon the cross for them that crucified him, and to apologise for such as barbarously slew him, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do? 14 Thus Christ did suffer for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps; 15 that as he suffered for us in the flesh, we should arm ourselves likewise with the same mind. For he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin: that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh, to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. 16 And so his death was necessary for the confirmation and completion of his prophetic office.

18.—Secondly, it was necessary that Christ should die, and by his death perform the sacerdotal office. For every high-priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. 17 But Christ had no other sacrifice to offer for our sins than himself. For it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins: 18 and therefore when sacrifice and offering God would not, then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God; 19 then did Christ determine to offer up himself for us. And because the sacrifices of old were to be slain, and generally without shedding of blood there is no remis-

---

1 John x. 17. 2 Luke xxiii. 46. 3 Heb. xii. 2. 4 Matt. xx. 28. 5 Acts viii. 32. 6 Heb. xii. 3. 7 Phil. ii. 8. 8 Heb. v. 8. 9 Gal. iv. 4. 10 Phil. ii. 8. 11 John xiv. 31. 12 Rom. v. 8. 13 John xv. 13. 14 Luke xxiii. 34. 15 1 Peter ii. 21 16 1 Peter iv. 1, 2. 17 Heb. v. 1. 18 Heb. x. 4. 19 Ver. 8. 9
sion; therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin he must of necessity die, and so make his soul an offering for sin. If Christ be our passover, he must be sacrificed for us. We were sold under sin, and he which will redeem us must give his life for our redemption; for we could not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but only with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. We all had sinned, and so offended the justice of God, and by an act of that justice the sentence of death passed upon us: it was necessary, therefore, that Christ our surety should die, to satisfy the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for our sins, and for that penalty, as he which was to bear our griefs. God was offended with us, and he must die who was to reconcile him to us. For when we were enemies, saith St. Paul, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son. We were sometimes alienated, and enemies in our mind by our wicked works; yet now hath he reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death. Thus the death of Christ was necessary toward the great act of his priesthood, as the oblation, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and not only for the act itself, but also for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it (For if the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our consciences from dead works?), and of the happiness flowing from it (for he that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?). Upon this assurance founded on his death, we have the freedom and boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh. Neither was the death of Christ necessary only in respect of us immediately for whom he died, but in reference to the priest himself who died, both in regard of the qualification of himself and consummation of his office. For in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest, and having suffered, being tempted, might be able to succour them that are tempted: so that passing through all the previous torments, and at last through the pains of death, having suffered all which man can suffer, and much more, he became, as an experimental priest, most sensible of our infirmities, most compassionate of our miseries, most willing and ready to support us under, and to deliver us out of, our temptations. Thus being qualified by his utmost suffering, he was also fitted to perfect his

1 Heb. ix. 22. 2 Isa. lli. 10. 3 1 Peter i. 18, 19. 4 Rom. v. 10. 5 Col. i. 21. 6 Heb. ix. 13, 14. 7 Rom. viii. 32. 8 Heb. x. 19, 20. 9 Heb. v. 17, 18.
offering. For as the high-priest once every year for the atonement of the sins of the people entered into the holy of holies not without blood, so Christ being come an high-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.¹ And this is the grand necessity of the death of Christ in respect of his sacerdotal office.

19.—Thirdly, there was a necessity that Christ should die in reference to his regal office. O king, live for ever, is either the loyal or the flattering vote for temporal princes; either the expression of our desires² or the suggestion of their own;³ whereas our Christ never showed more sovereign power than in his death, never obtained more than by his death. It was not for nothing that Pilate suddenly wrote and resolutely maintained what he had written, This is the king of the Jews.⁴ That title on the cross did signify no less than that his regal power was active even there: for having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it;⁵ and through his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.⁶ Nor was his death only necessary for the present execution, but also for the assecution of farther power and dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. The Spirit of Christ in the prophets of old testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.⁷ He shall drink of the brook in the way, saith the prophet David; therefore shall he lift up his head.⁸ He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.⁹ For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord of the dead and living.¹⁰

Thus it is necessary to believe and profess our faith in Christ who died; for by his blood and the virtue of his death was our redemption wrought, as the price which was paid, as by the atonement which was made, as by the full satisfaction which was given, that God might be reconciled to us, who before was offended with us, as by the ratification of the covenant made between us, and the acquisition of full power to make it good unto us.

20.—After which exposition thus premised, every Christian is conceived to express thus much when he makes profession of faith in Christ Jesus which was dead: I do really and truly assent unto this, as a most infallible and fundamental truth, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the working out of our

¹ Heb. ix. 7, 11, 12. ² Dan. vi. 6, 21. ³ ii. 4; iii. 9. ⁴ John xix. 19-32. ⁵ Col. ii. 15. ⁶ Heb. ii. 14. ⁷ 1 Peter i. 11. ⁸ Psalm cx. 7. ⁹ Phil. ii. 8, 9. ¹⁰ Rom. xiv. 9.
redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truly die, so as by the force and violence of those torments which he felt his soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his soul nor body was separated from his divinity, yet the body bereft of his soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ which was crucified and dead.

CHAPTER V.

And Buried.

1.—When the most precious and immaculate soul of Christ was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which his natural life consisted was dissolved, his sacred body, as being truly dead, was laid up in the chambers of the grave; so that as we believe him dead, by the separation of his soul, we also believe him buried, by the sepulture of his body.

And because there is nothing mysterious or difficult in this part of the article, it will be sufficiently explicated when we have shown, first, that the promised Messias was to be buried; and, secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the Messias was to be.

2.—That the Messias was to be buried, could not possibly be denied by those who believed he was to die among the Jews; because it was the universal custom of that nation to bury their dead. 1 We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers; and though those that were condemned by their supreme power were not buried in their fathers' graves, yet public sepulchres there were appointed even for them to lie in, and not only they, but all the instruments which were used in the punishment were buried with them. And yet beside the general consequence of death

---

1 It is observed by Tacitus of the Jews, in opposition to the Roman custom, "Corpora condere, quam cremare, e more Egyptian."—Historia, liber v. cap. 5. As of the Egyptians by others: Θάπτοντι δὲ Αἰγύπτων μὲν, ταφικώντες: 'Ρωμαίοι δὲ, καταταφοῦσαν, èì τάς Αἰμαντικώτητας. — Diogenes Laert. in Pyrrhonis Vita. But the Jews received this custom no more from the Egyptians than from the Persians, whom they may be rather said to follow, because they used not the Egyptian ταφικόντως: neither were they more distinguished from the Romans than from the Grecians, who also burned the bodies of the dead. Διελόμεθα κατα "θην τὸς ταφᾶς, ὦ μεν Ἑλλην ἐκαστοιν: ὦ δὲ Πέρσης θυατεῖεν ὦ δὲ 'Ἰωνὸς ὑλῶν περιχρείες: ὦ δὲ Σκινθῆς καταστοθεῖες ταριχεῖες δὲ το δοξατος. — Lycian. Περὶ Πένθους. § 21. Although therefore it be not true, that the Jews received their custom of burying their dead from the Egyptians, because Abraham at the first purchased a burying-place; yet it hath been observed, and is certainly true, that their general custom was to inter. Philo, one of their own writers: Ἀνδρώντας καὶ πᾶσι χερσαίους οἰκεῖστεροι η φύσις χωρίον απένεμε γην, οὐ μόνον ζωσιν, ἀλλὰ και ἀποθανοῦσιν, ἵν' ἦ αὐτή καὶ τὴν πρώτην ὑποδέχηται γένεσιν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ βίου τελευταίαν ἀνάλυσιν.—Iud. in Flaccian.
among the Jews, there was a perfect type in the person of Jonas: for as that prophet was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so was the Messias, or the Son of man, to be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.  

Nor was his burial only represented typically, but foretold prophetically both by a suppositive intimation and by an express prediction. The Psalmist intimated and supposed no less, when, speaking in the person of the Christ, he said, My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. That flesh is there supposed only such, that is, a body dead, and that body resting in the grave, the common habitation of the dead; yet resting there in hope that it should never see corruption, but rise from thence before that time in which bodies in their graves are wont to putrefy. Beside this intimation there is yet a clear expression of the grave of the Messias in that eminent prediction of Isaiah, He was cut off out of the land of the living, and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death. For whatsoever the true interpretation of the prophecy be (of which we shall speak hereafter), it is certain that he which was to be cut off was to have a grave; and being we have already shown that he which was to be cut off was the Messias, it followeth that, by virtue of this prediction, the promised Messias was to be buried.

3.—Secondly, that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, was thus buried, we shall also prove, although it seem repugnant to the manner of his death. For those which were sentenced by the Romans to die upon the cross had not the favour of a sepulchre, but their bodies were exposed to the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field, or if they escaped their voracity,
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to the longer injury of the air and weather. A guard was also usually set about them, lest any pitying hand should take the body from the cursed tree and cover it with earth.

4.—Under that custom of the Roman law was now the body of our Saviour on the cross, and the guard was set; there was the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus. The centurion returned as soon as Christ was dead, and gave testimony unto Pilate of his death; but the watch continued still. How, Pontus, from whence Marcion came: "Omnia torpentes, omnia rigentes; nihil illic nisi feritas calet; [illa sibilent] que fabulas secundis dedit, de sacrificiis Taurorum, et amoribus Colchorum, et crucibus Caesarorum."

—Adv. Marcion, lib. i. cap. 1. He touches the subject of three tragedies, Medea, Iphigenia in Tauris, and Prometheus Vinctus, or rather, Crucifixus. As therefore the eagle there did feed upon his liver, so were the bodies of crucified persons left to the promiscuous rapacity of carnivorous fowls. So true it was of them what Augustus once said: "Unl supplicier sepulturam prevente response dicitur. Jam iam in omnem fore potestate."—Stee. lib. ii. cap. 13. Nor were they only in the power of the fowls of the air, as Promethes was, whom they durst not hang too low, lest men should succour him: Quemque terras, deliciasque avium, propter virum qui ad postera venit, desiderat, ut supellexe passa terrae seculo, hic, vicem ignis, in Lucian for that reason: (Prometh. cap. 1 i) but ordinarily they hung so low upon the cross that the ravenous beasts might reach them, as Apuleius describes, "Fatibus cruciatum, cum canes et vultures intima protractum viscera." De Aqu. Asin. lib. vi.

So the bodies were often left upon the cross till the sun and rain had putrefied and consumed them. As when the daughter of Polycrates did see her father's fate in a dream, to be washed by Jupiter and to be anointed by the sun; when he hung upon the cross, it was performed. Polycratetis de anaeramemoseo epiteleni passa terrae seculo, hic, vicem ignis, in Lucian for that reason: (Prometh. cap. 1 i) but ordinarily they hung so low upon the cross that the ravenous beasts might reach them, as Apuleius describes, "Fatibus cruciatum, cum canes et vultures intima protractum viscera." De Aqu. Asin. lib. vi.

Thus, whether by the fowls or beasts, or by the injury of time and weather, the flesh of those which were crucified was consumed; as Artemidorus observed, who concluded from thence, that It was bad for the rich to dream of being crucified: Tous de plousiwni phlaxtai, gamoi gar staurounontai, kai tas sarkas apalloiwsan oi staurounontes. — Onieirocr. lib. ii. cap. 58. 2 As appeareth by that relation in Petronius Arbiter: "Imperator provincie latrones jussit crucibus affligi." Proxima autem nocte, cum miles qui cruxess avessabat, ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detraderet," &c. And when that soldier was absent, "Itaque cruciarii unius parentes, ut viderint laxatam custodiam, detraxerent eoque pendentem, supremaque mandavenunt officio." Where we see the soldier set for a guard; and the end of that custodia, (which the Greek lexicographers do not well confine to the straetia de desmetripi epieidemien.) to keep the body of him which was crucified from being buried by his friends. Thus when Cleomenes was dead, his body was fastened to a cross (another example of the ignominy of this punishment) by the command of Ptolemy: 'O de Ptolomeios, os evnwn taistos, prosoaste to mèn swma tov Klaemoinos kremasai kataherwosantai. Where kremasai is again to be observed as taken for anastauwosai; for not long after in the same author it follows: 'Olymias 8 'ysteroi hemeras, oi to swma tov Klaemoinos anestauwosai parautoibountes eldos evyloghyno doxakata to kaiqakai peiraepilemenon, kai apektroif mia to prwistos, woste mdh evnun afihosai staurofagon. — Plutarch. in Vita Cleomen. cap. 38, 39. Where we see a guard set to keep him from burial; and the voracious fowls ready to seize on him, had they not been kept off by a serpent involving his head. Thus were soldiers, upon the crucifixion of any person, set as a guard, tov anestauwosai parautoibountes, or parautoibontes, et crucem asserbantes, viz. ne quis ad sepulturam corpus detraperet.

2 Matt. xxvii. 54.
then, can the ancient predictions be fulfilled? how can this Jonas be conveyed into the belly of the whale? where shall he make his grave with the wicked, or with the rich, in his death of crucifixion? ¹

By the providence of him who did foretell it, it shall be fulfilled. They which petitioned that he might be crucified shall intercede that he may be interred. For the custom of the Jews required, ² that whosoever suffered by the sentence of their law should be buried, and that the same day he suffered. Particularly they could not but remember the express words of Moses, If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day. ³ Upon this general custom and particular law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, the Jews, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath-day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. ⁴ And this is the first step to the burial of our Saviour.

For though by the common rule of the Roman law those which were condemned to the cross were to lose both soul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or mourning; ⁵ yet it was in the power of the magistrate to indulge the leave of burial; ⁶ and therefore Pilate, who crucified Christ because the Jews desired it, could not possibly deny him burial when they requested it: he which professed to find no fault in him while he lived, could make no pretence for an accession of cruelty after his death.

Now though the Jews had obtained their request of Pilate, though Christ had been thereby certainly buried, yet had not the prediction been fulfilled which expressly mentioned the rich in his death. For as he was crucified between two thieves, so had he been buried with them, because by the Jews there was appointed a public place of burial for all such as suffered as malefactors.

5—Wherefore to rescue the body of our blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those that caused his crucifixion, there came

¹ Isai. lili. 9.
² So Upianus: Corpora eorum qui capite damnantur cognatis ipsorum neganda non sunt: et id se observasse etiam Divus Augustus libro decimo de vita sua scribit. Hodie autem eorum in quos animadverterit, corpora non aliter sepelirunt, quam si ficerit petitum et permissum; et nonnunquam non permitterut, maxime majestatis causa damnatorum.—Lib. ix. De Officio Proconsulis. So Paulus, lib. i. Sententiarium: Corporatione animadversorum quibuslibet potentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt. Obnoxios criminum digno supplicio subjectos sepulture tradi non vetamus.—Cod. lib. iii. tit. 43, l. 11.
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a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honourable counsellor, a good man and a just, who also himself waited for the kingdom of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews: this Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave him leave, and commanded the body to be delivered: he came, therefore, and took the body of Jesus.  

Beside, there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, a master of Israel: this Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrin and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.  

6.—And thus was the burial of the Son of God performed according to the custom of the people of God. For the understanding of which there are three things considerable: first, what was done to the body, to prepare it for the grave; secondly, how the sepulchre was prepared to receive the body; thirdly, how the persons were fitted by the interring of our Saviour to fulfil the prophecy.  

As for fulfilling the custom of the Jews as to the preparation in respect of his body, we find the spices and the linen clothes. When there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard, very precious, and she brake the box and poured it on his head, Christ made this interpretation of that action, she is come before-hand to anoint my body to the burying.  

When Christ was risen, Mary Magdalen and the other Mary brought the spices which they had prepared, that they may come and anoint him. Thus was there an interpreted and an intended unction of our Saviour, but really and actually he was interred with the spices which Nicodemus brought. The custom of wrapping in the clothes we see in Lazarus rising from the grave; for he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin. In the same manner when our Saviour was risen, Simon Peter went into the sepulchre and saw the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Thus according to the custom of the Jews was the body of Christ bound in several linen clothes with an aromatical composition, and so prepared for the sepulchre.

2 John iii. 1, 19; xix. 39, 40.
3 Mark xiv. 3, 8.
4 Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 1.
5 John xix. 44. 6 John xx. 6, 7.
7 There are four words in the Gospel expressing the linen clothes in which the dead were buried, σταύρως, θέωνα, καταρα, and σουδάμων. The σταύρως is used by three evangelists, as what was brought by Joseph. Και ἁγοράζας συνδώνα, καὶ καταράμων αὐτὸν ἐνελάφαι τῇ συνδώνῃ. (Mark xv. 46.) and St Matthew and St. Luke, Ἐνεπολέτεισαν αὐτὸ συνδώνον. (Matt. xxvii. 59; Luke xxiii. 53.) "Θέωνα is used by St. Luke and St. John;
As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custom of the Jews was also punctually observed.

Elabov oin to somia tou 'Ihsoou, kai e'dhgan autov o'dhnyov. (John xix. 40.) Now both these words show that the clothes were linen. Sindon, tunicia linea. — Gloss. Post-

sionum, lanovn ve, ghtu sindonov. — Etym. So, 'Odania, lina imata. — Hesteh. This was according to the custom of the Jews, amongst whom there was a kind of law, that they should use no other grave-clothes. As therefore the Egyptians in Herodotus, lib. ii. cap. 86: 'Aouaiovtes tov nekrov, katel被盗-
souvi pav autov to somia sindonov bavasqin' so the Jews. But it is farther to be ob-
erved, that St. John saith, 'E'dhgan autov o'dhnyov, "They bound up his body with se-

veral clothes," which signifies it was done fascliai. As Herodotus in another case, 

Sawmpofe ti wThmen to elaka, kai sindonov bavasqin' tov bavasqin. — Lib. vii. cap. 181. Whereas then Julius Pollux observes, Efragta de pov kai telamovn sy-
douvin, bavasqin' telamovn kai kalistisouev. — Lib. vii. cap. 16, segm. 72.) I con-

ceive these o'dhnia in St. John were such telamovn sindouvin, lineas fasicu, or in-

stica, called in the case of Lazarus ke'riai. (John xi. 44.) for as he is described de'dem-

ovn ke'riai, so it is said of the body of Christ, 'E'dhgan autov o'dhnyov, "They bound 
it with four bandages or swathes." These are the entapha desia, as the grammarians 

interpret ke'riai lambalmpa kriai. So the ancient ms. in the library at St. James's 

reads it, De'demovn ta'xheis kai tov xelov kriaias. And so Hesychius reads it, 

when he made that interpretation: ke'riaias (llg. Kriaias) entelistanta entuvellogkuma. 

What anciently ke'riai was, will appear by the words of Julius Pollux: Kai 

mwn tove kai kriai, ou tis ke'nemado entemovn, ou tove tov kriai, ou tove tov 

kriai (lit. x. cap. 7, segm. 36) the bands or cords by which the beds or couches are 

fastened, and upon which the bedding lies. In this sense it is to be taken in that known 

place of Aristophanes, in Aenetus: 816:—

Σπάρτην γὰρ ἂν θείμην εῦχο τῇ μῆ πόλει; 
Οὐδ' ἂν ἔχεινε τάγμην κερίαν εὑρὼν.

Of which Enstatius, II. B. gives us this account: Φτια μὴ ἂν δεσποίνης σπάρτης, 
ke'riaiain euvon' ἴτοι μὴ δεσποινὴ σπαρτιάνος πλεγματος, ταν ἄλλον ἐχον κεριαν, ἄτο 

δεσμωτα κλημῆς. Hence the grammarians 

give that interpretation of ke'riai. As Epy-

mologos: Ke'riai σημαινει τὸ σκοτιον τὸ 

desmonov την κλήνην, viz., in reference 
to that place of Aristophanes: otherwise it 

hath no relation to a bed, but indifferently 

signifieth any fasicu or "band." So the 

scholiast of Aristophanes: 'H de ke'riai, eido

xarhēs ek skotianov pareukos imatai, ò de 

desmoustai tois klínais: not the cord of a 

bed, but a fasicu or "girdle" like unto it. With 
such linen fasicu, "swathes," or "band-

agas," was the body of Lazarus involved.—

—Εκ ποσοα ἀχρι καρπήν 
Σφυγμόρουνον πλεκτής πολυ δέμας εἴπε 
κερίας,

says Nonnus. And Juvenals:— 

"Nec mora: connexis manibus pedibusque 
repente 
Procedit tumulo; vultum cui linea texta, 
Et totum gracilis connectit fascia corpus."


Hence Basil bishop of Seleucia makes Laza-

rus come out of the grave to live like an in-

fant in swaddling-clothes: "Ecce den anphga 

nekrov tepatymferos τό του θανάτου περι-

κείμενος συμβολα; and τον βάπτισθαν ἀποκα

μενος, την του τάφου στολήν οὐκ ἡλλάξατο 

ἀλλ' ἐφάστατο τας κερίαις ως ἕκ τάφον 

τεχθεί, καὶ μετὰ τόκον φέρων τὰ σπάργανα. 

—Orat. 35, in Publicam et Pharis. The 

ke'riai then were institi, as the Vulgar La-

tin; fasicu, as Juvenals and the Syriac 

translation, κόρα δεινον γίνεται fasicis. 

Of the same nature, I conceive, were the 

o'dhnia mentioned in our Saviour's burial; 

and so St. Augustin does express them in 

reconciling the rest of the evangelists, who 

mentioned only Joseph and the sindon, with 

St. John, who addeth Nicodemus and the 

o'dhnia: "Neque hic aliqqu repugnau reed 

intellectualiter. Neque enim illi qui de Ni-

codemo tacerentur, affermaverunt a solo Jose-

pho Dominum sepultum, quamvis solius com-

memorationem feerient; aut quia illi una 
sindone a Josepho involutum diercurt, prop-

terea prohibuerunt intelligii et alia lineta 
potissime afferire a Nicodemo et superaddi;

ut verum narraret Joannes, quod non uno 

lineo, sed lintelo, involutus sit; quamvis et 

proper sudarium quod capiti adhibebatur; et 

insitas quibus totum corporis alligatum est, 

quia omnia de lino crant, etiam una sindon 

fulvis corporis, de cieli potest, Ligerius in 

lindet."—De Consente Evang. lib. iii. cap. 

23. These he calls institi quibus totum 

corporis alligatum est, were the ποτίσματο 
involucra mortui. Beside these, we read in 

the history of Lazarus, 'Η δυσι αὐτοῦ σοų 

darwos periexēgethe (John xi. 44.) and of 

our Saviour, Καὶ τὸ σπαρέων ὕν ἐπὶ τῆς 

cēphalís autou. (John xx. 7.) The same is 
rendered by the Syriac καθαρὰ καὶ 

Νωννος. And Nonnus makes it a Syriac word:—

Καὶ λιμφε πεπυκαστὸ καλλιμάτι κυκλάδα 

κόρην,

Σπαρέων τὸ περ ἑπι Σώρων στόμα—

—Paraphr. cap. 11; 

whereas the word is not of a Syriac, but 

Latin, origination; and from the Latin 

came to the Greek and Eastern people: 

suitor and sudare, from hence sudarium. 

Vatinius reus, agent in undo Calvo, can-

didly frontem sudaricum detersit." — Quintil. 

Inst. Orator. lib. vi. cap. 3. Suetonius of 

Nero: "Plerumque ligato circa collum
in that. Joseph of Arimathea had prepared a place of burial for himself, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein never man was laid, which Joseph had hewn out of the rock for his own tomb: there laid they Jesus, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre. And so Christ was buried after this manner of the Jews, in a vault made by the excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth, and that vault secured from external injury.

sudario prodit in publicam."—Lib. vi. cap. 53.

This was translated into their own language by the latter Greeks, to signify that which before was called ἡμιτίβιον and καβαλδρώνιον, as is observed by Julius Pollux, lib. viii. cap. 16, segm. 71: Το δὲ ἡμιτίβιον, ἐστι μὲν καὶ τούτο Ἡγίστρων, εἰτ ἀν κατὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ κωμῳδίᾳ καβαλδρώνιον καλουμένου, ὁ νῦν στάδιον κυνοκείμενον. Αὐριστοφάνει γὰρ ἐν Πολύντι τοιάῦτα τὴ δόξα—

'Εποτα καθαρὸν ἡμιτίβιον λαβών, Τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψυε·—Πλιτ. 729;

where τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψυε is the same with that in Quintilian, frontem detersit. Ἡμιτίβιον then was the same with μπαλδρώνιον: so the scholiast upon that place: Παλαιοῦ ράκος ἡμιτίβιες, λυών τι, οὖν ἐκμαγείον. This is the proper signification of σοφοδάριον, viz., "a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat:" but when it was translated into the Chaldee or Syriac language, it received a more general signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use: as Ruth iii. 15: "Bring the veil that thou hast upon thee:"

the Chaldee rendereth it, יבכ ובי יבר דעל פflamm, and it held six measures of barley: so when Moses is said "to put a veil on his face," (Exod. xxxiv. 33,) the Chaldee again rendereth it יבכ ובי יבר דעל פflamm: Targ. Jonath. So the rabbins ordinarily use, יבר דעל פflamm, "the veil or covering of his head;" and in that sense it is here taken, not with any relation to the etymology, as Nonnus conceived in those words,—

ὑπερηφανεῖς ἐχών ἰδροτα καλυπτομένου προσώπου

as if Lazaurus had come sweating out of his grave; but only to the use, as being bound about the head, and covering the face, which the Epistle of Martyrs calls "sudarium mortuorum."—Epist. ad Tholos. cap. 1.

1 Matt. xxvii. 60; Mark xv. 46; John xix. 41.

2 Strabo observeth of Jerusalem, that the ground about it, εἰς τὸ ἐξενοτὸ στάδιον, was ὑποπετρος, "for nine miles rocky underneath."—Lib. xvi. It is therefore no wonder that in a garden so near Jerusalem there should be found ground which was petrosa, τὰς ἐστὶν δὲ Σαλομών, that which signifies εἰς τὸν στῦλον πετραν, ἢ ἐλατόμησα, unde ecce! As therefore Deut. vii. 11: Λάκκου καὶ τομημένους ὅσι σῶν ἐξελατομήσα, so Isai. xxii. 15: Τότε ἐλατόμησα σεαυτῷ ὅσι μυμημένοι καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι—

λατομήσανεν εἰς τῇ πέτρᾳ. (St. Matt. xxvii. 60;) of the sepulchre, that ἡ λατομήσαμεν ἐκ πέτρας (St. Mark xv. 46,) and λαβέντων, (St. Luke xxiii. 53,) which signify no less than that it was cut out of a rock: and Nonnus makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of λατέντων only:—

―Ἐντ δὲ ἔντει γένεσιν κύριον
Τύμβος ἀδώνητοι βαθύνωμεν ἀπὸ πέτρας
Πλάτους ὅλος νεότερος.―

Where βαθυνώμενος signifies the excavation of the rock, and γνωτός the manner by which that excavation was performed, by incision or excallback. But Salmusius hath invented another way, making the earth to be digged, and a sepulchre built by art, of stone, within it. And this interpretation he endeavours to prove out of the text: first alleging that πέτρα signifies, in the writers of that age, a "stone," not a "rock," and therefore λατομήσαμεν ἐκ πέτρας is ἐκ λίθου, "made of stone:" otherwise the article would have been added, ἐκ τῆς πέτρας, if he meant the rock which was there. But this is soon answered; for in St. Matthew the article is expressly added, ἔλατωμησαν εἰς τῇ πέτρᾳ. St. Matthew therefore understood it of that rock which was in the garden: and the rest without question understood the same. Again, the objects that λατομεῖν signifies not only λαπίδες ex lacipidina cadere, but also polire et quadrare ad edificationem; and λαβέντων signifies the last only. Wherefore being [seeing] it is said not only λατομήσαμεν, which may be understood of building, but also λαβέντων, which can be understood of no other; therefore he concludes that it was a vault built of square stone within the ground. But there is no necessity of such a precise sense of λαβεῖν, which may be extended to any sense of λατόμενον (as Origen indifferently, λατομητέρων ἢ λαβεντῶν μυμημένον εἰς πέτραν—Cont. Cels. lib. ii. 4;) and that, when it speaks of a Jewish custom, must be taken in that sense which is most congruous to their custom, and as they used the word. Now they rendered the word בּצֶל לַאֲמִימֹן by λατομεῖ, 1 Kings v. 15: בּצֶל לַאֲמִימֹן לְאֲמִימוֹן, in τῇ ὀρεί. Isai. li. 1: סֶלֶם רְצוֹנֶתוּ לִבְגַּד יִשָּׂרוּאֵל. Ἐμβέβληται εἰς τὴν στέρνῃ πέτραν, ἢ ελατόμησα, unde ecce! As therefore Deut. vii. 11: Λάκκου λατομήσαντος ὅσι σῶν ἐξελατομήσα: so Isai. xxii. 16: Οἱ ελατομήσαντες σεαυτῷ ὅσι μυμημένοι, καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι—
by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which stone was once rolled thither, the whole funeral action was performed and the sepulture completed; so that it was not lawful by the custom of the Jews any more to open the sepulchre or disturb the interred body.  

Thirdly, two eminent persons did concur unto the burial of our Saviour, a ruler and a counsellor; men of those orders among the Jews as were of greatest authority with the people, Joseph of Arimathea, rich and honourable, and yet inferior to Nicodemus, one of the great council of the Sanhedrim: these two, though fearful while he lived to acknowledge him, are brought by the hand of providence to inter him, that so the prediction might be fulfilled which was delivered by Isaiah to this purpose. The counsel of his enemies, the design of the Jews, made his grave with the wicked, that he might be buried with them which were crucified with him; but because he hath done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth; because he was no way guilty of those crimes for which they justly suffered, that there might be a difference after their death, though there appeared little distinction in it; the counsel of his Father, the design of heaven put him with the rich in his death, and caused a counsellor and a ruler of the Jews to bury him.
7.—The necessity of this part of the article appeareth, first, in that it gives a testimony and assurance of the truth both of Christ's death preceding, and of his resurrection following. Men are not put into the earth before they die: Pilate was very inquisitive whether our Saviour had been any while dead, and was fully satisfied by the centurion before he would give the body to Joseph to be interred. Men cannot be said to rise who never died; nor can there be a true resurrection where there hath not been a true dissolution. That, therefore, we might believe Christ truly rose from the dead, we must be first assured that he died; and a greater assurance of his death than this we cannot have, that his body was delivered by his enemies from the cross, and laid by his disciples in the grave.

8.—Secondly, a profession to believe that Christ was buried is necessary, to work within us a correspondence and similitude of his burial. For we are buried with him in baptism, even buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. That nothing may be done or suffered by our Saviour in these great transactions of the mediator, but may be acted in our souls and represented in our spirits.

9.—Thirdly, it was most convenient that those pious solemnities should be performed by the body of our Saviour, that his disciples might for ever learn what honour was fit to be received and given at their funerals. When Ananias died, though for his sin, yet they wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him: when Stephen was stoned, devout men carried him to his burial, and made great lamentation over him; and when Dorcas died, they washed her, and laid her in an upper chamber. So careful were the primi-

---

1 Mark xv. 44, 45. 2 Col. ii. 12. 3 Rom. vi. 4. 4 "Quicquid gestum est in cruce Christi, in sepultura, in resurrectione tertiio die, in ascensione in coelum, et in sede ad cæstram Patris, ita gestum est, ut his rebus, non mystice tautum dictis, sed etiam gestis, figuraretur vita Christiana quæ hic gestur. Nam propter ejus crucem dictum est, Quia autem Jesu Christi sunt, carrum sann crucifixi sunt cum vitis et concupiscientis; propter sepulturam, Conspectuli enim annus cum Christo per baptismum in mortem; propter resurrectionem, Ut quemadmodum Christus resurrexit a mortuis per gloriam Patris, ita et nos in novitate vitæ ambulemus; propter ascensionem in coelum, sedemque ad cæstram Patris, Si autem resurrectionis cum Christo, qua sursum sunt querule, ubi Christus est ad cæstram Dei sedes."—S. August. Enchirid. ad Laur. cap. 53. And this was before observed by Origën: ῶτι σωματικά ναι ἀναγεγραμμένα τῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐκ εν ψυλῇ τῇ λέξει καὶ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τὴν πάσαν ἔχει θεωριάν τῆς ἀληθείας. "Εκαστὸν γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ συμβολῶν τίνος εἶναι παρὰ τοῖς συνετάεροις ἐνυπνήσασθαι τῇ γραφῇ ἀποδείκται. Ἡσπερ ὅτι τὸ σταυρώθηκαν αὐτὸν ἔχει τὴν δημοφιλίαν ἀλληθεύων ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ συνετάρωμα, καὶ τῷ σημανωμένῳ ἐκ τοῦ, Ἑμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοισαν κακοφημεῖς εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δεῖ οὗ ἔμοι κόψωμεν ἔσταιρωμαι, καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ. Καὶ ὁ θάνατος αὐτῶν ἀναγκαῖος, διὰ τὸ ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ καὶ διὰ τὸ τὸν δίκαιον λέγειν, Σινομορφόμενος τῷ βανάτῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ. Εἰ γὰρ συνετάρωμεν, καὶ συζύγωμεν, οὕτω καὶ η τάφῳ αὐτῶν διείνει ἐπὶ τοὺς συμμορφοῦσαν τοῦ βανάτου αὐτῶν, καὶ τοὺς συνεταρωθέντας αὐτῶν καὶ συναφθαλντας, καθὼ καὶ τῷ Παύλῳ ἄλλεκται ταῦτα, Συνετάφθημεν γὰρ αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσιμος, καὶ συνανέφθημεν αὐτῇ. —Centra Cælestis, lib. ii.

5 Acts v. 6. 6 Acts viii. 2. 7 Acts ix. 37
tive Christians of the rites of burial. Before, and at our Saviour's time, the Greeks did much, the Romans more, use the burning of the bodies of the dead, and reserved only their ashes in their urns; but when Christianity began to increase the funeral flames did cease, and after a few emperors had received baptism, there was not a body burnt in all the Roman empire. For the first Christians wholly abstained from consuming of the dead bodies with fire, and followed the example of our Saviour's funeral, making use of precious ointments for the dead, which they refused while they lived, and spending the spices of Arabia in their graves. The description of the persons who interred Christ, and the enumeration of their virtues, and the everlasting commendation of her who brake the box of precious ointment for his burial, have been thought sufficient grounds and encouragements for the careful and decent sepulture of Christians. For as natural reason will teach us to give some kind of respect unto the bodies of men, though dead, in reference to the souls which formerly inhabited them, so, and much more, the followers of our Saviour, while they

1 This appeareth by Macrobius, who lived in the time of Theodosius Junior, and testified thus much: "Licet urredi corpora defunctorum usus nostro seculo multis sit, lectio tamen docet, eo tempore quo igni datur honor mortuis habebatur," &c.—*Saturnal. lib. vii. cap. 7. That this was done by the Christians is certain, because the Heathens, ancienly did object it to the Christians: "inde dicet ex eo factum regos, et domni ignium sepulturas." And the answer given to this objection was: "Nec, ut creditis, ullum damnum sepulturas timeamus, sed veterem et meliorem consuetudinem humandi frequentamus."—*M. F. in *Octavio, cap. 11 et 34. And Tertullian: "Et hoc etiam in opinione quorumdam est; propter nec ignibus funerandum alim, parcentes superfluam animam. Alia est autem ratio ple- tatis istius, non reliquis animae adulatrix, sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine aver- satiis, quod et ipsam homin non utique mercatur penaill exitu impendi."—*De Anima. cap. 51. "At ego magis ridebo vulgar, tunc quoque, cum ipsos d-functos atrovissimo exurit, quos postmodum gulossissime nutrit, isdem ignibus et promeret et offendens. O pietaetem de crudelitate Indentem! sacrif- ficet, an insultet, cum crematis cremat?"—Idem, *De Resur. Carn. cap. 1.

2 The Heathens objected it to the primitive Christians: "Reservatis unguenta fune- ribus."—*M. F. in *Octavio, cap. 12. And Tertullian confesseth it: "Thura plane non numinis. Sic Arabibus quercus, scit Salbei pluris et cariores suas merces Christianis sepeliendi profugigr, quam diis fumi- gandis."—*Apologet. cap. 42. And speaking of spices: "Etiam hominibus ad pigmenta medicinallia, nobis quoque insuper ad solatia sepulture usui sunt."—*De Idololat. cap. 11. So Clemens Alexandrinus: *M. F. sed om. or necrois: and again: *I. f. quod etiam eque interempto rogos, et domni ignium sepulturas." And the answer given to this objection was: "Nec, ut creditis, ullum damnum sepulturas timeamus, sed veterem et meliorem consuetudinem humandi frequentamus."—*M. F. in *Octavio, cap. 11 et 34. And Tertullian: "Et hoc etiam in opinione quorumdam est; propter nec ignibus funerandum alim, parcentes superfluam animam. Alia est autem ratio ple- tatis istius, non reliquis animae adulatrix, sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine aver- satiis, quod et ipsam homin non utique mercatur penaill exitu impendi."—*De Anima. cap. 51. "At ego magis ridebo vulgar, tunc quoque, cum ipsos d-functos atrovissimo exurit, quos postmodum gulossissime nutrit, isdem ignibus et promeret et offendens. O pietaetem de crudelitate Indentem! sacrif- ficet, an insultet, cum crematis cremat?"—Idem, *De Resur. Carn. cap. 1.

3 *I. f. in *Octavio, cap. 11 et 34. And Tertullian confesseth it: "Thura plane non numinis. Sic Arabibus quercus, scit Salbei pluris et cariores suas merces Christianis sepeliendi profugigr, quam diis fumi- gandis."—*Apologet. cap. 42. And speaking of spices: "Etiam hominibus ad pigmenta medicinallia, nobis quoque insuper ad solatia sepulture usui sunt."
looked upon our bodies as living temples of the Holy Ghost, and bought by Christ, to be made one day like unto his glorious body, they thought them no ways to be neglected after death, but carefully to be laid up in the wardrobe of the grave, with such due respect as might become the honour of the dead and comfort of the living. And the decent custom of the primitive Christians was so acceptable unto God, that by his providence it proved most effectual in the conversion of the heathens and propagation of the gospel.

10.—Thus I believe the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, for the confirmation of the truth of his death already past, and the verity of his resurrection from the dead suddenly to follow, had his body, according to the custom of the Jews, prepared for a funeral, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and after that accustomed preparation deposited in a sepulchre hewn out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and by rolling of a stone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ was buried.

1 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. 2 Phil. iii. 21.
3 "Nec ideo tamen contemnenda et abjicienda sunt corpora defunctorum, maximeque justorum atque fidelium, quibus tanquam organism et vasis ad omnla bona opera Sanctus usus est Spiritus. Si enim paterna vestis et annulus, ac si quid hujusmodi, tanto charinis est posteris, quanto erga parentes major effectus afficeris; nullo modo Ipsa sponenda sunt corpora, quae utique multo familiarius atque conjunctius quam qualibet indumentum gestamus. Hae enim non ad ornamentum vel adulatorium, quod adhibetur extrinsecus, sed ad ipsum naturam hominis, pertinent."—S. August. De Civit. Dei, lib. i. cap. 13. 

Tuanta teléstas d ierárrhés, apòstabhvén en oikw tima to sóma, meb etéron omoyston ieroun soúmaton. Ei ÿar en psuchh kai soúmati twn theodhlj òwvn d kekoumofiajous éòbas, tímion éstaxi metab tis óstias psuchís kai to svnabásthon autj swma kata toùs ierous idróstas, ònynh thea koukosisúna meta taw svxetéron swmatos autj dweleveta tos òmoystas légés, òw òmoystereuwv kai svmmetatósw tis óstias ò tis érastías òwshs.—Dionys. Eccl. Hierarch. cap. 7. "Proper patrem militiam Christi desceram, cui seculorum Christi causa non debeo, quam etiam omnibus ejus causa debeo?"—S. Hieron. Epist. ad Heliodor. de Laude Vit. solitar. cap. 3.

4 This was observed by Julian the Apostle, who, writing to an idolatrous high priest, puts him in mind of those things by which he thought the Christians gained upon the world, and recommends them to the practice of the heathen priests. Of these he reckons three: the gravity of their carriage, their kindness to strangers, and their care for the burial of the dead. 'Tó on hmeij oýmvea tauta árkein, odbh' apóbhlétojmen ó málasta twn theotápsa (so he calls Christianly, because they rejected all the heathen gods) svnpáxhjgen, h peri toùs éxoun xilav- thrwiasa, kai peri taws tawfis twn uevkrw proimhésa, kai h peplasménei svmmótis kata to àvios. 'Ov onkaston oýmva xhría na par' hmeín alhthos peptidéusetha.—Epist. 49, ad Arcuacium. And as Julian observed the care of burial as a great encouragement to the Heathens to turn Christians, so Gregory Nazianzen did observe the same to the great dishonour of the Apostle, comparing his funeral with his predecessor's. 'O mên vàr (that is, Constantius) parapásteptai paeióh- mous evdymiías te kai poimaiás, kai toúntos òtis hmeirhous svmeiós, òhais panyriouis kai ddouhagias, òs Xristiavnoi kimhvn metá- stastai enubhjoghovmèn kai gíhetai pani- gynus meta páthous ò ékkoumhd toù swmatos. But as for Julian, Mícwi geollywv òghon autoî, kai tois òtis tis schhrhj aísgexen ètopumhêntos —èwos tis aísgexen autoî upodechetai poljs—ènta ò dei tis témouvs atimoin, kai fáros òxágístos, kai vados apótyntios, kai oudei theorwv enubhjoghovmèn—Orat. In Julian. 2.
ARTICLE V.

He descended into Hell: the third day he rose again from the dead.

CHAPTER I.

He descended into Hell.

1. The former part of this article, of the descent into hell, hath not been so anciently in the Creed, or so universally, as the rest. The first place we find it used in was the church of Aquileia, and the time we are sure it was used in the creed of that church was less than 400 years after Christ. After that it came into the Roman creed, and others, and hath been acknowledged as a part of the apostles' creed ever since.

1 First, it is to be observed, that the descent into hell was not in the ancient Creeds or Rules of Faith. Some tell us that it was not in the Confession of Ignatius, Epist. ad Magnes. But indeed there is no Confession of Faith in that Epistle; for what is read there was thrust out of Clemens's "Constitutions." In the like manner, in vain is it objected that it was omitted by Polycarp, Clemens Romanus, and Justin Martyr, because they have not pretended any Rule of Faith or Creed of their times. But that which is material in this case, it is not to be found in the Rules of Faith delivered by Irenæus, lib. i. cap. 2; by Origen, lib. Hæg Apoxyor, in Proem. ; or by Tertullian, Adv. Prov. cap. 2; De Virg. Veland. cap. 1; De Præscr. adv. Hæret. cap. 13. It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the councils as larger explanations of the Apostles' Creed; not in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan; nor in that of Ephesus or Chalcedon; not in those Confessions made at Sardica, Antioch, Sclencia, Sirmiun, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of Eusebius Cæsariensis, presented to the council of Nice.—THEODORUS. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. cap. 12. Not in that of Marcellus bishop of Ançyra, delivered to pope Julius. — S. EULOGI. Hist. Eccl. lxxii. § 16. Not in that of Arius and Eunomius, presented to Constantine.—SOCRAT. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. cap. 26. Not in that of Acæius bishop of Cæsarea, delivered in to the synod of Sclencia.—Idem, lib. ii. cap. 40. Not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus, and Silvanus, sent to Libérilus.—Idem, lib. iv. cap. 12. There is no mention of it in the Creed of

St. Basil, Tract. de Fide in Aætacis; in the Creed of Epiphanius, in Ancorato, § 120. Gelosius, Dumasus, Macarius, &c. It is not in the Creed expounded by St. Cyril; (though some have produced that Creed to prove it; it is not in the Creed expounded by St. Augustin, De Fide et Symbolo; not in that De Symbolo ad Catechumenos, attributed to St. Augustin; nor in that which is expounded by Maximus Taurinensis, nor that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the church of Antioch, delivered by Cassianus De Incarn. lib. vi.; neither is it to be seen in the xs. Creeds set forth by the learned Archbp. of Armagh (Usher). Indeed it is affirmed by Ruffinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the oriental Creeds; "Sciedendum sane est, quod in ecclesia Romana Symbolo non habetur additum, Descendit ad Inferna; sed neque in Orientalis eccelesiae habetur hic sermo."—RUFINUS. In Symb. It is certain therefore (nor can we disprove it by any acknowledged evidence of antiquity) that the article of the descent into hell was not in the Roman or any of the oriental Creeds.

2 That the descent into hell came afterwards into the Roman Creed appeared, not only because we find it there of late, but because we find it often in the Latin church many ages since: as in that produced by Etherius against Elinandus in the year 785; in the 115th Sermon de Tempore, falsely ascribed to St. Augustin, where it is attributed to St. Thomas the apostle; in the Exposition of the Creed falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom.

3 As in the Creed attributed to St. Athanasius, which, though we cannot say was...
Indeed the descent into hell hath always been accepted, but with a various exposition; and the church of England at the Reformation, as it received the three creeds, in two of which this article is contained, so did it also make this one of the articles of religion, to which all who are admitted to any benefice or received into holy orders are obliged to subscribe. And at the first reception it was propounded with a certain explication, and thus delivered in the fourth year of King Edward the Sixth, with reference to an express place of scripture interpreted of this descent, That the body of Christ lay in the grave until his resurrection; but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter testifieth. So likewise after the same manner in the creed set forth in metre after the manner of a Psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this staff:

"And so he died in the flesh,
   But quickened in the Spirit;
   His body then was buried,
   As is our use and right.

"His spirit did after this descend
   Into the lower parts,
   Of them that long in darkness were
   The true light of their hearts."

But in the synod ten years after, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, the articles, which continue still in force, deliver the same descent, but without any the least explication or reference to any particular place of scripture, in these words: As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell. Wherefore being our church hath not now imposed that interpretation of St. Peter’s words, which before it intimated; being it hath not delivered that as the only place of scripture to found the descent into hell upon; being it hath alleged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other explication to expound it; we may with the greater liberty pass on to find out the true meaning of this article, and to give our particular judgment in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

2. — First, then, it is to be observed, that as this article was first

his, yet we know was extant about the year 600, by the Epistle of Isidorus Hispalensis ad Claudium Duicem. It was also inserted into the Creed of the council of Ariminum; (Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 37;) and of the fourth council of Toledo, held in the year 633; and of the sixteenth council of the same Toledo, held in the year 693.

1 "Quis nisi infidelis negaverit suisse apud inferos Christum?" — S. Augustin. Epist. retx. cap. 2

2 "Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit; spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur fuit, illisque prindicavit, ut testatur Petri locus," &c.—Articuli anni 1552. Which place was also made use of in the Exposition of the Creed contained in the Catechism set forth by the authority of King Edward, in the seventh year of his reign.

3 Article iii. 1562
in the Aquileian creed, so it was delivered there not in the express and formal term of hell, but in such a word as may be capable of a greater latitude, descendit in inferna: which words, as they were continued in other creeds, so did they find a double interpretation among the Greeks; some translating inferna hell, others the lower parts: the first with relation to St. Peter’s words of Christ, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell; the second referring to that of St. Paul, He descended into the lower parts of the earth.

3.—Secondly, I observe that in the Aquileian creed, where this article was first expressed, there was no mention of Christ’s burial; but the words of their confession ran thus, crucified under Pontius Pilate, he descended in inferna. From whence there is no question

Thus ounced are those which Æschylus elsewhere calls τοῦ γὰς νεφέων and τοὺς γὰς νεφέων. And as ounced are “the souls of the dead in the earth,” so are inferni in the first acceptance, that is, manes. Pompeius Mela: “Augylea manes tantum deos putant.”—De Siliu Orb. lib. i. cap. 9. Which Pilby delivers thus: “Augylea inferos tantum colunt.”—Hist. Nat. lib. v. cap. 8. And Solinus: “Augylea vero solos colunt inferos.”—Polyhist. cap. 44. Inferi were then first ounced, “the souls of men in the earth:” and as manes is not only put for the souls below, but also for the place; as in the poet,—

—Manesque profundi.”—Virg. Georg. i. 243, and—

—“Hae manes veniat mihii fama sub imos.”

—Æneid iv. 387; so inferni is most frequently used for the place under ground where the souls departed are; and the inferna must then be those regions in which they take up their habitations. And so, Descendit ad inferna, Κατὰ ιηλίδεις εἰς ὄουν, and, Descendit ad inferos, are the same.

3 Acts lii. 27. 4 Eph. iv. 9.

5 So are the words cited in Ruffinus Cruclijus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in inferna. And his observation upon them is this: “Sciendum sani est, quod in ecclesiis Romana Symboio non habetur additum, descendit ad inferna; sed neque in Orientiis ecclesiis habetur hic sermo: visi tamen verbi cedem videtur esse in eo quod sepultus est.”—Expos. Symb. The same may also be observed in the Athanasian Creed, which has the descent, but not the sepulture: “Who suffered for our salvation, descended Into hell, rose again the third day from the dead.” Nor is this only observable in these two, but also in the Creed made at Sirmium, and produced at Ariminum, in which the words run thus, Σταυρωθήτω, καί πάντως καί ἀπανεθοῦντα. Where though the descent be expressed, and the burial be not mentioned, yet it is most certain, those men which made it (heretio
but the observation of Ruffinus, who first expounded it, was most true, that though the Roman and Oriental creeds had not their words, yet they had the sense of them in the word buried. It appeareth, therefore, that the first intention of putting these words in the Creed was only to express the burial of our Saviour, or the descent of his body into the grave. But although they were first put in the Aquileian creed to signify the burial of Christ, and those which had only the burial in their creed did confess as much as those which without the burial did express the descent; yet since the Roman creed hath added the descent unto the burial, and expressed that descent by words signifying more properly hell, it cannot be imagined that the Creed as now it stands should signify only the burial of Christ by his descent into hell. But rather, being the ancient church did certainly believe that Christ did some other way descend beside his burial; being though he interpreted those words of the burial only, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviour’s death he makes mention of his descent into hell, beside and distinct from his sepulture; being those who in after-ages added it to the burial did actually believe that the soul of Christ descended: it followeth that, for the exposition of the Creed, it is most necessary to declare in what that descent consisteth.

4.—Thirdly, I observe again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed we therefore believe, because it is contained in the scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is contained there; whence all this exposition of the whole is nothing else but an illustration and proof of every particular part of the Creed by such scriptures as deliver the same, according to the true interpretation of them and the general consent of the church of God. Now these words as they lie in the Creed, he descended into hell, are nowhere indeed, but not in this) did not understand his burial by that descent; and that appears by addition of the following words: Et, ut cataphora kathelantai, kai tâ eterne oikou mouhântai, evn poularôi òdou idontes òxoimov. For he did not dispose and order things below by his body in the grave, nor could the keepers of the gates of hell be affrighted with any sight of his corpse lying in the sepulchre.

1 For having produced many places of scripture to prove the circumstances of our Saviour’s death, and having cited those particularly which did belong unto his burial, he passes farther to his descent, in these words: “Sed et quod in infernum descendit, evidenter prœnunciatur in Psalmis, ubi dicit, Et in pulserem mortis deduxisti me; et iterum, Qua utilis in sanguine meo dum descendis in corruptionem? et iterum, Descendisti in limum profundum, et non est substantia. Sed et Matthæus dicit, Tu es qui venturus est, an aliun expectamus? Unde et Petrus dicit, Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu. In ipso, aut, et eis qui in carceri inclusi erant in diebus Nœ; in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declarat. Sed et ipse Dominus per prophetam dicit tanquam de futuro, Quia non derlum quies animam meas in inferno nec dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem: quod rursus prophetice nihilominus ostendit implicitum, cum dicit, Domine, eduxisti ab inferno animam meam, salvasi me a descendentibus in locum. Whence it appeareth, that though Ruffinus thought that the sense of descendit ad infernum was expressed by sepultus est; yet he did distinguish the doctrine of Christ’s descent into hell from that of his burial.
formally and expressly delivered in the scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said in express and plain terms that Christ, as he died and was buried, so he descended into hell. Wherefore being these words of the Creed are not formally expressed in the scripture, our inquiry must be in what scriptures they are contained virtually; that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same doctrine, in what words soever, which is contained and to be understood in this expression, He descended into hell,

5.—Now several places of scripture have been produced by the ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not; but three there are which have been always thought of greatest validity to confirm this article. First, that of St. Paul to the Ephesians seems to come very near the words themselves, and to express the same almost in terms: Now that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth? This many of the ancient fathers understood of the descent into hell, as placed in the lowest parts of the earth; and this exposition must be confessed so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it. Those lower parts of the earth may signify hell, and Christ’s descending thither may be, that his soul went to that place when his body was carried to the grave. But that it was actually so, or that the apostle intended so much in those words, the place itself will not manifest. For we cannot be assured that the descent of Christ, which St. Paul speaks of, was performed after his death; or if it were, we cannot be assured that the lower parts of the earth did signify hell, or the place where the souls of men were tormented after the separation from their bodies. For as it is written, No man ascendeth up to heaven, but he that descended from heaven; so this may signify so much, and no more, In that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first? And for the lower parts of the earth, they may possibly signify no more than the place beneath; as when our Saviour said, Ye are from beneath,

1 For the first expression which we find in Ruffinus, Descendit in inferna, comes most near to this quotation; especially if we take the ancient Greek translation of it, κατέλθοντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα. For if we consider that κατώτερα may well have the signification of the superlative, especially being [seeing] the LXX, hath so translated Psalm lxii. 9: ἐγελέεσσονται εἰς τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς; and Psalm cxviii. 15: Καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις μου ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τῆς γῆς: what can be nearer than these two, Κατέλθοντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα, and, Καταβαίνει εἰς τὰ κατώτατα; or these two, Κατελθοντα εἰς τὰ καταξάθυνα, and, Καταβάντα εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς; Eph. iv. 9.

2 This appeareth by their quotation of this place to prove, or express, the descent into hell, as St. Irenæus doth, lib. v. cap. 31; Origen, Homil. 35 in Matt.; St. Athanasius, Epist. ad Epictetum; St. Hilary, In Psalms cxxvi. St. Jerome upon the place: “Inferea autem terrae infernum accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit.” So also the Commentary attributed to St. Ambrose, and St. Hilary: “Si itaque hac omnis Christus unus est, neque alius est Christus mortuus, alius sepultus, alius ascendens ad inferna, et alius ascendens in coelos, secundum illud apostoli, Ascendit autem quid est,” &c.—De Trin. lib. x. cap. 65.

3 John iii. 13.
I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world: or as God spake by the prophet, I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath. Nay, they may well refer to his incarnation, according to that of David, My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lower parts of the earth; or to his burial, according to that of the prophet, Those that seek my soul to destroy it shall go into the lower parts of the earth: and these two references have a great similitude according to that of Job, Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither.

The next place of scripture brought to confirm the descent is not so near in words, but thought to signify the end of that descent, and that part of his humanity by which he descended. For Christ, saith St. Peter, was put to death in the flesh, and quickened by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; where the spirit seems to be the soul of Christ, and the spirits in prison the souls of them that were in hell, or in some place at least separated from the joys of heaven: whither because we never read our Saviour went at any other time, we may conceive he went in spirit then when his soul departed from his body on the cross. This did our church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the descent, and the ancient fathers did apply the same in the like manner to the proof of this article. But, yet those words of St. Peter have no such power of probavation, except we were certain that the spirit there spoken of were the soul of Christ, and that the time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrection. Whereas if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they staggered St. Augustin, and caused him at last to think that these words of St. Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christ's descending into hell. But indeed the spirit by which he is said to preach was not the soul of Christ, but that Spirit by which he was quickened: as appeareth by the coherence of the words, being put to death in

1 John viii. 23. 2 Joel ii. 30; Acts ii. 19. 3 Psalm cxxxix. 15. 4 Psalm lxiii. 9. 5 Job i. 21. 6 1 Peter iii. 18, 19. 7 As Hermes, lib. i. Sumil. 9; St. Ireneaus, lib. iv. cap. 45; St. Clemens Alexandria, Strom. lib. vi.; Origen, Homil. 35 in Matt.; St. Athanasius, Cont. Apoll. lib. ii., et Epist. ad Epictetum; St. Epiphanius, Heres. Ixxvii. 7; St. Cyril, De recta Fide ad Theodosium, in Jorn. lib. xii. cap. 36, Orat. Pasch., et alibi servius; Author Com. Ambros. ascript. ad Rom. x.; Ruffinus in Explic. Symb.

6 For in his answer to Exodus he thus begins: "Quaestio, quam mihi proposuit RX Epistola apostoli Petri, solut nos, ut te latere non arbitror, vehementissime commove, quomodo illa verba accipienda sint tam quam de inferis dicit. Replico ergo tibi eandem questionem, ut, sive ipse potueris, sive aliquem qui possit inveneris, anferas de illa atque finias dubitationem meam." Then setting down in order all the difficulties which occurred at that time in that exposition of the descent into hell, he concludes with an exposition of another nature: "Consider tamen, ne forte totum illud quod de conclusio in carcere spiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus apostolus dicit, omnino ad inferos non pertinent, sed ad illa potius tempora, querae formam ad haec tempora transituli." — Epistola xci. cap. 1 et f.
the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison. Now that Spirit by which Christ was quickened is that by which he was raised from the dead, that is, the power of his divinity, as St. Paul expresseth it, Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God: in respect of which he preached to those which were disobedient in the days of Noah, as we have already shown.

The third, but principal text, is that of David, applied by St. Peter. For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. Thus the apostle repeated the words of the Psalmist, and then applied them: He being a prophet, and seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. Now from this place the article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus: if the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection; but it was not there before his death, therefore upon or after his death, and before his resurrection, the soul of Christ descended into hell, and consequently the CREED doth truly deliver that Christ, being crucified, was dead, buried, and descended into hell. For as his flesh did not see corruption by virtue of that promise and prophetical expression, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it rested in hope until his resurrection, so his soul, which was not left in hell, by virtue of the like promise or prediction, was in that hell, where it was not left, until the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the resurrection. We must, therefore, confess from hence that the soul of Christ was in hell; and no Christian can deny it, saith St. Augustin, it is so clearly delivered in this prophecy of the Psalmist and application of the apostle.
6.—The only question then remains, not of the truth of the proposition, but the sense and meaning of it. It is most certain that Christ descended into hell, and as infallibly true as any other article of the CREED; but what that hell was, and how he descended thither, being once questioned, is not easily determined. Different opinions there have been of old, and of late more different still, which I shall here examine after that manner which our subject will admit. Our present design is an exposition of the CREED as now it stands, and our endeavour is to expound it according to the scriptures in which it is contained. I must, therefore, look for such an explication as may consist with the other parts of the CREED, and may withal be conformable unto that scripture upon which the truth of the article doth rely; and consequently, whatsoever interpretation is either not true in itself, or not consistent with the body of the CREED, or not conformable to the doctrine of the apostle in this particular, the expositor of that CREED by the doctrine of the apostle must reject.

7.—First, then, we shall consider the opinion of Durandus, who, as often, so in this, is singular. He supposeth this descent to belong unto the soul, and the name of hell to signify the place where the souls of dead men were in custody; but he maketh a metaphor in the word descended, as not signifying any local motion, nor inferring any real presence of the soul of Christ in the place where the souls of dead men were, but only including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious presence, by which descent the effects of the death of Christ were wrought upon the souls in hell; and because the merits of Christ’s death did principally depend upon the act of his soul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his soul as the principal agent, and consequently Christ is truly said at the instant of his death to descend into hell, because his death was immediately efficacious upon the souls detained there. This is the opinion of Durandus, so far as it is distinct from others.

8.—But although a virtual influence of the death of Christ may be well admitted in reference to the souls of the dead, yet this opinion cannot be accepted as the exposition of this article; being neither the CREED can be thought to speak a language of so great scholastic subtily, nor the place of David expounded by St. Peter

sapere auderet, in Actibus Apostolorum idem Petrus exponit; vel ejusdem Petri illis verbis quibus cum asserit solvisse inferni do-lores, in quibus impossibile erat eum teneri. Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum?"—Epist. xcix. cap. 2.

1 Cum Articulus sit, Christum ad infernos descendisse, et non posse intelligi ratione Divinitatis, secundum quam est ubique; nec ratione corporis, secundum quod fuit in sepulchro; restat quod intelligatur ratione animae: quo supposito, videndum est qualiter anima Christi descendit ad infernum."—Durandus, Com. in Sentent. Theol. lib. iii. dist. 22, q. 3.
can possibly admit any such explication. For what can be the sense of those words, *thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, if his being in hell was only virtually acting there?* If the efficacy of his death were his descent, then is he descended still, because the effect of his death still remaineth. The opinion, therefore, of Durandus, making the descent into hell to be nothing but the efficacy of the death of Christ upon the souls detained there, is to be rejected, as not expository of the CREED's confession, nor consistent with the scripture's expression.

9.—The next opinion, later than that of Durandus, is that the descent into hell is the suffering of the torments of hell; 2 that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatened by the law unto them which depart this life in their sins and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and borne by Christ; that he died a true and natural death, the death of Gehenna, 3 and this dying the death of Gehenna was the descending into hell; that those which are now saved by virtue of his death should otherwise have endured the same torments in hell which now the damned do and shall endure, but that he, being their surety, did himself suffer the same for them, even all the torments which we should have felt, and the damned shall.

10.—This interpretation is either taken in the strict sense of the words, or in a latitude of expression; but in neither to be admitted as the exposition of this article. Not if it be taken in a strict, rigorous, proper, and formal sense; for in that acceptance it is not true. It must not, it cannot, be admitted that Christ did suffer all those torments which the damned suffer, and therefore it is not, it cannot, be true, that by suffering them he descended into hell. There is a worm that never dieth which could not lodge within his breast, that is, a remorse of conscience seared in the soul for what that soul hath done; but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ, who though he took upon himself the sins of those which otherwise had been damned, yet that act of his was a most virtuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly conformable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horror in the soul of Christ, which we have expressed in the explication of his sufferings ante-

1 "Si [Christus] ad inferos descendis hicetur, nihil mirum est, cum eam mortem pertulerit quem sceleratis ab irato Deo infiligerit;" which he expresseth presently in another phrase, "Cum diros in anima cruciatus damnavit ac perdit hominis pertulerit."—Calvin, *Instit.* lib. ii. cap. 16, § 10.

2 "Quid igitur? Christus persona sua secundum humanitatem, inam rem gnemem nobis debitam passus est, anima principaliter, corpore secundario, utroque causat am mercedum, ad nos sui ipsius merito liberandum."—Parkes, *De De-sevus,* lib. iii. § 48. *Et statim,* § 49: "Descendisse namque Servatorem, modo super memorare, ad Haden mortis gehennalis, hunc merito patet argumentum."
cedent to his crucifixion, had reference to the sins and punishment of men, to the justice and wrath of God; but clearly of a nature different from the sting of conscience in the souls condemned to eternal flames. Again, an essential part of the torments of hell is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God, and an impossibility of obtaining favour and avoiding pain; an absolute and complete despair of any better condition, or the least relaxation: but Christ, we know, had never any such resentment, who looked upon the reward which was set before him, even upon the cross, and offered up himself a sweet-smelling sacrifice; which could never be efficacious, except offered in faith. If we should imagine any damned soul to have received an express promise of God, that after ten thousand years he would release him from those torments and make him everlastingly happy, and to have a true faith in that promise and a firm hope of receiving eternal life, we could not say that man was in the same condition with the rest of the damned, or that he felt all that hell which they were sensible of, or all that pain which was due unto his sins; because hope and confidence and relying upon God would not only mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguish of despair. Christ, then, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion of his sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of his own death and resurrection, who had made a covenant with his Father for all the degrees of his passion, and was fully assured that he could suffer no more than he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and should continue no longer in his passion than he had himself determined, he who by those torments was assured to overcome all the powers of hell, cannot possibly be said to have been in the same condition with the damned, and strictly and properly to have endured the pains of hell.

Again, if we take the torments of hell in a metaphorical sense, for those terrors and horrors of soul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernal torments, because they are of greater extremity than any other tortures of this life, and because they were accompanied with a sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousness of men; yet this cannot be an interpretation of the descent into hell, as it is an article of the CREED, and as that article is grounded upon the scriptures. For all those pains which our Saviour felt (whether, as they pretend, properly infernal, or metaphorically such) were antecedent to his death, part of them in the garden, part on the cross, but all before he commenced his spirit into the hands of his Father and gave up the ghost. Whereas it is sufficiently evident that the descent into hell, as it now stands in the CREED, signifieth something commenced after his death,
contradistinguished to his burial; and, as it is considered in the apostle's explication, is clearly to be understood of that which immediately preceded his resurrection, and that also grounded upon a confidence totally repugnant to infernal pains. For it is thus particularly expressed, I foresaw the Lord always before my face: for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,1 Where the faith, hope, confidence, and assurance of Christ is shown, and his flesh, though laid in the grave, the place of corruption, is said to rest in hope, for this very reason, because God would not leave his soul in hell. I conclude, therefore, that the descent into hell is not the enduring the torments of hell, because, if strictly taken, it is not true; if metaphorically taken, though it be true, yet it is not pertinent.

11.—The third opinion, which is also very late, at least in the manner of explication, is, that in those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, the soul of Christ is taken for his body, and hell for the grave; and consequently, in the Creed, He descended into hell, is no more than this, that Christ in his body was laid into the grave. This explication ordinarily is rejected, by denying that the soul is ever taken for the body, or hell for the grave, but in vain: for it must be acknowledged that sometimes the scriptures are rightly so, and cannot otherwise be, understood. First, the same word in the Hebrew,2 which the Psalmist used, and in the Greek,

1 Acts ii. 25-27.
2 The Hebrew word is נב and the Greek ψυχή. Oók ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς δόνην. (Psalm xvi. 10.) But both נב and ψυχή are used for the body of a dead man, Num. vi. 6, and it is so translated: for Moses, speaking there of a Nazarite, gives this law, "All the days that he separeth himself unto the Lord he shall come at no dead body;" in the original נב and in the LXX. Ἐπὶ πᾶσα ψυχὴ εὐελευθερωθείς, in the same manner for the high priest, Lev. xxi. 11: "Neither shall he go in to any dead body;" נב קαὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσα ψυχὴ εὐελευθερωθείς, οὐκ εὐελευθερωθείται. And the general law, Lev. xxii. 4: "And whoso toucheth any thing that is unclean by the dead," נב קαὶ ὁ ἀπόμενος πᾶσις ακαθάρτιος ψυχής. Which is farther cleared by that of Num. xix. 11: "He that toucheth the dead body of any man," Qui tegerit cadaver hominis; and, verse 13: "Who-
He descended into Hell.

which the apostle used, and we translate the soul, is elsewhere used for the body of a dead man, and translated so. And when we read in Moses of a prohibition given to the high-priest or the Nazarite, of going to or coming near a dead body, and of the pollution by the dead, the dead body in the Hebrew and the Greek is nothing else but that which elsewhere signifies the soul. And Mr. Ainsworth, who translated the Pentateuch nearer the letter than the sense, hath so delivered it in compliance with the original phrase, and may be well interpreted thus by our translation: Ye shall not make in your flesh any cutting for a soul, that is, for the dead: 1 For a soul he shall not defile himself among his people, that is, There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people: 2 He that toucheth any thing that is unclean by a soul, that is, by the dead: 3 Every one defiled by a soul, that is, by the dead: 4 He shall not come at a dead soul, that is, he shall come at no dead body. 5 Thus Ainsworth's translation showeth that in all these places the original word is that which usually signifies the soul; and our translation teacheth us, that though in other places it signifies the soul, yet in these it must be taken for the body, and that body bereft of the soul.

Secondly, the word which the Psalmist used in Hebrew, 6 and the apostle in Greek, and is translated hell, doth certainly in some other places signify no more than the grave, and is translated so. As where Mr. Ainsworth followeth the word, For I will go down unto my son mourning to hell; our translation, aiming at the sense,
rendereth it, For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning.1
So again he, Ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow unto
dell, that is, to the grave.2 And in this sense we say, The Lord
killeth, and maketh alive; he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth
up.3

Now being the soul is sometimes taken for the body deserted by
the soul, and hell is also sometimes taken for the grave, the recep-
tacle of the body dead; therefore it is conceived that the prophet
did intend these significations in those words, Thou shalt not leave
my soul in hell; and consequently the article grounded on that
scripture must import no more than this, Christ in respect of his
body bereft of his soul, which was recommended into and deposited
in the hands of his Father descended into the grave.

12.—This exposition hath that great advantage, that he which
first mentioned this descent in the CREED did interpret it of the
burial; and where this article was expressed, there that of the
burial was omitted. But notwithstanding those advantages, there
is no certainty of this interpretation: first, because he which did
so first interpret it,4 at the same time and in the tenure of that
expression, did acknowledge a descent of the soul of Christ into
hell;5 and those other creeds which did likewise omit the burial,
and express the descent, did show, that by that descent they
understood not that of the body, but of the soul. Secondly, because
they which put these words into the Roman creed, in which the
burial was expressed before, must certainly understand a descent
distinct from that; and therefore though it might perhaps be
thought a probable interpretation of the words of David, especially
taken as belonging to David, yet it cannot pretend to an exposition
of the CREED, as now it stands.

The next opinion is, that the soul may well be understood either
for the nobler part of man distinguished from the body, or else
for the person of man consisting of both soul and body, as it often

---

1 Gen. xxxvii. 35. 2 xlii. 38.
4 1 Sam. ii. 6.
5 Ruffinus, who first mentioned this article,
first interpret it of the grave, as we have
already observed; but yet he did believe a
descent distinct from that, in the Exposi-
tion of the Creed: “Sed et quod in infernum
descendit, evidenter pronunciatur in Psalms,”
—Sic: and then citing that of St. Peter: “Unde
cet Petrus dixit, Quia Christus mortificatus
carme, vivificatus autem Spiritu. In ipso
nit) et quia qui in carere inclusi erant
descendit spiritibus praevicere, qui increduli
jure) in diebus Noe; in quo elam quid
egerit in inferno declaratur,” as we
before more largely cited the same place.

See p. 349.

3 I showed before, that in the Creed
made at Sirimium there was the descent
mentioned, and the burial omitted, and yet
that descent was so expressed that it could
not be taken for the burial: besides now I
add, that it was made by the Arians, who in
few years before had given in another Creed,
in which both the burial and the descent
were mentioned; as that of Nice in Thra-
cia: ‘Apostath parties, i.e. ta kataklyasma,
on autoi eis eis eis.
---THEODORETUS, Hist. Eccles. lib. II. cap. 21; and not long after gave in
another at Constantinople to the same pur-
pose: 'Svaoutwveta, kai apotheveta, kai
taphveta, kai eis ta kataklyasma katelelupeta,
Dv tov eis kai autoi eis eis. —SOEBE:
Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 41.
The opinion of the ancient Greeks in this case is excellently expressed by Tertullian, who shows three kinds of men to be thought not to descend ad inferos when they die: the first "inaquili;" the second "aorit, the third "by othanati. "Credatum est, inspulitos non ante ad inferos reediti quam justa perceperunt." — De Anima, cap. 56. "Aimut et immatura morte praeventas consque vagari istiac, donec reliquatio complexur aetas, quacum pervixissent si non intempestive obissent."—Ibid. "Proinde ex torres inferem habebuntur, quas vi creptas arbritantur, praelique per atrocitates suppliciorum; cruces, dico, et secures, et gladii, et feras."—Ibid. The souls then of those whose bodies were unburied were thought to be kept out of Hades till their funerals were performed, and the souls of them who died an untimely or a violent death were kept from the same place until the time of their natural death should come. This he farther expresses in the terms of the magicians, whose art was conversant about souls departed: "Aut optimum est hic retineri, sequendum ahoros; (id est, ádopes) aut pessimum, sequendum bia othanatos; (Biaobaronis) ut ipsis jam vocabulis utar, quisbus auetrix opinionum istarum magica sonat, Hostanes, et Typhon, et Dardanus, et Damigeron, et Nectabis, et Bernice. Publica jam literata est, que animas etiam justa aetate sepitas, etiam proba morte disjunctas, etiam prompta humatione dispunctatas, evocatum se ab inferum incolatam pellectur." — Cap. 57. Of that of the host.
differed much concerning the place of the infernus; but never any doubted but that it signified some place or other:¹ and if they had conceived any such notion as the state of death, and the perennial

¹ Not that anima does there signify the body, as some have observed; but that the soul of Polydorus was then in rest when his body had received funeral rites; as Servius: "Legimus praeterea in sexto sepulchrorum animas vagas esse; et hic constat non legitime sepulchrumuisse. Rite ergo, reddit legitima sepultura, redit [anima] ad quietem sepolchri," saith Servius; or rather, in the sense of Virgil, ad quietem inferni, according to the petition of Palinurus,—

"Sedibus ut saltam placidis in morte quiescam."—Aeneid. vi. 371.

And that the soul of Polydorus was so wandering about the place where his body lay unburied, appeared out of Euryipples in Hecuba, where he spake thus:

— — — — Nunc uter mutryos filius Ἐκάβις αἶστος, σωμα ἐρημώσας ἐμβόλοι. ἔρρητον ἴδιος οἰωνομένουs.—V. 30.

And in the Troades of the same poet this ἀθανασία, or erratior vagabunda insepellorum, is acknowledged by the chorus in these words:

— — — — Ὁ φίλος, ὃς τοιον, Σὺ μὲν φίλεινς ἀλαίνεις

— — — — Ἀδάπτος, ἀνυψόμενος.—V. 1052.

And when their bodies were buried, then their souls passed into ἱδαί, to the rest. So was it with Polydorus, and that man mentioned in the history of the philosopher Athenodorus, whose umbra or phasma walked after his death. "Inveniuntur ossa inserta catenis et implicata, quae corpus aequa terraque putrefactum nuda et exesa reliquebat viunculam: collecta publice sepelluntur; domus postea rite conditus manibus caritur; —Pis. lib. vii. E. 27. This was the case of the insepellium. And for that of the bicevathanai, it is remarkable that Dido threateneth Aeneas:

— — — — Sequar atris ignibus absens; Et, cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus, Omnibus umbra locis aderit."—Aeneid. iv. 334.

Upon which place Servius observes: "Di-cunct physice blacothanatarum animas non recipi in originem suas, nisi vagantes legitimum tempus fatis compleverint; quod postea ad sepulchra transferant. ut, Aeneid. vi. 329, Centum errant annos, volitantque hae litora circum.”—VIRG. Aeneid. vi. 325.

Thus he is to be understood in the description of the funeral of Polydorus:

— — — — Ergo instauramus Polydoro funus, et ingen Aggetis tamulo tellus, animamque sepulcro

Condimus."—Aeneid. iii. 64.
sion of the dead in that state, they needed not to have fallen into doubts or questions, the patriarchs and the prophets being as certainly in the state of death, and remaining so, as Corah, Dathan, and Abiram are, or any person which is certainly condemned to everlasting flames. Though, therefore, it be certainly true that Christ did truly and properly die, as other men are wont to do, and that after expiration he was in the state or condition of the dead, in deadlihood, as some have learned to speak; yet the Creed had spoken as much as this before when it delivered that he was dead. And although it is true that he might have died, and in the next minute of time revived, and consequently his death not (precisely taken) signify any permansion or duration in the state of death, and therefore it might be added, he descended into hell, to signify farther a permansion or duration in that condition; yet if hell do signify nothing else but the state of the dead, as this opinion doth suppose, then to descend into hell is no more than to be dead, and so notwithstanding any duration implied in that expression, Christ might have ascended the next minute after he descended thither, as well as he might be imagined to revive the next minute after he died. Being then to descend into hell, according to this interpretation, is no more than to be dead; being no man ever doubted but that person was dead who died; being it was before delivered in the Creed that Christ died, or, as we render it, was dead; we cannot imagine but they which did add this part of the article to the Creed did intend something more than this, and therefore we cannot admit this notion as a full or proper exposition.

13.—There is yet left another interpretation grounded upon the general opinion of the church of Christ in all ages, and upon a probable exposition of the prophecy of the Psalmist, taking the soul in the most proper sense, for the spirit or rational part of Christ; that part of man which, according to our Saviour’s doctrine, the Jews could not kill, and looking upon hell as a place distinct from this part of the world where we live, and distinguished from those heavens whither Christ ascended, into which place the souls of men were conveyed after or upon their death: and therefore thus expounding the words of the Psalmist in the person of Christ; Thou shalt not suffer that soul of mine which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the cross, but resigned into thy hands, when it shall go into that place below where the souls of men departed are detained, I say, thou shalt not suffer that soul to continue there as theirs have done, but shalt bring it shortly from thence and re-unite it to my body.

14.—For the better understanding of this exposition, there are several things to be observed, both in respect of the matter of it
and in reference to the authority of the fathers. First, therefore, this must be laid down as a certain and necessary truth, that the soul of man, when he dieth, dieth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure, according to the ground of our Saviour's counsel, Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. That better part of us, therefore, in and after death doth exist and live, either by virtue of its spiritual and immortal nature, as we believe, or at least the will of God, and his power upholding and preserving it from dissolution, as many of the fathers thought. This soul thus existing after death, and separated from the body, though of a nature spiritual, is really and truly in some place, if not by way of circumscription, as proper bodies are, yet by way of determination and indistancy, so that it is true to say this is really and truly present here, and not elsewhere.

Again, the soul of man, which, while he lived, gave life to the body and was the fountain of all vital actions, in that separate existence after death must not be conceived to sleep, or be bereft and stript of all vital operations, but still to exercise the powers of understanding and of willing, and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the souls of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace and rest, in joy and happiness, others by the justice of the same God left to sorrow, pains, and misery.

As there was this different state and condition before our Saviour's death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, the elect and reprobate; so there were two societies of souls after death, one of them which were happy in the presence of God, the other of those which were left in their sins and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous Abel the first man placed in this happiness, and the souls of them that departed in the same faith to be gathered to him. Whosoever it was of the sons of Adam which first died in his sins was put into a place of torment, and the souls of all those which departed after with the wrath of God upon them were gathered into his sad society.

Now as the souls at the hour of death are really separated from the bodies, so the place where they are in rest or misery after death is certainly distinct from the place in which they lived. They continue not where they were at that instant when the body was left without life; they do not go together with the body to the grave; but as the sepulchre is appointed for our flesh, so there

1 Matt. x. 28.
is another receptacle or habitation and mansion for our spirits. From whence it followeth, that in death the soul doth certainly pass by a real motion from that place, in which it did inform the body, and is translated to that place and unto that society which God of his mercy or justice hath allotted to it. And not at present to inquire into the difference and distance of those several habitations (but for method's sake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the infernal parts, or the mansions below), it will appear to have been the general judgment of the church that the soul of Christ contradistinguished from his body, that better and more noble part of his humanity, his rational and intellectual soul, after a true and proper separation from his flesh, was really and truly carried into those parts below where the souls of men before departed were detained, and that by such a real translation of his soul he was truly said to have descended into hell.

Many have been the interpretations of the opinion of the fathers made of late, and their differences are made to appear so great, as if they agreed in nothing which concerns this point; whereas there is nothing which they agree in more than this which I have already affirmed, the real descent of the soul of Christ unto the habitation of the souls departed. The persons to whom and end for which he descended they differ in; but as to a local descent into the infernal parts they all agree. Who were then in those parts they could not certainly define; but whosoever were there, that Christ by the presence of his soul was with them they all determined.

15.—That this was the general opinion of the church, will appear not only by the testimonies of those ancient writers which lived successively, and wrote in several ages, and delivered this exposition in such express terms as are not capable of any other interpretation, but also because it was generally used as an argument

1 As Irenæus: "Cum enim Dominus in medio umbrae mortis abierit, ubi anima mortuorum erat, post deinde corporaliiter resurrectionem, et post resurrectionem assumptus est: manifestum est, quia et discipulorum ejus, proper quos et haec operatus est Dominus, animae abibunt in invisibilibus locum definitum, ubi Deus," &c.—Ad. Hier. lib. v. cap. 26. Clemens Alexandrinus was so clearly of that opinion, that he thought the soul of Christ preached salvation to the souls in hell. — Strom. lib. vi. And Tertullian proves that the inferi are a cavity in the earth, where the souls of dead men are, because the soul of Christ went thither. "Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo mortuus secundum scripturas, et secundus secundum easdem, huic quoque legi satisfactit, forma humana mortis apud inferos fundatus, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora caelorum quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic patriarchas et prophetas compotes su! faceret; habes et regionem inferi subterraneam credere, et illos cubito pellere, qui sati superbe non putent animas fidelium inferis digeris."—De Anim. cap. 55. Τηνός σώματις γενόμενος ψυχή τας γαμνας σωμάτων υμάκεν ψυχής.—Opp. Cont. Cels. lib. ii. "Ipsa anima, etiam fuit in abysso, jam non est; quia scriptum est, Non dereliqueris animam meam in inferno."—S. Ambros. De Incarn. cap. 5. "Si ergo secundum hominem, quem Verbum Deus suscepit, putamus dictum esse, Hostie mecum crisi in paradiso, non ex his verbis in calo existimandus est esse paradisus. Neque enim ipso die in calo futurus erat homo Christus Jesus; sed in inferno secundum animam, in sepulcro autem so-
candum carnem. Et de carne quidem, quod eo die in sepulchro sit posita, manifestum est evangelium. Quod vero illa anima in infernum descendit, apostolica doctrina praeclara. Quandoqueidem B. Petrus ad hanc rem testimonium de Psalmis adhibuit, [ubi praedicatum esse demonstrat,] Quoniam non dereliques animam meam in inferno, neque dubis Sanctorum tuum videm corruptionem. Ille de anima dictum est, quia ibi non est derelicta, unde tam cito remeavit; ille de corpore, quod in sepulchro corrupta celeri resurrectione non potuit." —S. Augustin. Epist. lvi. ad Dardanium, cap. 2.

"Corpore máximique atque córporis animas in sepulchro corpora septuaginta, unde nesci quid de corruptione in sepulchro. —SYNESA Hymn. ix. 7.

Ψυχή δὲ η Θεία, τήν πρός αυτόν λαξύνεται συνδρόμημα τε και εὕωνας, καταπετάρθη μὲν εἰς ἄδου, θεωρητεῖ δὲ διάνυσαι καὶ ἐξουσίας ἁρμόνιας, καὶ τοὺς ἐκείσε πνεύματα κατεφαίνετο. —S. CYRIL ALEX. Dial. de Incarn.

'Ο μὲν τάφος αὐτοῦ σῶμα μόνον ἑπεδέξατο, ψυχή δὲ μόνην ὑπῆρξ.—AIAST. apud EUTHYM. Panop. vol. ii. lib. 17. "Postquam igitur exultatus est, id est, a Judicis in cruce suspensus, et spirituitt re:id, unita sua Divinitati anima ad Infernum profunda descendit." —AUTHOR Sext. de Temp. "Corpore in sepulchro sepposita, Divinitas cum anima hominis ad inferna descendens vocavit de locis suis animam sanctam." —GALDENT. Brix. Tract. 10. "In hoc Divinitatis Christi virtutem sua impassibilitatem ostendit, que, ubique semper et inefflabili presens, et secundum animam suam in inferno sine doloribus fuit, et secundum carmen suam in sepulchro sine corruptione jacuit; quia nec carnis seu defunctum animam suam in inferno dolere non niteret; nec animam suam in inferno deseruit, cum in sepulchro carnem suam a corruptione servaret." —GUL- 

GENT. Ad Thrasim. lib. iii. cap. 31.

1 What the Apollinarian heresy was, is certainly known; they denied that Christ had a human soul, affirming that the Word was to him in the place of a soul; and the argument produced by the fathers for the conviction of this error was, that Christ descended into hell, which the Apollinarians could not deny, and that this descent was not made by his divinity, or
He descended into Hell.

by his body, but by the motion and presence of his soul, and consequently that he had a soul distinct both from his flesh and from the Word. Whereas if it could have then been answered by the heretics, as now it is by many, that his descent into hell had no relation to his soul, but to his body only, which descended to the grave; or that it was not real, but only virtual, descent, by which his death extended to the powers of hell; or that his soul was not his intellectual spirit or immortal soul, but his living soul, which descended into hell, that is, continued in the state of death: I say, if any of these senses could have been affixed to this article, the Apollinarians’ answer might have been sound, and the catholics’ argument of no validity. But being those heretics did all acknowledge this article; being the catholic fathers did urge the same to prove the real distinction of the soul of Christ both from his divinity and from his body, because his body was really in the grave when his soul was really present with the souls

παρὸν ὁ Κύριος ἀσώματος, ὡς ἀνθρώπος ἐνομίζη τίπο τοῦ θανάτου; Ἰδιὰ ψυχαὶ ταῖς εἰς δεσμοίς κατεγείμαις μορφῆν ἑπίδοσις ψυχῆς ἀνεπιδέκτων [ὡς δεκτική] τῶν δεσμῶν τοῦ θανάτου παραστῆται, παροῦσα παροῦσαις, διαβρῆσα τὰ δεσμαὶ ψυχῶν τῶν ἐν ᾅδο κατεγείμαινεν. — De civ. Apool. lib. I. Thus Euthymius, in his Commentary upon the words of the Psalmist, “Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell:” Tίθησι καὶ τῆς ἐλπίδος τῆς αἰώνιας. Καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπεις, φησι, τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς φόδην, ὅπως τῶν τετελευτηκότων αἱ ψυχαὶ κατέχονται: τῶτες γὰρ ὁ φόδης ὑπὸ γῆν ἀποκεκληρωμένος ταῖς ἀποθησικοῖς ψυχαῖς: τοῦ τοῖνα ὁ λόγος Ἀπολλιαράμος, ὁ τὴν προσληθεῖσαν σάρκα δυνατεῖς ἄψυχοι καὶ ἄνους, ἐς αἰώνας; And from hence we may understand the words of Theodore, who at the end of his Exposition of this Psalm thus concludes: Οὕτος ὁ Ψαλμός καὶ τὴν Ἀρείου, καὶ τὴν Εὐσίμωνοι, καὶ Ἀπολλιαράμον διενθάλασσεν ἐλέγεις; which is in reference to those words, “Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.” In the same manner, Leporius Presbyter (“quod male senserat de incarnatone Christi, corrigeris,” as Gennadius observes, Iust. Vitr. Catal. 60, and particularly disavowing that of the Arians and Apollinarians, “Deum hominemque commixtum, et tali confusione carnis et Verbi quasi aliquod corpus effectum,”) does thus express the reality and distinction of the soul and body in the same Christ: “Tam Christus Filius Dei tunc mortuus Jacuit in sepulcro, quam idem Christus Filius Dei ad inferna descendit; sicut beatus apostolus dicit, Quod autem ascendit, quid est nisi quod descendit primum in infernus partes terrae? — Ipsi utique Dominus et Deus noster Jesus Christus Unicus Dei, qui cum anima ad inferna descendit, ipsa cum anima et corpore ascendit ad coelum.” — Libell. Etenim dationis. And Capreolus bishop of Carthage, writing against the Nestorian heresy, proveth that the soul of Christ was united to its divinity when it descended into hell, and follows that argument, urging it at large: in which discourse, among the rest he hath this passage: “Tantum abest, Deum Dei Filium, immutabilem atque incomprehensibilem, ab inferis potuisse concludi; ut nec ipsam adsumptionis animam credamus, aut exita bliter suspetam, aut tenaciter derelictam, Sed nec tarnem ejus credimus contagione aliucjus corruptionis infectam. Ipsius namque vox est in Psalmo, sicut Petrus interpretatur apostolus, Non dereliquisset, neque dabis Sanctum tuum videre corruptionem.” — Epist. ad Vital. et Constant. Lastly, the true doctrine of the immaculate against all the enemies thereof, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and the like, was generally expressed by declaring the verity of the soul of Christ really present in hell, and the verity of his body at the same time really present in the grave; as it is excellently delivered by Fulgentius: “Humanitas vera Filii Dei nec tota in sepulcro fuit, nec tota in inferno; sed in sepulcro secundum veram carnem Christus mortuus jacuit, et secundum animam ad infernum Christus descendit, et secundum carnem animam ab inferno ad carnem (quam in sepulcro reliquerat) redit; secundum Divinitatem vero suam, que nec loco tenetur, nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepulcro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima: ac pro hoc plenus fuit ubique Christus; quia non est Deus ab humanitate, quam suscepistis, separatus, qui et in anima sua fuit, ut solutis inferni doloribus ab inferno victrix rediret, et in carne sua fuit, ut celeri resurrectione corrumpi non posset.” — Ad Thrasian. lib. III. cap. 34.
16.—The only question which admitted any variety of discrepancy among the ancients was, who were the persons to whose souls the soul of Christ descended, and, that which depended on that question, what was the end and use of his descent. In this, indeed, they differed much, according to their several apprehensions of the condition of the dead and the nature of the place into which the souls before our Saviour's death were gathered. Some, looking on that name which we translate now hell, hades, or infernum, as the common receptacle of the souls of all men, both the Apollinarians denied an human soul to Christ only in respect of the intellectual part; 1 granting that the animal soul of Christ was of the same nature with the animal soul of other men. If, therefore, the fathers had proved only that the animal soul of Christ had descended into hell, they had brought no argument at all to prove that Christ had an human intellectual soul. It is therefore certain that the catholic fathers in their opposition to the Apollinarian heretics did declare that the intellectual and immortal soul of Christ descended into hell.

1 At first indeed the Apollinarians did so speak, as they denied the human soul in both acceptions; but afterwards they clearly affirmed the ψυχή, and denied the νοῦς alone. So Socrates testifies of them: Πρότερον μὲν ἔλεγον ἀναληφθέντα τὸν ἀνθρώπον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου εἰς τῇ οἰκομοίᾳ τῆς ἐνανθρωποσείως ψυχῆς ἀνένεν εἶναι ὡς ἐκ μετανοιας ἐπίδοικθημένου, προσεθέθην ψυχήν μὲν ἀνεκληθέναι, νοῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔχειν αὐτήν, ἀλλ' εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ἀπὸ νοῦ εἰς τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἀνθρώπον.—Hist. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. 46. "Nam et aliqui corum fuisse in Christo animam negare non potuerunt. Videte absurditatem et insaniam non ferendum. Animam irrationalem eum habere voluerunt, rationalem negaverunt: dederunt ei animam pecoris, subtraxerunt animam hominis."—S. August. Tract. 47 in J ohn. This was so properly indeed the Apollinarian heresy, that it was thereby distinguished from the Arian. "Nam Apollinaristae quidem carnis et animae naturam sine mente alstrumpisse Dominum credunt; Ariani vero carnis tantummodo."—Facsim. lib. ix. cap. 3.

2 Some of the ancient fathers did believe that the word ἄδης in the scriptures had the same signification which it hath among the Greeks, as comprehending all the souls both of the wicked and the just; and so they took infernum in the same latitude. As therefore the ancient Greeks did assign one ἄδης for all which died, — Πάντας ἑμῶν θυμίων εἰς ἄδην δέχεται—and, Εἰς κοινῶν ἄδην πάντες ἣξουσιν βροτοί: as they made within that one ἄδης two several receptacles, one for the good and virtuous, the other for the wicked and unjust; (according to that of Diphilus, opul. C. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. v.):

Καὶ γὰρ καθ' ἄδην δύο τρίβους νουμίζουσιν. Μιαί, δικαίων 'χτέρας ἄσβεσιν ἄδου

and that of Plato: Οὕτω δὲ δὴ εἶναι δεῖ τελευτήσαι, δικαίους δὲν τῷ λειψάνῳ, ἐὰν τῇ τριβῇ, ἐὰν δὲς φέρεσαι τῷ ὄδου, ἢ μὲν εἰς μακρῶν νίκου, ἢ δὲ εἰς Τάρταρον. — In
just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those which departed in the true faith and fear of God, the souls of the patriarchs and the prophets, and the people of God.

Corgia: and that of Virgil:—

"Hic locus est, partes ubi se via findit in ambas:
Dexteraque Ditis magni sub mania te induit;
Hac hier Elysium nobis: at larva malorum
Exercet panas, et ad impia Tartara mitteri."

—Eneid. vi. 510;)
as they did send the best of men to άθης, there to be happy, and taught rewards to be received there as well as punishments; ἐλεγεται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεληκοῦ Πνεύματος ταύτη τερά των εὐανείων ἐν άθου—

Τοίοι λαμπεί μέχρι μένου άθλειν
Τίνον ἐνέδα νικά κατ' άυτό
Φοινικόρδια τε λειψώνι
Εἰς πρόσαυτοι αὐτών.

—Plutarch. de Consolat. ad Apollon.:—

—Ο τριστιβόλιον
Κείνοι βρατόν, οί ταῦτα δερψήτες τέλῃ
Μάλως εἰς άδόν τοσίδο γὰρ μάνους ἔκαι
Ζην εστὶ, τοῖς δ’ ἄλλοις πάντες ἔρει κακαί.

—Sophocles, oed. Plat. de Aud. Poet.:)

so did the Jews also before and after our Saviour's time. For Josephus says, the soul of Samuel was brought up ἐν άθον, and delivers the opinion of the Pharisees after this manner: Α'θανατον τε ιερον ταῖς θυσιαῖς πίστεις αὐτοῖς, εἶναι καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιωμένης τε καὶ τιμᾶς οἷα ἀρετῆς ἥ κακίας ἐπίτηδεός ἐν τῷ βίω γέγονεν; and of the Sadducees after this manner: θυσίας τε τὴν δειμομένην, καὶ τὸς καθ’ άθων τιμωρίας καὶ τιμᾶς αναφέροντο. —Antiq. Jud. liber xviii. cap. 2. Therefore the Jews which thought the souls immortal did believe that the just were rewarded, as well as the unjust punished, ὑπὸ χθονοῦ, or καθ’ άθον. And so did also most of the ancient fathers of the church. There was an ancient book written De Universi Naturâ, which some attributed to Justin Martyr, some to Irenæus, others to Origen, or to Caius, a presbyter of the Roman church in the time of Victor and Zephyrinus, a fragment of which is set forth by David Hosiuschelius in his Annnotations upon Photius, delivering the state of ἄθως at large: Περί δέ άθων, εν δὲ συνέχονται γυμναῖ δικαιωμένων τε καὶ δικαιῶν, ἀναγκασον ἑπιστ. Here then were the just and unjust in hades, but not in the same place. Οἱ δὲ δικαιῶν—

ἐν τῷ άθω νῦν μὲν συνεχονται, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ, οἱ καὶ οἱ δικαιῶν. Μία γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ χρυσὸν κάθοδος, ὡς. “There was but one passage into the hades,” saith he; but when that gate was passed, the just went on the right hand to a place of happiness, (Τούτω δέ ὡνομα, κακλησίσκουμεν κάλπον Αδραμά) and the unjust on the left to a place of misery. Οὕτως δὲ περὶ άθων λόγος ἐν ἃς γυμναῖ πάντων κατέχονται ἄχρι καιροῦ,

οὐ δ’ θεὸς ἀριστεύει. Tertullian wrote a tract De Paradiso, now not extant, in which he expressed thus much: “Habeas chim de Paradiso a nobis libellum, quo constitutum omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini.” — De Anim. cap. 55. St. Jerome on the third chapter of Ecclesiastes: “Ante adventum Christi omnia ad inferos pariter ducebantur. Unde et Jacob ad inferos descensurum se dicit; et Job pios et impios in inferno queritur retenetur; et evangelium, chaos ma-mus interpsitum apud inferos, et Abraham cum Lazaro, et divilig in supplicibus, esse testatur.” And in his twenty-fifth Epistle: “Perfectis ad ista responsio est: Luxisse Jacob illum, quem putabat occidum, ad quem et ipse erat ad inferos descensurus, dicens, Descendam ad filium meum lugens in infernum: quia necevum paradisi jamam Christus effregat, neodium flammeos illam rompean et veritigenim presidentium cherubin singulis dicas extinxerat. Unde et Abraham, licet in loco refrigerei, tamen apud inferos cum Lazaro fulsis scriberit.” And again: “Nequeo satis scripturea laudare mysteria, et divinum sensum; in quibus lietum simplicitatis, admirari: quid sit uli atid quod Myoses plangitur; et Jesus Nave, vir sanctus, sequitas fertur, et tamen fictus esse non scribatur. Nempe illud, quod in Myose, id est, in lege vetei, sub peccato Adam, omnes tenebantur elocio; et ad inferos descendentes consequenter lacrymae prossequabantur; in Jesu vero, id est, in evangello, per quem paradisus est aperturae, mortem gaudia prossequuntur.”

Τὸ πρότερον ὁ θάνατος εἰς τὸν άθων κατίγγει νυνι δὲ ὁ πάντων πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν παραπημι:—S. Chrysostomus, Pascegr. in Domin. Mart. Bein. et Prodo. And in his tractate proving that Christ is God, he makes this exposition of Isaiah xiv. 2: ἦν οἷος καλλάς συνθήλαστα, καὶ μαγεύων σεβόμενον συντυγίω, καὶ άνοιείον ψηφαρων σκετονών, ἀποκρυφὸν, ἀποτιπόθεν συνών τὸν άθων ὁμοίον καλάν. Εἰ γάρ καὶ άθων ἡν, ἀλλὰ ψυχας ἐκρατεί ἄγιας καὶ σκέψη τιμων, τοῦ Ἀβρααμ, τοῦ Ἰσαάκ, τοῦ Ἰακωβδι καὶ θησαυρῶν ἐκλέσεσ. This doctrine was maintained by all those who believed that the soul of Samuel was raised by the witch of Endor: for though he were so great a prophet, yet they thought that he was in Hades; and not only so, but under the power of Satan. Thus Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho: Φαίνεται δέ καὶ οτι πάσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν άθων δικαιῶν καὶ προφητῶν, υπὸ εξουσίαν ἐπιτον τῶν τουλουντίων ὑπάρχων, οὕτω δε καὶ εἰς τῇ ἐγενασμενογενει ἐκείνῃ εἰς αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖται.—Sect. 105. Who was followed in this by Origen, Anastasius, Andronicus, and others.
But others there were who thought hades or infernus was never taken in the scriptures for any place of happiness, and therefore they did not conceive the souls of the patriarchs or the prophets did pass into any such infernal place, and consequently that the descent into hell was not his going to the prophets or the patriarchs, which were not there. For as, if it had been only said that Christ had gone unto the bosom of Abraham, or to paradise, no man would have ever believed that he had descended into hell; so being it is only written, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, it seems incongruous to think that he went then unto the patriarchs, who were not there.

Now this being the diversity of opinions ancienly in respect of the persons unto whose souls the soul of Christ descended at his death, the difference of the end or efficacy of that descent is next to be observed. Of those which did believe the name of hades to belong unto that general place which comprehended all the souls of men (as well those which died in the favour of God as those which departed in their sins), some of them thought that Christ descended to that place of hades, where the souls of all the faithful, from the death of the righteous Abel to the death of Christ, were detained, and there dissolve all the power by which they were detained below, translated them into a far more glorious place,
and stated them in a condition far more happy in the heavens above. Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the souls of all men are detained below still, and shall not enter into heaven until the general resurrection. They made no such distinction at the death of Christ, as if those which believed in a Saviour to come should be kept out from heaven till he came, and those which now believe in the same Saviour already come should be admitted thither immediately upon their expiration.

But such as thought the place in which the souls of the patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called hell, nor was ---
ever so named in the scriptures, conceived, that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper hell, or place of torment, so the end of his descent was to deliver souls from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of happiness and a glorious condition. They which did think that hell was wholly emptied, that every soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the names of heretics; but to believe that many were delivered was both by them and many others counted orthodox.

1 St. Augustine in his book De Heresibus reckons this as the seventy-ninth heresy: "Alia, descendente ad inferos Christo, credidisse incredulos, et omnes exinde existimavit liberatos."—And though he gives the heresy without a name, as he found it in Philastrius, yet we find the opinion was not very singular. For Eunomius propounded it to St. Augustine as a question in which he desired satisfaction, "An descensens Christus omnium evangelizavit, omnesque a tenebris et punis per gratiam liberavit, ut a tempore resurrectionis Domini Judicium expectaret, eximantis inferioris?"—Epist. xviii, ad S. August. And in his answer to that question, he looks not upon the affirmative part as an heresy, but as a doubtful proposition. His resolution, First, is, that it did not concern the prophets and the patriarchs, because he could not see how they should be thought to be in hell, and so capable of a deliverance from thence: "Addunt quidam hoc beneficium antiquis etiam sanctis fusisse concessum, Abel, Seth, Noe, et domini ius, Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob, alisque patriarchis et prophetis, ut eum Domini in infernum venisset, habens doloribus solvere. Sed quomodo intelligatur Abraham, in cujus sinum plus etiam pauper ille suscepit est, in illis fusisse doloribus, ego quidem non video: explicat fortasse qui possunt."—Epist. xix. in Eudodium, cap. 3. Et paulo post: "Unde illis justis qui in sinu Abraham erant, cum ille in inferno descendere, nondum quid contulisset invenit, a quibus eum secundum beatitatem presentiam suae Divinitatis munquam video recessisse." And yet in another place he will not blame them that believed the contrary, nor did he think their opinion absurd. "Si enim non absurde credidissent, antiquos etiam sanctos, qui venturi Christi temeritut fidei, locis quidem a tormentis impiorum remississimis, sed apud inferos, fusisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi ad ea loca descensus erueret." &c.—De Civitate Dei, lib. xx. cap. 15. His second resolution was, that Christ did by his descent relieve some out of the pains of hell; taking "hell" in the worst sense. "Quia evidentia testimonia et infernum commemo- rant et dolores, nulla causa occurrit, cur illuc credatur venisse Salvator, nisi ut ab ejus doloris salvas facret."—Epist. xix. cap. 3. Quamobrem teneamus firmissime quod fides habet fundatissima authoritate firmata, quia Christus mortuus est secundum scripturas, et quia sepultus est, et quia resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas: et cetera quae de illo, testatissima veritate, conscripta sunt. In quibus etiam hoc est, quod apud inferos fuit, solutis eorum doloribus, quibus eum erat impossibile teneri, a quibus etiam recte intelligitur soluisse et liberasse quos voluit."—Ibid. cap. 5. His third resolution was, that how many these were which were delivered out of the torments of hell was uncertain, and therefore temerarious to define. "S.d utrum omnes quos in cisi inventit, an quos quos illos beneficio dignos judicavit, adhuc requiro."—Ibid. cap. 3. "Hoc scilicet quod scriptum est, Solutis doloribus in terris, non in omnibus, sed in quibusdam accipi potest, quos ille dignos ista liberatione judicabat: ut neque frustra illuc descendisse existimetur, nulli eorum profutura qui ibi teneban tur inclusi; nec tamen sit consequens, ut quod Divina quibusdam meritoria justitiaeque concessit omnibus concessum esse putandum sit."—Ibid. cap. 2. "Pote tis et sic, ut eos dolores eum solvisse credamus, quibus teneri ipsa non poterat, sed quibus ali quiescentur quos ille noverat liberrando. Verum quinam isti sint, terramurium est define. Si enim omnes omnino diei ximum tunc esse liberrato, qui illic inventi sunt, quia non gratuletur, si hoc possimus ostendere?"—Ibid. cap. 2. Thus the opinion of St. Augustine is clear, that those which departed in the faith of Christ were before in happiness and the beatific presence of God, and so needed no translation by the descent of Christ; and of those which were kept in the pains of hell, some were lessened and delivered from them, some were not; and this was the proper end or effect of Christ's descent into hell. Thus Capreolus: "Ipse in homine est visitare inferorum dignatus abstrusa, et prepositos mortis praesentia invicta majestatis exterruit, et propter liberandos quos voluit, inferorum portas recessari praeceptum."—Epist. ad Vital. et Constant. St. Ambrosius: "Ipse autem inter mortuos liber remissionem in Inferno positis, soluta mortis lege, donabat."—De Fide, cap. 5. "Oleum in eis quoque scelusin tur quoniam jet, ut teneat ab omnibus anapastas ptulas, eremum te et manu a famulatis eis esse, ut omnia in dio desolant anastas. St. Chrys."
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The means by which they did conceive that Christ did free the souls of men from hell was the application of his death unto them which was propounded to those souls by the preaching of the gospel there;¹ that as he revealed here on earth the will of God unto the sons of men, and propounded himself as the object of their faith, to the end that whosoever believed in him should never die, so after his death he showed himself unto the souls departed, that whosoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him should pass from death to life.

Thus did they think the soul of Christ descended into hell to preach the gospel to the spirits there, that they might receive him who before believed in him, or that they might believe in him who before rejected him. But this cannot be received as the end, or way to effect the end, of Christ's descent; nor can I look upon it as any illustration of this article, for many reasons. For first, I have already showed that the place of St. Peter, so often mentioned for it, is not capable of that sense, nor hath it any relation to our Saviour after death. Secondly, the ancients seem upon no other reason to have interpreted this place of St. Peter in that manner, but because other apocryphal writings led them to that interpretation, upon the authority whereof this opinion only can rely. A place of the prophet Jeremy was first produced, that the Lord God of Israel remembered his dead, which slept in the land of the grave, and descended unto them, to preach unto them his salvation.² But

¹ Homil. Pasch. 7; who speaks full as high as those words of Exodus, or that heretic, whosoever it was which is mentioned, though not named, by Philostratus: for ἐφίμηκα καὶ μάνος διάβολος is as much as ἀφθηγενιζωλ. And κεννᾶσα τοῦ βαναύσου μυχῶν (which he useth in another homily) is the same.

² Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew: Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τουτοῦ ἐρεμίου ὁμοίως ταῦτα περιέχομεν: ἐμμυθήθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραήλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τοὺς κεκομιμημένους εἰς γῆν χωρίων, καὶ κατέβη μοι αὐτοῦ εὐστά
being there is no such verse extant in that prophet or any other, it was also delivered that it was once in the translation of the Septuagint, but raised out from thence by the Jews; which, as it can scarce be conceived true, so, if it were, it would be yet of doubtful authority, as being never yet found in the Hebrew text. And Hermes, in his book called the Pastor, was thought to give sufficient strength to this opinion; whereas the book itself is of no general authority, and in this particular is most extravagant, for he taught that not only the soul of Christ, but also the souls of the apostles, preached to the spirits below; that as they followed his steps here, so did they also after their death, and therefore descended to preach in hell.  

Nor is this only to be suspected in reference to those pretended authorities which first induced men to believe it, and to make forced interpretations of scripture to maintain it, but also to be rejected in itself, as false and inconsistent with the nature, scope, and end of the gospel (which is to be preached with such commands and ordinances as can concern those only which are in this life), and as incongruous to the state and condition of those souls
to whom Christ is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the patriarchs, prophets, and all saints before departed, it is certain they were never disobedient in the days of Noah; nor could they need the publication of the gospel after the death of Christ, who by virtue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptance had received a reward long before. If we look upon them which died in disobedience, and were in torments for their sins, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the gospel preached. The rich man, whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, lest they also should come unto that place; but we find no hopes he had that any should come from them which were alive to preach to him. For if the living, who heard not Moses and the prophets, would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead, surely those which had been disobedient unto the prophets should never be persuaded after they were dead.

Whether, therefore, we consider the authorities first introducing this opinion, which were apocryphal; or the testimonies of scripture, forced and improbable; or the nature of this preaching, inconsistent with the gospel; or the persons to whom Christ should be thought to preach (which, if dead in the faith and fear of God, wanted no such instruction; if departed in infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such a dispensation); this preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper to effect the end, of his descent into hell.

Nor is this preaching only to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of Christ's descent, but the effect itself pretended to be wrought thereby, whether in reference to the just or unjust, is by no means to be admitted. For though some of the ancients thought, as is shown before, that Christ did therefore descend into hell, that he might deliver the souls of some which were tormented in those flames and translate them to a place of happiness; yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance, neither in respect of the ground or foundation on which it is built, nor in respect of the action or effect itself. The authority upon which the strength of this doctrine doth rely is that place of the Acts, whom God hath raised up, loosing the pains of hell, for so they read it; from whence the argument is thus deduced. God did loose the pains of hell when Christ was raised; but those pains did not take hold of Christ himself, who was not to suffer anything after death, and consequently he could not be loosed from or taken out of those pains in which he never was: in the same manner the patriarchs and the prophets, and the
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saints of old, if they should be granted to have been in a place sometimes called hell, yet were they there in happiness, and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the loosing of the pains of hell: it followeth, then, that those alone which died in their sins were involved in those pains, and when those pains were loosed then were they released; and being they were loosed when Christ was raised, the consequence will be, that he, descending into hell, delivered some of the damned souls from their torments there.

But, first, though the Latin translation render it so, the pains of hell;¹ though some copies and other translations, and divers of the fathers, read it in the same manner; yet the original and authentic Greek acknowledgeth no such word as hell, but propounds it plainly thus, whom God hath raised up loosing the pains of death. Howsoever, if the words were so expressed in the original text, yet it would not follow that God delivered Christ out of those pains in which he was detained any time, much less that the soul of Christ delivered the souls of any other, but only that he was preserved from enduring them.²

Again, as the authority is most uncertain, so is the doctrine most incongruous. The souls of men were never cast into infernal torments, to be delivered from them. The days which follow after death were never made for opportunities to a better life. The angels had one instant either to stand or fall eternally; and what that instant was to them, that this life is unto us. We may as well believe the devils were saved, as those souls which were once tormented with them. For it is an everlasting fire, an everlasting punishment,³ a worm that dieth not.⁴ Nor does this only belong to us who live after the death of Christ, as if the damnation of all

¹ The Vulgar Latin renders it thus, Quem Deus suscitavit, solutis doloribus inferni: so also the Syriac, هنُذلِأ هنُذلِأ: So some of the ancient fathers read it; as Irenæus, or rather his interpreter: “Quem Deus excitavit, solutis doloribus inferorum.”—Adv. Hæres. lib. iii. cap. 12. Capreolus bishop of Carthage: “Resolves, sicut scriptum est, inferorum parturitiones.”—Epist. ad Vital. et Constant. And before these Polycarpus: “On γέγενεν ὁ Θεὸς, λύσας τὰς δώινας τοῦ ἄδου. “Quem resuscitavit Deus, dissolvens dolores inferni.”—Epist. ad Phil.; whom I suppose Grotius understood when he cited Barnabas. And thus St. Augustin read it, and laid the stress of his interpretation upon this reading: “Quia evidentia testimonia et infernum commenrunt et dolores,” &c.—Epist. xci. cap. 3. But in the original Greek it is generally written δώινας θανάτων, and in all these many copies of it, only that of Petrus Fraxardus, and two of the sixteen copies which Robertus Stephanus made use of, read it δόου. And this mistake was very easy: for in Psalm xviii. 5, there is δόου, δόου, and verse 6, δόου, δόου. And we find twice in the Proverbs (chap. xiv. 12; and xvi. 25) translated πολυμενα δονων, and 2 Samuel xxii. 6, δονω δονω, δονω θανατων.

² “Quonc si movet aliquem, quemadmodum accipiens sit, inferni ab illo solutus dolores: quae enim erat in ea esse tamquam in vinculis, et sic esse solutus tamquam si catenas solvisset quisque fuerat aliquis?” facile est intelligere sic esse solvtos esse quemadmodum solvi possunt laquel venuntium, ne tenant; non quia tollentur.”—S. August. Epist. xcix. cap. 2.

³ Matt. xxv. 41, 46. ⁴ Mark ix. 44.
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sinners now were ineluctable and eternal, but before that death it were not so; as if faith and repentance were now indispensably necessary to salvation, but then were not. For thus the condition of mankind before the fulness of time, in which our Saviour came into the world, should have been far more happy and advantageous than it hath been since. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternal flames, except we obtain the favour of God before we be swallowed by the jaws of death. **We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body:** but if they be in the state of salvation now by virtue of Christ’s descent into hell which were numbered amongst the damned before his death, at the day of the general judgment they must be returned into hell again; or if they be received then into eternal happiness, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to those flames at first, according to the general dispensations of God, or else they did not receive the things done in their body at the last; which all shall as certainly receive, as all appear. This life is given unto men to work out their salvation with fear and trembling; but after death cometh judgment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never die; he that believeth, though he die, yet shall he live; but he that dieth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which went before, as of those which came after our Saviour, because he was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. I therefore conclude, that the end for which the soul of Christ descended into hell was not to deliver any damned souls, or to translate them from the torments of hell unto the joys of heaven.

The next consideration is, whether by virtue of his descent the souls of those which before believed in him, the patriarchs, prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before, and whether Christ descended into hell to that end, that he might translate them into a place and state far more glorious and happy. This hath been in the later ages of the church the vulgar opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the denial of the former; he delivered not the souls of the damned, therefore he delivered the souls of them which believed, and of them alone, till at last the schools

1 This is the argument of Gregory the Great: "Si fideles nunc sine bonis operibus non salvantur, et infales ac reprobis sine bonâ actione, Domino ad inferos descendent, salvati sunt; melior illorum sors fuit, qui incarnationem Domini minime viderunt, quam horum qui post incarnationis ejus mysterium nati sunt. Quod quanta futilitas sit dicere [vel sentire], ipse Dominus testatur discipulis, dicens, Multi reges et prophem veluerunt videre que vos videtis, et non viderunt."—Lib. vii. Epist. 15.

2 2 Cor. v. 10.

3 John xi. 25, 26.

4 Rev. xiii. 8.

5 So Gregory the Great, after he had proved that none of the damned were released...
nave followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of faith and infallible certainty, that the soul of Christ descending into hell, did deliver from thence all the souls of the saints which were in the bosom of Abraham, and did confer upon them actual and essential beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds: first, that the souls of saints departed saw not God; and secondly, that Christ by his death opened the gate of the kingdom of heaven.

But even this opinion, as general as it hath been, hath neither that consent of antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretendeth, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The most ancient of all the fathers, whose writings are extant, were so far from believing that the end of Christ's descent into hell was to translate the saints of old into heaven, that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christ's death, until the general resurrection. Others, as we have also shown, thought the bosom of Abraham was not in any place which could be termed hell, and consequently could not think that Christ should therefore descend into hell to deliver them which were not there. And others yet which thought that Christ delivered the patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did not think so exclusively, or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be saved as well as the patriarchs were, and doubted whether all were not so saved or no. Indeed I think there were very few by Christ's descent, thus infer and concludes: "Hac itaque omnia pertractantae, nihil aliud tenacis nisi quod vera fides per catholicae ecclesiae doct: quia descendens ad inferos Dominus illos solusmodo ab inferni claustris eripuit, quos viventes in carne per suam gratiam in fide et bona operatione servavit."

1 These are the words of Suarez: "Primo ergo certum est, Christum descendendo ad inferos animabus sanctis, quae in seu Abraham erant, essentiam beatitudinem, et cetera animae dona, quae iliam consequuntur, contulisse. Hoc de fide certum existimo; quia de fide est illas animas non vidisse Deum ante Christi mortem. - Delince est de fide certum. Christum per mortem aperisse hominibus Januam regni; - idoque de fide etiam certum est, animas sanctorum omnium post Christi mortem decesentium (si nihil purgandum habeant) statim videre Deum; ergo idem est de predictis animabus."

2 We have showed this before to have been the opinion of the most ancient, producing the express testimonies of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen. So also Novatian: "Quae infera terram jacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis et ordinatis postestatibus vacua. Locus enim est, quo plurum animas impiorumque ducentur, futuri judicii praefigurata sentientes."

3 We have already shown that many did believe all the damned souls were saved then; and St. Augustin had his adhibe requir, when he wrote unto Eudocius concerning that opinion. Beside, the doubt of that great divine, Gregory Nazianzen, is very observable, who in his second Oration De Passiata hath these words: "An eis daemon, scio, katekèi: gnôde kai tâ ektiê bûntoou Hristou moutênma. Tis tê oikômêi têis diphêis kato- bāseos; tis ò lógos; ò Aplôos sôzei pàntos
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(if any) for above five hundred years after Christ, which did so believe Christ delivered the saints out of hell, as to leave all the damned there: and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the ancients believed not that they were removed at all, and so few acknowledged that they were removed alone.

And if the authority of this opinion in respect of its antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be less. For first, if it be not certain that the souls of the patriarchs were in some place called hell after their own death, and until the death of Christ; if the bosom of Abraham were not some infernal mansion; then can it not be certain that Christ descended into hell to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the souls of the just, the patriarchs and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was or may be called hell: the bosom of Abraham might well be in the heavens above, far from any region where the devil and his angels were; the scriptures nowhere tell us that the spirits of just men went unto, or did remain in hell; the place in which the rich man was in torments after death is called hell, but that into which the angels carried the poor man's soul is not termed so. There was a vast distance between them two; nor is it likely that the angels which see the face of God should be sent down from heaven to convey the souls of the just into that place where the face of God cannot be seen. When God translated Enoch, and Elias was carried up in a chariot to heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable that Moses was with Elias as well before as upon the mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that Abraham should be in any worse place or condition than Enoch was, having as great a testimony that he pleased God, as Enoch had. 1

Secondly, it cannot be certain that the soul of Christ delivered the souls of the saints of old from hell, and imparted to them the

epifaneis, ἦ κακει τοὺς πιστεύοντας; Where his question is clearly this, Whether Christ appearing in hell did save all without exception, or did save there, as he does here, only such as believed. To this it is answered by Suarez two ways:—that it is the ordinary and universal law, that none of the damned should be saved: "An vero ex speciali privilegio sua voluntate et arbitrio aliquem damnatum ex gehenna Christus eduxerit, dubitari quoque modo potest.—Et juxta hae possent intelligi Nazianzenus et Augustinus." But this will by no means save their authorities; for neither of them did doubt or question whether some of the damned were released, but whether all were released, or some only; which Suarez did very well perceive, and therefore was ready in the same sentence with another answer: "Quanquam Nazianzenus non videatur illa scripsisse verba, quoniam de hac veritate dubitaret, sed solum ut proponeret quid de hoc mysterio inquirere ac scire oporteat." Which is as much as to say, that he was satisfied of the truth, but desired to satisfy no man else. Whereas it is clear that it was a doubt in his age, as we have here shown, and that he would leave it still a doubt and undetermined. And as for the other, "Augustinus recta potest intelligi de animabus purgatorii," it is certainly false, unless they will enlarge that purgatory as wide as hell; for the question was of emptying that.—Comment. in tertiam Partem Thomae, disp. 43, sect. 3. 1 Heb. xi. 5.
beatifical vision, except it were certain that the souls are in another place and a better condition now than they were before. But there is no certainty that the patriarchs and the prophets are now in another place and a better condition than they were before our blessed Saviour died; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the scriptures; there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actual accession of happiness and glory already past. Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven;¹ there then did the Gentiles which came in to Christ find the patriarchs, even in the kingdom of heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them anywhere else than Lazarus did. For the description is the same, There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.² For as the rich man in hell lift up his eyes being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off,³ before the death of Christ; so those that were in weeping and gnashing of teeth, saw Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the prophets, when the Gentiles were brought in.

Thirdly, though it were certain that the souls of the saints had been in a place called hell, as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition than they were before Christ's death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that Christ descended into hell to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his resurrection, it might not be effected till his ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his passion, it might have no dependence on his descent. I conclude therefore that there is no certainty of truth in that proposition which the schoolmen take for a matter of faith, that Christ delivered the souls of the saints from that place of hell which they call limbus of the fathers, into heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into hell.

Wherefore being it is most infallibly certain that the death of Christ was as powerful and effectual for the redemption of the saints before him, as for those which follow him; being they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink;⁴ being Abraham is the father of us all, and we now after Christ's ascension are called but to walk in the steps of the faith of that father;⁵ being the bosom of Abraham is clearly propounded in the scriptures as the place into which the blessed angels before the death of Christ conveyed the souls of those which departed in

¹ Mat. viii. 11. ² Luke xiii. 28. ³ xvi. 23. ⁴ 1 Cor. x. 3, 4. ⁵ Rom. iv. 12, 18.
the favour of God, and is also promised to them which should believe in Christ after his death; being we can find no difference or translation of the bosom of Abraham, and yet it is a comfort still to us that we shall go to him, and while we hope so never fear that we shall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of Christ's descent into hell, to convey the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and those which were with them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.

Another opinion hath obtained, especially in our church, that the end for which our Saviour descended into hell was to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominions. And this hath been received as grounded on the scriptures and consent of fathers. The scriptures produced for the confirmation of it are these two: Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them; and, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? By the conjunction of these two they conceive the triumph of Christ's descent clearly described in this manner: Ye were buried with Christ in baptism, with whom ye were also raised; and when ye were dead in sins, he quickened you together with him, forgiving your sins, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open show of them, triumphing over them in

1 Luke xvi. 22. 2 Although "the bosom of Abraham" in express and formal terms be spoken only of Lazarus, whom Christ being yet alive in the flesh supposed dead; yet the same "bosom" is virtually and in terms equivalent promised to those which afterwards should believe. For the joys of the life to come are likened to a feast, in which, according to the custom then in use, they lay down with the head of one toward the breast of the other, who is therefore said to lie in his bosom, as we read of St. John, 'Hunc anaxeimenos ev tw kóly tov Tnou. (John xiii. 23.) Thus in that heavenly feast in the kingdom of God, Lazarus is ἀνακείμενος εν τω κόλπῳ Αβραάμ: (Luke xvi. 23) and in St. Matt. viii. 11, Christ saith, that "many shall come from the east and from the west, κατ' ἀνακληθοῦντα μετὰ Αβραὰμ, δισεκούπητα κυπρὶ Ἀβραὰμ," to sit down with Abraham," as we translate it after our custom, at the same feast, that is, Ἀνακληθοῦται εν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Αβραὰμ, etc.; as Euthymius: "Quia Deus Abraham, coeli Conditor, Pater Christi est; idcirco in regno caelorum est et Abrahami, cum quo accabitura sunt nationes que crediderunt in Christum Filium Creatoris."

3 St. Augustin often shows the comfort which he had in going to the bosom of Abraham: as in the case of his friend Nebridius: "Nunc ille vixit in simul Abraham. Quicquid illud est quod illo significatur simum, ibi Nebri- dus meus vivit, dudcibus anicicus meus, tunc autem, Domine, adoptivus ex liberto filius, ibi vivit. Nam quis alius tali animae locus?" — Confess. lib. ix. cap. 3. And he saith that place (as uncertain as before) where it was before. "P. est vitam istam parvam nondum eris ubi cunct sancti, quibus dicetur, Venite, benedicti I tuis mei, percipite regnum quod ronis paratum est ab initio mundi, Nondum ibi eris, quis nescit? Sed jam potes nulliter esse, ubi illum quondam ulcerostum pauperem dives ille superbus et steriles in mediis suis tormentis visit a longa requies centum." — Concl. i. in I saulum xxxiv. This and this must necessarily take for a sufficient comfort to a dying Christian, who sees that place "in conspectu Domini." (De Civitate Dei, lib. i. cap. 12,) and looked upon them which were in it, as upon those "a quibus Christus secundum beatificam presentiam [suae Divinitatis] munium recognos- sit."—Epist. xcix cap. 3.

4 Col. ii. 15. 5 Eph. 17. 8, 9.
That is, say they, ye died and were buried with Christ, who fastened the handwriting of ordinances to the cross, that he might abolish it, from having any right to tie or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickened and raised together with Christ, who spoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, spoiling principalities and powers, are not referred to the cross, but to Christ's resurrection. This triumph over Satan and all his kingdom the same apostle to the Ephesians setteth down as a consequent to Christ's death, and pertinent to his resurrection, Ascending on high he led captivity captive; and this, He ascended, what meaneth it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth? so that ascending from the lower parts of the earth he led captivity captive, which is all one with he triumphed over powers and principalities. With this coherence and conjunction of the apostle's words, together with the interpretation of the ancient fathers, they conceive it sufficiently demonstrated, that Christ after his death, and before his resurrection, in the lowermost parts of the earth, even in hell, did lead captivity captive, and triumphed over Satan.

But notwithstanding, I cannot yet perceive either how this triumph in hell should be delivered as a certain truth in itself, or how it can have any consistency with the denial of those other ends, which they who of late have embraced this opinion do ordinarily reject. First, I cannot see how the scriptures mentioned are sufficient to found any such conclusion of themselves. Secondly, I cannot understand how they can embrace this as the interpretation of the fathers, who believe not that any of the souls of the damned were taken out of the torments of hell, or that the souls of the saints of old were removed from thence by Christ's descent; which were the reasons why the fathers spake of such a triumphing in hell, and leading captivity captive there.

That the triumphing in the epistle to the Colossians is not referred to the cross but to the resurrection, cannot be proved; the coherence cannot inforce so much: no logic can infer such a division, that the blotting out of the handwriting belongeth precisely to our burial with him, and the triumphing over principalities and powers particularly to our being quickened together with him; or that the blotting out was performed at one time, and the triumphing at another. Our present translation attributeth it expressly to the cross, rendering the last words, triumphing over them in it, that is, in the cross, mentioned in the former verse; and though anciently it have been read, triumphing over them in
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1 So the Vulgar Latin, "Palam triumphantes illos in semetipsos, and also in the Syriac:


2 Ecumenius showed their reading, "Triumphes illos in semetipsos, et interpretatio: "Triumphus legieta e catà tòn hýmò-

mén en pòliti kai pànygrias. "Eidémaíven-

sèn ouv àntou dià tòu stauróu, toutéstín, én kàv àntou òrçiaòv tov nóvov étiapélese.—Coom. in Ephiad Coloss. vii.

3 "En àntou thon dià tòu stauróu, and his érvtíava nóvov in the cross will no way agree with that actual triumph in hell. But Theophylact yet more clearly: "Triumphes illos in semetipsos, and interpretatio: "Triumphus legieta e catà tòn hýmò-

mén en pòliti kai pànygrias. "Eidémaíven-

sèn ouv àntou dià tòu stauróu, toutéstín, én kàv àntou òrçiaòv tov nóvov étiapélese.—Coom. in Epi
dad Coloss. vii.

4 Prudentius:—

"Die trophaenum passionis, Diem triumphalem crucem.

—Cathem. Hymn. ii. 3.

St. Hilary most expressly: "Manus ejus edocta ad bellum sunt cum victi seculum. Ego enim, tibi, vici mundum, cum extensis in crucem invictissimis armis ipsius passio-
nis instruitur, Et posuisisti, inquit, ut arcanum arca
drum brachia mea, cum de omnibus virtutibus ac potestatibus in ipso se trophoeo glo-
róse crucis triumphat, et principatùs et potestatùs traduxit cum fiducia triumphans eos in semetipsos." — Tract. in Psalmum xxii. Where it is observable that the father does read it in semetipsos, and inter-
prets it in cruce. "Nos quoniam trophaenum jam videmus, et quod currum suum Trium-
phator ascendit, consideremus quid non ar-
borum, non quadrupugis plantri mammatis de mortal, hoste questes, sed patibulo trium-
phali captiva de seculo spolia su-pendit."—

S. Ambros. lib. x. in cap. xxiii. S. Luca.

And amongst the rest of the captives he reckons afterwards, "captivitatem principem mundi, et spiritualia nequitiae quos sunt in celestibus." To this alludes Fulgentius: "Sc oportuit nostrorum peccatorum delicii graphorum, ut dum venus hom nostrer simul cruci afligatur, tanquam in trophaeo, Triumphtoris victoria pandaret." — Ad

Thraetamund. lib. iii. cap. 29. Whether therefore we read it in àntou with the Greeks, that is, in stauróu, or in àntou with the Latins, in seipso, it is the same: for he triumphed over the devil by himself upon the cross, as in the same case it is written, Eph. ii. 16: "Cæ caq atokatallaghe tov ànmyfórfous én evi ówma tò òbrì dia tòu stauróu, àpoxai
tus ton évibra eis àntou."
This place then of St. Paul to the Colossians cannot prove that Christ descended into hell, to triumph over the devil there: and it be not proper for that purpose of itself, it will not be more effectual by the addition of that other to the Ephesians. For first we have already shown, that the descending into the lower parts of the earth doth not necessarily signify his descent into hell, and consequently cannot prove that either those things which are spoken in the same place, or in any other, are to be attributed to that descent. Again, if it were granted that those words did signify hell, and this article of our Creed were contained in them, yet would it not follow from that scripture that Christ triumphed over Satan while his soul was in hell; for the consequence would be only this, that the same Christ who led captivity captive descended first into hell. In that he ascended (and ascending led captivity captive) what is it but that he descended first? The descent then, if it were to hell, did precede the triumphant ascent of the same person, and that is all which the apostle's words will evince. Nay further yet, the ascent mentioned by St. Paul cannot be that which immediately followed the descent into hell, for it evidently signifies the ascension which followed forty days after his resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an ascending up on high, even far above all heavens. Now the leading captivity captive be longeth clearly to this ascent, and not to any descent which did precede it. It is not said, that he descended first to lead captivity captive, and yet it must be so if Christ descended into hell to triumph there; it is not said, when he had led captivity captive, he ascended up on high, for then it might be supposed that the captives had been led before; but it is expressly said, ascending up on high he led captivity captive, and consequently that triumphant act was the immediate effect of his ascension. So that by these two scriptures no more can be proved than this, that Christ triumphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the cross, and led captivity captive at his ascension into heaven. Which is so far from proving that Christ descended into hell to triumph there, that it is more proper to persuade the contrary. For why should he go to hell to triumph over them, over whom he had triumphed on the cross? why should he go to captive that

1 The original words do manifestly show that this triumphant act did not precede this ascent: for had it been, ἀπέδυσεν ἀποστάλλοντας ἀνεβη ζυγόν, we might well have expounded it thus,—"Christ did lead sin and death and Satan captive, and, when he had done so, ascended up on high;" but being [seeing] it is written, Ἀνάβας εἰς ζυγόν, that is, "Having ascended up on high," ἡ χειραλοτυπίας ἀποστάλλοντας ζυγόν, "he captivated a captivity," the ascent must here precede the captivity, though not in time, (as it did the giving of gifts,) yet in nature: so that it is not proper to say, "By captivating he ascended;" but it is proper to express it thus, "By ascending to lead captive a captivity."
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captivity then, which he was to captivate when he ascended into heaven?

As for the testimonies of the fathers, they will appear of small validity to confirm this triumphant descent as it is distinguished from the two former effects, the removal of the saints to heaven, and the delivering the damned from the torments of hell. In vain shall we pretend that Christ descended into hell to lead captivity captive, if we withdraw maintain that when he descended thither he brought none away which were captive there. This was the very notion which those fathers had, that the souls of men were conquered by Satan, and after death actually brought into captivity; and that the soul of Christ descending to the place where they were, did actually release them from that bondage and bring them out of the possession of the devil by force. Thus did he conquer Satan, spoil hell, and lead captivity captive, according to their apprehension. But if he had taken no souls from thence he had not spoiled hell, he had not led captivity captive, he had not so triumphed in the fathers' sense. Wherefore, being the scriptures teach us not that Christ triumphed in hell; being the triumph which the fathers mention, was either in relation to the damned souls which Christ took out of those tormenting flames as some imagined, or in reference to the spirits of the just, which he took out of those infernal habitations, as others did conceive; we have already thought fit not to admit either of these two as

1 So St. Jerome on that place of the Ephesians: "Inferiora autem terrae infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut sanctorum animas, quae ibi tenabantur inclusae, secum ad coelos Victor abducueret." And on Matt. xii. 29: "Alligatus est fortis, et reliogatus in Tartarum, et Domini contritus pele; et direptis sedibus tyrannii, captiva ducta est captivitas." So Ambrosus Carnotensis is to be understood: "Passus est Rex illud, et Vita occidit; descendensque ad inferos captivam ab antiquo captivitatem reduxit."—De Unechina Chrientalis. Applying it to the custom of the church, "Omnino convenit, ut eo tempore quo Christus captivos eduxit ab inferis, reconciliati pecatores ad ecclesiam redintegratur."—Ibid. Thus Athanasius, when he speaks of Christ's triumphing over Satan in hell, he mentions the χαίμαλώτως ελευθερήι κοπρίζας. — Homil. de Resur. And thus Macarius supposed Christ victoriously speaking unto hell and death, Κελεύω σοι, ὑδη, και σκότος, και βάνατε ἐκβάλε τάς ἐγκκλησιανέναι ψυχας.— Homil. 11. Author Libelli de Paschale, under the name of St. Ambrose: "Expers peccati Christus, cum ad Tartari ima descenderet, seras inferni jamassque confringisse, vincas peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, e diabi faciundis revocavit ad vitam: atque ita Divinum triumphusaternis characteribus est conscriptus, dum dicit, 'ubi est, mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi est, mors, victoria tua?"—Cap. 4. And the Commentaries under the same name: "Gratia Pei abundavit in descensu Salvatoris, omnibus dans indulgentiam, cum triumpho sublatis eis in coelum."—Ad Tom. v. 15. "Secundum animam descendit ad inferna, et spoliat principes tenebrarum ab animabus electorum."—Eccles. Nunc. ut contra Catharos. Thus still the fathers which speak of spoiling hell, of leading captivity captive, of triumphing over Satan in his own quarters, are to be understood in respect to those souls which they thought were taken out of the custody, possession or dominion of Satan, whether just or unjust.
the effect of Christ's descent, it followeth that we cannot acknowledge this as the proper end of the article.

Nor can we see how the prophet David could intend so much, as if when he spake those words in the person of our Saviour, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, he should have intended this, thou shalt not leave my soul separated from my body, and conveyed into the regions of the damned spirits, amongst all the principalities and powers of hell; I say, thou shalt not leave me there, battering all the infernal strength, redeeming the prisoners, leading captivity captive, and victoriously triumphing over death, and hell, and Satan. In sum, those words of the prophet cannot admit any interpretation involving a glorious, triumphant, and victorious condition, which is not a subject capable of dereliction. For as the hope which he had of his body, that it should not see corruption, supposed that it was to be put in the grave, which could not of itself free the body from corruption; so the hope that his soul should not be left in hell, supposeth it not to be in such a state as was of itself contradictory to dereliction.

17.—And this leads me to that end which I conceive most conformable to the words of the prophet, and least liable to question or objection. We have already shown the substance of the article to consist in this, that the soul of Christ, really separated from his body by death, did truly pass unto the places below where the souls of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did so was, that he might undergo the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the similitude of sinful flesh, and went into the other world in the similitude of a sinner. His body was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men are; his soul was conveyed into such receptacles as the souls of other persons use to be. All, which was necessary for our redemption by way of satisfaction and merit, was already performed on the cross; and all, which was necessary for the actual collation and exhibition of what was merited there, was to be effected upon and after his resurrection: in the interim, therefore, there is nothing left, at least known to us, but to satisfy the law of death. This he undertook to do, and did; and though the ancient fathers by the several additions of other ends have something obscured this, yet it may be sufficiently observed in their writings,1 and is certainly most conformable to that prophetical

1 St. Irenæus so calls his descent, "legem mortuorum servare." — Adv. Hæres. lib. v. cap. 26. And St. Hilary expresses that which I intend very clearly: "Morte nunc interceptus est Unigenitus Dei Filius; ad expiandam quidem hominis naturam, etiam morti se, id est, discussioni se tanguam anime corporisque, subjectat, et ad infernas sedes, id quod homini debuitum videtur esse penetravit." — Tractatus in Psalmum lax
expression, upon which we have hitherto grounded our explication, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption.

18.—Secondly, by the descent of Christ into hell all those which believe in him are secured from descending thither; he went unto those regions of darkness that our souls might never come into those torments which are there. By his descent he freed us from our fears, as by his ascension he secured us of our hopes. He passed to those habitations where Satan hath taken up possession, and exerciseth his dominion, that having no power over him, we might be assured that he should never exercise any over our souls departed, as belonging unto him. Through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and by his actual descent into the dominions of him so destroyed secured all which have an interest in him in the same freedom which he had. Which truth is also still preserved (though among many other strange conceptions) in the writings of the fathers.

19.—Having thus examined the several interpretations of this part of the article, we may now give a brief and safe account


Fulgentius: "Restabat ad plenum nostra redemptions effectum ut illuc usque homo sine peccato a Deo susceptus descenderet, quonque homo, separatus a Deo, peccati merito cecidisset, id est, ad infernum, ubi solebat peccatoris anima torqueri, et ad sepulchrum, ubi consueverat peccatoris caro corrupi."—De Thrasim. lib. iii. cap. 30. Ei oun kai atov uther, Ktisous ouv taw pantos pai Despantos, kai Phou taw ev skoton, Zw jot aw pantom, hagnatoioy geystastai, kai taw eis zdon katabaw tonop edebevar, os an kata pantw hominw diwmw chrwv diarwias, elc. — And. Crete, Serm. de Vita humana. I conclude this with that exposition of St. Hilary upon those words of the Psalmist, "If I go down into hell, thou art there also!": "Humane ista lex necessitatis est, ut consequitis corporibus ad inferos anima descendat: quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recursavit."—Tractatus in Psalmum xxxviii. 1 Heb. ii. 14. 2 As we read of the opinion in Tertullian's time, though not of him: "Sed in hoc, inquit, Christus inferos addid, ne nos adiremus. Externum, quod discrimen Ethnorum et Christianorum, si carcer mortuorum idem est."—De Anima, cap. 55. "Aut ipsius vox est hic, Eruisti animam meam ad infernum inferiorum; aut nostra vox per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum; quia ideo dixit libenter usque ad infernum, ne nos remaneremus in inferno."—S. Augustin, In Psalmum li. 2xv. Placitum egh avon homis anelahe, kai peinwv avon homis etrefe, kai eis tov zdon katabwv homas anfebre.—S. Athen. In Omnia mihi iad., elc.
thereof, and teach every one how they may express their faith without any danger of mistake, saying, I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not, and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die, and being he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who die for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death; but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore as God suffered not his holy one to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ of never coming under the power of Satan or suffering in the flames prepared for the devil and his angels. And thus and for these purposes may every Christian say, I believe that Christ descended into hell.

CHAPTER II.

He rose again.

1.—WHATSOEVER variations have appeared in any of the other articles, this part of Christ's resurrection hath been constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or diminution. The whole matter of it is so necessary and essential to the Christian faith, that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered, that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are presented with three particulars. First, the action itself, or the resurrection of Christ, he rose again. Secondly, the verity, reality, and propriety of that resurrection, he rose from the dead. Thirdly, the circumstance of time, or distance of his resurrection from his death, rose from the dead the third day.

2.—For the illustration of the first particular, and the justification of our belief in Christ's resurrection, it will be necessary first

1 For though Eusebius Gallicanus and Venantius Fortunatus leave out the last word, a mortus, and some copies in Rufinus have it not; yet is it generally expressed in all the rest, which are more ancient than Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the author or the scribe, than to the usage of the church in their age. "Quod die tertio resurrexit a mortuis Dominus Christus, nullus ambigit Christianus." — S. August. Sermon. in Vigiliis Paschae.
to show the promised Messias was to rise from the dead; and secondly, that Jesus whom we believe to be the true and only Messias, did so rise as it was promised and foretold. As the Messias was to be the son of David, so was he particularly typified by him and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which David suffered both by his own people and by the nations round about him, which he expressed of himself and foretold of the Messias in those words, The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, that is, his Christ. From whence it came to pass, that against the holy child Jesus, whom God had anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to do whatsoever the hand and the counsel of God determined before to be done, which was to crucify and slay the Lord of life. But notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution, it was spoken of David, and foretold of the son of David, Yet have I set mine anointed upon my holy hill of Sion. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. As, therefore, the persecution in respect of David amounted only to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a settling in the kingdom; so being the conspiration against the Messias amounted to a real crucifixion and death, therefore the exaltation must include a resurrection. And being he which riseth from the dead, begins as it were to live another life, and the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore when God said of his anointed, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee, he did foretell and promise that he would raise the Messias from death to life.

3.—But because this prediction was something obscured in the figurative expression, therefore the Spirit of God hath cleared it farther by the same prophet, speaking by the mouth of David; but such words as are agreeable not to the person, but the son of David, My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. As for the patriarch David, he is both dead and buried, and his flesh consumed in his sepulchre; but being a prophet, and knowing that God hath sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. They were both to be separated by his death, and each to be disposed in that place which was respectively appointed for them; but neither long to

Psalm ii. 2. 2 Acts iv. 27, 28. 3 Psalm ii. 6, 7. 4 Acts ii. 30, 31. 5 Acts xv. 18. 6 Acts vii. 52.
continue there, the body not to be detained in the grave, the soul not to be left in hell, but both to meet, and being reunited to rise again.

Again, lest any might imagine that the Messias dying once might rise from death, and living after death yet die again, there was a further prophecy to assure us of the excellency of that resurrection and the perpetuity of that life to which the Messias was to be raised. For God giving this promise to his people, I will make an everlasting covenant with you (of which the Messias was to be the mediator, and to ratify it by his death), and adding this expression, even the sure mercies of David, could signify no less than that the Christ, who was given first unto us in a frail and mortal condition, in which he was to die, should afterwards be given in an immutable state, and consequently that he being dead should rise unto eternal life. And thus by virtue of these three predictions we are assured that the Messias was to rise again, as also by those types which did represent and presignify the same. Joseph, who was ordained to save his brethren from death who would have slain him, did represent the Son of God, who was slain by us, and yet dying saved us; and his being in the dungeon typified Christ's death; his being taken out from thence represented his resurrection, as his evection to the power of Egypt next to Pharaoh, signified the session of Christ at the right hand of his Father. Isaac was sacrificed, and yet lived, to show that Christ should truly die, and truly live again. And Abraham offered him up, accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure. In Abraham's intention Isaac died, in his expectation he was to rise from the dead, in his acceptance being spared he was received from the dead, and all this acted to presignify that the only Son of God was really and truly to be sacrificed and die, and after death was really to be raised to life. What was the intention of our father Abraham not performed, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfilled. And thus the resurrection of the Messias was represented by types and foretold by prophecies, and therefore the Christ was to rise from the dead.

1 Isai. lv. 3.
2 “Post Juos annos dierum, tertio incipientes, de carceri educitur Joseph. Et post ter- 

ter Joseph, Christus Dominus, die tertio a mortuis resurrexit. Presentatur Pharaoni: 

mundo resurrecto declaratur.—Data est Jos- 

seph a Pharaone in tota Egypto potestas. 

Et noster Joseph, Christus Dominus, post 

resurrectionem dicit, Data est mihi omnis 

potestas in celo et in terra.”—Prosper De 

Promiss. et Predict. p. i. cap. 29.
3 "ideo Isaac immolatus non est, quia 

resurrectio Filio Dei servata est.”—Pros- 

per De Promiss. et Predict. p. i. cap. 17. 

Oùto γάρ του Ἀγίου Πνεύματος το μέγα 

μυστήριον τυπικός ἀμφοτέρους ἐπιμερισμα-

τος, τῷ τῇ ἡγημαντίῳ νῦν καὶ τῷ συμπαρα-

dείκθητι προβάτῳ, ὡστε δείχνων ἐν μὲν 

τῷ προβάτῳ τῷ τῶν βαθαντον μυστήριον, ἐν 

dὲ τῷ μονογενείᾳ τῆς ζωῆς, τῆς μὴ διακοπτο-

μείνη τῶ βαθαντῶ.—S. Gregorius Ny-

nus, Oratio i. in Resurrectionem.
4. — That Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and only Messias, did rise from the dead according to the scriptures, is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us and confirmed by testimonies human, angelical and divine. Those pious women which thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, held him by the feet and worshipped him, and as the first preachers of his resurrection, with fear and great joy ran to bring his disciples word. The blessed apostles follow them, to whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, who with great power gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of Matthias into the place of Judas, grounded upon this necessity. Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection, the rest of the disciples testified the same, to whom he also appeared, even to five hundred brethren at once. These were the witnesses of his own family, of such as worshipped him, such as believed in him. And because the testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not only his disciples but even his enemies to confirm it. Those soldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and pretended to keep his body from the hands of his apostles; they which felt the earth trembling under them, and saw the countenance of an angel like lightning and his raiment white as snow; they who upon that sight did shake and became as dead men, while he whom they kept became alive; even some of these came into the city and showed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. Thus was the resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest human testimonies, both of his friends and enemies, of his followers and revilers.

5. — But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony than that of man; and therefore an angel from heaven, who was ministerial in it, gave a present and infallible witness to it. He descended down, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. Nay, two angels in white, sitting the one at the head, the other at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain, said unto the women, Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is not here but is risen. These were the witnesses sent from heaven, this the angelical testimony of the resurrection. And if we receive the witness of men, or angels, the witness of God is greater, who did sufficiently attest this resurrection; not only

---

1 Matt. xxviii. 8, 9. 2 Acts i. 3. 3 Acts i. 33. 4 Acts i. 21, 22. 5 1 Cr. xv. 6. 6 Matt. xxviii. 3, 4. 7 Verse 11. 8 Verse 2. 9 John xv. 2. 10 Luke xxxiv 6, 9. 11 1 John v. 9.
because there was no other power but that of God which could effect it, but as our Saviour himself said, the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me; adding these words to his apostles, and ye shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.\(^1\) The Spirit of God sent down upon the apostles did thereby testify that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father; and the apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were enlightened, comforted, confirmed, and strengthened in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus, and showed him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to those who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.\(^2\) And thus as it was foretold of the Messias, did our Jesus rise; which was the first part of our enquiry.

6.—For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christ's resurrection, expressed in that term from the dead, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essential characters and proprieties of a true resurrection, and secondly, to show how those proprieties do belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper notion of the resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantial change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should annihilate a man or angel, and make the same man or angel out of nothing, though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a resurrection, because it is not a change or proper mutation, but a pure and total production. This change is called a substantial change to distinguish it from all accidental alterations: he which awaketh from his sleep ariseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sickness to health; but neither of these is a resurrection. It is called a change of that which was and hath been corrupted, because things immaterial and incorruptible cannot be said to rise again, resurrection implying a reproduction, and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced. Again, of those things which are material and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies and all irrational souls, when they are corrupted, cease to be, and therefore if they should be produced out of the same matter, yet were not this a proper resurrection, because thereby there would not be the same individual which was before, but only a restitution of the species by another individual. But when a rational soul is separated from

\(^1\) John xv. 26, 27.  
\(^2\) Acts x. 40, 41.
its body, which is the corruption of a man, that soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and re-union with the body; and if the two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live which lived before; and consequently this re-union is a perfect and proper resurrection from death to life, because the same individual person, consisting of the same soul and body, which was dead is now alive again.

7.—Having thus delivered the true nature of a proper resurrection, we shall easily demonstrate that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead. For first, by a true though miraculous generation he was made flesh, and lived in his human nature a true and proper life, producing vital actions as we do. Secondly, he suffered a true and proper dissolution at his death, his soul being really separated and his body left without the least vitality, as our dead bodies are. Thirdly, the same soul was re-united to the same body, and so he lived again the same man. For the truth of which two things are necessary to be shown upon his appearing after death, the one concerning the verity, the other concerning the identity of his body. All the apostles doubted of the first, for when Christ stood in the midst of them, they were affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit. But he sufficiently assured them of the verity of his corporeity, saying, Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. He convinced them all of the identity of his body, saying, Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; especially unbelieving Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing. The body then in which he rose must be the same in which he lived before, because it was the same with which he died.

8.—And that we might be assured of the soul as well as of the body, first we gave an argument of the vegetative and nutritive faculty, saying unto them, Have ye here any meat? and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb, and he took it and did eat before them. Secondly, of the sensitive part, conversing

1 Luke xxiv. 37.
3 Verse 39.
4 John xx. 27. 
with them, showing himself, seeing and hearing them. Thirdly, he gave evidence of his rational and intellectual soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the scriptures concerning those things which he spake unto them while he was yet with them. Thus did he show that the body which they saw was truly and vitally informed with an human soul. And that they might be yet further assured that it was the same soul by which that body lived before, he gave a full testimony of his divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the apostles the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into heaven in the sight of his disciples. For being no man ascended into heaven but he which came from heaven, the Son of man which was in heaven, being the divinity was never so united to any human soul but only in that person, it appeared to be the same soul with which he lived and wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being Christ appeared after his death with the same body in which he died, and with the same soul united to it, it followeth that he rose from the dead by a true and proper resurrection.

9.—Moreover, that the verity and propriety of Christ's resurrection may further appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effected. And if we look upon the meritorious cause we shall find it to be Christ himself. For he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly deserve to be raised unto life again. Because he drunk of the brook in the way, because he humbled himself unto death, even to the death of the cross, therefore was it necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his resurrection. Now being Christ humbled himself to the sufferings both of soul and body; being whatsoever suffered; the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; being all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that Christ did truly rise from the dead with the same soul and the same body, with which he lived united and died separated.

10.—The efficient cause of the resurrection of Christ is to be considered either as principal or instrumental. The principal

1 Verse 44.
2 "ideo clausis ad discipulos ostis in- trolbat; et flatu suo dabat Spiritum Sanctum, et dato intelligentiae lumine, sanctarum scrip- turarum occulta pandebat; et rursus idem vulnus lateris, fixuras clavorum, et omnia re- centissimae passionis signa monstrabat: ut agnosceretur in eo proprietas Divine hu- manaeque naturae individuum permanere."—LEONIS SERMO 5. DE RESURREXIONE.
3 John iii. 13.
4 "Ut mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus resurrectione clarificaretur [vel glorificaretur], prius humiliatus est pas- sione: non enim a mortuis resurrectisset, si mortuos non fuisse. Humilitas claritatis est meritum, claritas humiliatis est premium."—S. AUGUST. TRACTATUS 104 in Ioan.
5 Psalm cx. 7
6 Phil. ii. 8.
cause was God himself; for no other power but that which is omnipotent can raise the dead. It is an act beyond the activity of any creature, and unproportionate to the power of any finite agent. This Jesus hath God raised up, saith the apostle, wherein we all are witnesses. And generally in the scriptures as our, so Christ’s, resurrection is attributed unto God; and as we cannot hope after death to rise to life again without the activity of an infinite and irresistible power, no more did Christ himself, who was no otherwise raised than by an eminent act of God’s omnipotency, which is excellently set forth by the apostle, in so high an exaggeration of expressions, as I think is scarce to be paralleled in any author, That we may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of the might of his power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him up from the dead.

Being then omnipotency is a divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone; being no less power than infinite could raise our Saviour from the dead; it followeth that whatsoever instrumental action might concur, God must be acknowledged the principal agent.

And therefore in the scriptures the raising of Christ is attributed to God the Father (according to those words of the apostle, Paul, an apostle not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead), but is not attributed to the Father alone. For to whomsoever that infinite power doth belong, by which Christ was raised, that person must be acknowledged to have raised him. And because we have already proved that the eternal Son of God is of the same essence, and consequently of the same power with the Father, and shall hereafter show the same true also of the Holy Ghost, therefore we must likewise acknowledge that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost raised Christ from the dead. Nor is this only true by virtue of this ratioci-
nation, but it is also delivered expressly of the Son, and that by himself. It is a weak fallacy used by the Socinians, who maintain that God the Father only raised Christ, and then say they teach as much as the apostles did, who attribute it always either generally unto God, or particularly to the Father. For if the apostles taught it only so, yet if he which taught the apostles taught us something more, we must make that also part of our belief. They believe the Father raised Christ, because St. Paul hath taught them so, and we believe the same; they will not believe that Christ did raise himself, but we must also believe that, because he hath said so. These were his words unto the Jews, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up, and this is the explication of the apostle, But he spake of the temple of his body, which he might very properly call a temple, because the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily. And when he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them, and they believed the scripture and the word that Jesus had said. Now if upon the resurrection of Christ the apostles believed those words of Christ, Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up, then did they believe that Christ raised himself; for in those words there is a person mentioned which raised Christ, and no other person mentioned but himself.

A strange opposition they make to the evidence of this argument, saying, that God the Father raised Christ to life, and Christ being raised to life did lift and raise his body out of the grave, as the man sick of the palsy raised himself from the bed, or as we shall raise ourselves out of the graves when the trump should sound; and this was all which Christ could do. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, Destroy this temple, and in three days any one of you may raise it up. For when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and raised it out of the grave, and have shown it alive.

This answer, therefore, is a mere shift; for to raise a body which is dead is, in the language of the scriptures, to give life unto it, or to quicken a mortal body. For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. Socinianus Vindices.


5 "Εγέρειν τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοτοίκοις ἐστιν τὸ δοκεῖν τὸν θεόν, δια τον πατέρα, δι' ἑαυτοῦ, τοῦ χριστοῦ, τοῦ πνεύματος του Σωτῆρος. Εἰ γάρ οὐκ θέλεις, δυνάται ἡ ζωή τοῦ πνεύματος. Εἰ γάρ θέλεις, δυνάται τὸ πνεύμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Εἰ γάρ θέλεις, τὸν θεόν ἐξουσίαν εἰς τὸν θεόν, ἐπεξεργασάτε τὴν ζωήν τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸν θεόν, ἐπεξεργασάτε τὴν ζωήν τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸν θεόν, ἐπεξεργασάτε τὴν ζωήν τοῦ πνεύματος.
then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiseth them, he also quickened his own body when he raised that. The temple is supposed here to be dissolved, and being so to be raised again; therefore the suscitation must answer to the dissolution. But the temple of Christ's body was dissolved when his soul was separated, nor was it any other way dissolved than by that separation. God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, and therefore the parts of his body, in respect of each to other, suffered no dissolution. Thus as the apostle desired to be dissolved and to be with Christ, so the temple of Christ's body was dissolved here, by the separation of his soul; for the temple standing was the body living, and therefore the raising of the dissolved temple was the quickening of the body. If the body of Christ had been laid down in the sepulchre alive, the temple had not been dissolved: therefore to lift it up out of the sepulchre, when it was before quickened, was not to raise a dissolved temple, which our Saviour promised he would do, and the apostles believed he did.

Again, it is most certainly false that our Saviour had power only to lift up his body when it was revived, but had no power of

which words there is a manifest reference to that place in Exodus, where thrice this word is used in that sense by the LXX.; as i. 17: "ἔσωθεν ἡ γῆ νῦν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τῷ λαῷ τοῦ σωτῆρος." Vulg. Tr., Sed conservabant mares; Chald. אֱבַבְתֵ 트יניך So verso 18: "Exsouyovneite τὰ ἄρενα;" and 22: "Καὶ πῶς ἔσωσεν ἡγγενεία αὐτοῦ." And indeed נַח in Piel is often used for "keeping or preserving alive," and is several times translated ἦσων as well as ἀνζωρίας. As Judges viii. 19: מְטִי שָׁמְא In Εὐσουονυκείτε αὐτοῦ, so σαν ἄπεκτενα ὄμοι; Vulg. Tr.: Si servassetis eos, non vos occiderem: "If ye had saved them alive, I would not slay you." 1 Sam. xxvii. 9: נָהַי וְלָא קא ויק εὐσουονυκείται אֵלָד הַגּוֹנְאָה; Vulg. Tr.: Nec relinquebat viventem virum aut mulierem: "And left neither man nor woman alive." And, which is yet nearer to our purpose, 1 Kings xx. 31: רִשְׁרָצִים חַיִית לָא לָא לְבָדָה LXX.: Εἴπομεν εὐσουονυκείτε τὰς πυράς ὑμῶν; Vulg. Tr.: Forsitan salvabit animas nostras; "Peradventure he will save thy life." So that εὐσουονυκείτε, in the language of the LXX., is "to save alive," and ἦσων τὴν ψυχὴν is "to preserve one's life." So that St. Luke, in the text cited by the Socinians, could intend no more than that he which was ready to lose his life for Christ should thereby preserve it; and consequently he speaks nothing of the raising of the dead. John v. 21. 1 Phil. i. 23.
himself to re-unite his soul unto his body, and thereby to revive it. For Christ speaketh expressly of himself, I lay down my life (or soul) that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.¹ The laying down of Christ's life was to die, and the taking of it again was to revive, and by this taking of his life again he showed himself to be the resurrection and the life.² For he which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.³ But if Christ had done no more in the resurrection than lifted up his body when it was revived, he had done that which any other person might have done, and so had not declared himself to be the Son of God with power. It remaineth, therefore, that Christ by that power which he had within himself did take his life again which he had laid down, did re-unite his soul unto his body from which he separated it when he gave up the ghost, and so did quicken and revive himself; and so it is a certain truth, not only that God the Father raised the Son, but also that God the Son raised himself.⁴

11.—From this consideration of the efficient cause of Christ's resurrection we are yet farther assured that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead in the same soul and the same body. For if we look upon the Father, it is beyond all controversy that he raised his own Son; and as while he was here alive God spake from heaven, saying, This is my well-beloved Son,⁵ so after his death it was the same person of whom he spake by the prophet, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.⁶ If we look upon Christ himself, and consider him with power to raise himself, there can be no greater assurance that he did totally and truly arise in soul and body by that divinity which was never separated either from the body or from the soul. And thus we have sufficiently proved our second particular, the verity, reality, and propriety of Christ's resurrection, contained in those words, He rose from the dead.

12.—The third particular concerns the time of Christ's resurrection, which is expressed by the third day; and those words afford a double consideration: one in respect of the distance of time, as it was after three days; the other in respect of the day, which was

¹ John x. 17, 18. ² xi. 25.
the third day from his passion, and the precise day upon which he rose. For the first of these, we shall show that the Messias, who was foretold both to die and to rise again, was not to rise before, and was to rise upon, the third day after his death; and that in correspondence to these predictions our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did not rise from the dead until, and did rise from the dead upon, the third day.

13.—The typical predictions of this truth were two, answering to our two considerations, one in reference to the distance, the other in respect of the day itself. The first is that of the prophet Jonas, who was in the belly of the great fish three days and three nights, and then by the special command of God he was rendered safe upon the dry land, and sent a preacher of repentance to the great city of Nineveh. This was an express type of the Messias then to come, who was to preach repentance and remission of sins to all nations; that as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; and as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the Messias after three days be taken out of the jaws of death and restored unto the land of the living.

The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first-fruits, concerning which this was the law of God by Moses: When ye come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the priest, and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you, on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it, and ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt-offering unto the Lord. For under the Levitical law all the fruits of the earth in the land of Canaan were profane; none might eat of them till they were consecrated, and that they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the priest, who lifted it up as it were in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them, so that all the sheaves in the field were holy by the acceptation of that. For if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy. And this was always done the day after the sabbath, that is, the paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of the harvest followed; by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the priest to God, so the promised Messias, that immaculate Lamb which was to die, that priest which dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the

1 Jonah i. 17; ii. 10. 2 Matt. xii. 40. Lev. xxiii. 10-12. 3 Rom. xi. 16.
dead, or rather to shake and lift up and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. Thus was the resurrection of the Messias after death typically represented both in the distance and the day.

And now in reference to both resemblances we shall clearly show that our Jesus, whom we believe, and have already proved to be the true Messias, was so long and no longer dead, as to rise the third day; and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the sheep was waved, the day after that sabbath mentioned in the law.

14.—As for the distance between the resurrection and the death of Christ, it is to be considered first generally in itself, as it is some space of time; secondly, as it is that certain and determinate space of three days. Christ did not, would not, suddenly arise, lest any should doubt that he ever died. It was as necessary for us that he should die, as that he should live, and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did some time continue it. He might have descended from the cross before he died, but he would not, because he had undertaken to die for us. ¹ He might have revived himself upon the cross, after he had given up the ghost, and before Joseph came to take him down, but he would not, lest as Pilate questioned whether he were already dead, so he might doubt whether he ever died. ² The reward of his resurrection was immediately due upon his passion, but he deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being questioned, they both might lose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intercede between them.

Again, because Christ's exaltation was due unto his humiliation, and the first step of that was his resurrection; because the apostles after his death were to preach repentance and remission of sins through his blood, who were no way qualified to preach any such doctrine till he rose again; because the Spirit could not be sent till he ascended, and he could not ascend into heaven till he rose from the grave, therefore the space between his resurrection and passion could not be long; nor can there be any reason assigned

¹ "De cruce descendere poterat, sed differebat ut de sepulchro resurgeret."—S. August. Tract. 12 in Joan.
² "Hóvnato mén kai par' autà tov thavátov to sóma diegeirás kai pálen deixai zón: allá kai toútô kalwv prōtivn o Sweír òn pevòphanv. Eite 'gav 'en tis phòs allw autò tèbthíkan, ò mh dé tèleon autò 'en tov thavátov ephanénav, eî par' autà tìn ánastasian hy' epideiças. Táxha de kai ev 'inw toî dianstí-

µatov ómtoj tô te thavátov kai tôs ánastásiaswes, adhlon égineto to perí tôs áθvbarias kállos. 'Odev ian déleith' vekrón to sóma, kai mián upémeren músthn o Lógos, kai trimaiton toû tô pásow eide Xin áθvbarov.—S. Athanasian De Incarnat. Verbi. Kai treis de epiméras dia toútou sunechóressan, tennt pwsen th òtì apthiaveti ouv gar tì stáirmi autw mòn vebíanvntai, ka tì pántwn òvsi, allá kai tô kóron toû 'yma róvnu.—S. Chrysost. Homil. 43 in Matt.
why it should any longer be deferred, when the verity of his death was once sufficiently proved. Lest therefore his disciples should be long held in suspense, or any person after many days should doubt whether he rose with the same body with which he died, or no; that he might show himself alive while the soldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouths of the people, he would not stay many days before he rose. Some distance then of time there was, but not great, between his crucifixion and his resurrection.

15.—The particular length of this space is determined in the third day; but that expression being capable of some diversity of interpretation, it is not so easily concluded how long our Saviour was dead or buried before he revived or rose again. It is written expressly in St. Matthew, that as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. From whence it seemeth to follow, that Christ's body was for the space of three whole days and three whole nights in the grave, and after that space of time rose from thence. And hence some have conceived, that being our Saviour rose on the morning of the first day of the week, therefore it must necessarily follow that he died and was buried on the fifth day of the week before, that is, on Thursday, otherwise it cannot be true that he was in the grave three nights.

But this place, as express as it seems to be, must be considered with the rest in which the same truth is delivered; as when our Saviour said, After three days I will rise again: and again, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up, or, within three days I will build another made without hands. But that which is most used, both in our Saviour's prediction before his death, and in the apostles' language after the resurrection, is, that he rose from the dead the third day. Now, according to the language of the scriptures, if Christ were slain and rose the third day, the day in which he died is one, and the day on which he arose is one, and consequently.

1 Luke xviii. 5; xvii. 34; Acts x. 40; 1 Cor. xv.4.
sequently there could be but one day and two nights between the day of his death and of his resurrection. As in the case of circumcision, the male child eight days old was to be circumcised, in which the day on which the child was born was one and the day on which he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six complete days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision. 

The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the day of the wave-offering: but in the number of the fifty days was both the day of the wave-offering and of Pentecost included, as now among the Christians still it is. Whitsunday is now the day of Pentecost, and Easter-day the day of the resurrection, answering to that of the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to make the number of fifty days. Christ then who rose upon the first day of the week (as is confessed by all) died upon the sixth day of the week before; or if he had died upon the fifth, he had risen not upon the third, but the fourth day, as Lazarus did. Being then it is most certain that our Saviour rose on the third day, being according to the constant language of the Greeks

1 Lazarus is said to be τεταρταίος, “four days dead,” that is, counting the day on which he died, and the day on which his sister spake so to our Saviour at her sepulchre: and being [seeing] he was raised then, he rose τῇ τετάρτῃ ημέρᾳ, “the fourth day.” Our Saviour rose τῇ τρίτῃ ημέρᾳ, and therefore he was τριτάιος when he arose; and so the fathers call him, as you may observe in the words last cited out of Athanasius.

2 As we read in Plutarch: Σολόκδος ὁ Θεοσπέσιος—ἐξεδίωκε, καὶ τριταίος ὄψη περὶ τᾶς πασιάς αὐτάς αὐτήγερκε.—De his qui secd run. And of that spirit in a boy possessed, who hated all women: Ἡπειρε ἔγερσα περὶ τὴν εὐθυνὴ υβρίσκεται, τριταίοι κείμενοι γυναικεῖα ἐτήρῳ.—PHILOSTRAT. DE VIT. APOLL. 

Thus, when we consider, with the Greek grammarians, what this τριταίος is, the Greek grammarians will teach us: Πρὸς μὲν τὸ πόσο ἀπαντᾷ τῷ τρίῳ τυχόν ἔτηςαρα, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πόσον τὸ τρίτον ἔτησαρόν ἐπὶ τάξεως, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ποστάιον τὸ τριταίον ἔτησαρόν· οἷον πρὸς τό, Ποσταίος ἀπ’ οὗραν πόσον πάλαι; ἀπαντήσεις τῷ Τριταίοι τυχόν ἔτησαρόν, ἔγγον τρίτην ἡμέραν ἕχω αφ’ οὗ παρεῖ ἡ τετάρτῃ.—Schol. Long. Heséf., v. 32. 

Τριταίος then, in respect of his coming to or from any place, is that person which is now the third day ἡμέρα from or from that place; which cannot be better interpreted, as to the Greek language, than in the expression of a “tertian” fever, called so because the second accession is upon the third day from the first, and the third from the second, &c. In which case there is but one day between, in which the patient is wholly free from his disease; from whence παρὰ μίαν and τριταίος is the same in the language of the physicians. Thus it is excellently expressed by Alexander Aphrodisiæus in that problematical question, Διὰ τί ὁ μὲν τριταίος, ἐκ βεβηλόν χειρον γεγυμένος, καὶ ἐκ πρῶτως μοστάζουσα καὶ καταλαμπουσών καλά, παρὰ μίαν κυνηγαὶ ὃ ἐν ἁμαρτηματικόν, ἐχον ποθόνον τὸ φλέγμα τῇ βαρυτητί καὶ ψυχρότητι, καθ’ ἡμέραν ὁ δὲ τριταίος, διὰ δύο ἡμέρων μέσων.—Probl. 10, lib. ii. 

The quotation has the same succession as the tertian tertian fever, after one day, of perfect intermission; the quartan διὰ δύο ἡμέρων μέσων. In the same manner he mentions the πεπταίος, the ἔβδομαϊος, and ἐνναϊος. In all which this is constantly observable, that the days of perfect intermission are fewer by two, than the number of the name of the fever: for if the fever be τριταίος, the day of intermission is but one; if τεταρταίος, two; if πεπταίος, three; if ἔβδομαϊος, five; if ἐνναϊος, seven. Thus if our Saviour were one whole day in the grave, and died the day before, and rose the day after, he did rise τριταίος. If he were two whole days in the grave, he rose τεταρταίος. 

So Aristotle: Διὰ τί ὁ νυκτερινός βορειός τριταίος λάγη; πότερον ὃτι ἄπο αἰματος καὶ σάρκων ἀρχής; Ἡ τρίτη δὲ κρίσις.—Probl. 15, sect. xxvi. 

Τῇ τρίτῃ, therefore, and τριταίος, is the same. For from τρίτη comes τριταίος; and from τετάρτῃ, τεταρταίος. 

In which ἡμέρα is always understood. 

Τεταρταίος, τεταρταίος. Suid. 

Τριταίος, then, is τρίτηςος περὶ τοῦ τριταίος, διὰ τρίτης, and τεταρταίος, διὰ τετάρτης. 

Thus being [seeing] Christ did certainly rise τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, he did rise according to the Greeks τεταρταίος; and according to the same, then, he must also rise παρὰ μίαν, that is, one day only interceding between the day of his death, and the day of his resurrection.
and Hebrews; he cannot be said to rise to life on the third day, who died upon any other day between which and the day of his resurrection there intervened any more than one day, therefore those other forms of speech which are far less frequent must be so interpreted as to be reduced to this expression of the third day so often reiterated.

When, therefore, we read that after three days he would raise the temple of his body, we must not imagine that he would continue the space of three whole days dead, and then revive himself; but upon the third day he would rise again: as Joseph and his mother, after three days found him in the temple, that is, the third day after he tarried behind in Jerusalem. And when we read that he was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, we must not look upon those nights as distinct from the days, but as Moses spake, the evening and the morning, that is, the night and the day, were the first day; and as the saint spake unto Daniel, Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings, intending

1 Luke ii. 46.
2 "A night and a day" in the Hebrew language, not used to compositions, is the same with the Greek νυκτίσμενον or ημερονυκτίσκον: τω, της νυκτος, αυτως προστιθείτες ουτω δε πως, και των εικονων πνεύματος και στηκόσων ήμερων ειναι λαμπερα. — De Critiusiv, lib. ii. cap. 2.
3 This is observed by St. Basil to be also the custom of the scriptures, upon those words in Genesis, Εγενετο ουν σατερα, και έγενετο πρωι. Το ημερονυκτίσκον λέγει: και ουκ είτε προσγράμμεν, ήμερα και νυκτα, αλλα τω έπεκρατασμη την πασαν προστροφριαν απένειμε. Ταυτην αν και εν πάση τη γραφη των συνήθεισι ευροσ, εν τη του χρόνου μετρήσει ήμερας ημιθμημένας, ούδε δε και νυκτάς μετα των ήμερων. — In Pseudein. Homil. 2. Now being [seeing] generally in all computations of time, as St. Basil observeth, εν τη του χρόνου μετρήσει, αν ημερας, was taken for the whole space of day and night; and as the evening and the morning signified the same, that is, a day; and two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings no more than so many days; and so three days and three nights in the computation of time signify no more than "three days;" ("For God called the light day, and the darkness he called night. And the evening and the morning were the first day." And the evening and the morning were the second day," &c.) being [seeing] three days in the language of the scripture are said to be fulfilled when the third day is come, though it be not wholly passed over; it followeth that "to be three days dead," or "to be three days and three nights dead," in the Hebrew language, cannot necessarily infer any more than that the person spoken of did continue dead till the third day. Gen. i. 5. 4 Dan. viii. 14.
On the Creed.

thereby so many days: nor must we imagine that: those three days were accomplished after our Saviour's death, and before he rose, but that upon the first of those three days he died, and upon the last of those three days he rose. As we find that eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child;¹ and yet Christ was born upon the first and circumcised upon the last of those eight days:² nor were there any more than six whole days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision; the one upon the five-and-twentieth of December; the other upon the first of January. And as the Jews were wont to speak, the priests in their courses by the appointment of David were to minister before the Lord eight days, whereas every week a new course succeeded, and there were but seven days service for each course (the sabbath on which they began and the sabbath on which they went off being both reckoned in the eight days); so the day on which the Son of God was crucified, dead, and buried, and the day on which he revived and rose again were included in the number of three days. And thus did our Saviour rise from the dead upon the third day properly, and was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth synecdochically.³

This is sufficient for the clearing the precise distance of Christ's resurrection from his crucifixion, expressed in the determine

1 Luke ii. 21.
2 As we read of the circumcision of our Saviour, "Εκλήσθησαν ἡμέρας οκτώ" (Luke ii. 21;) so of Zachary, "Ως εκλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ." (Luke i. 22;) and though the number οκτώ were not expressed, yet it is to be understood, according to the language of the scripture in other cases, and of Josephus particularly in this: Διέταξε δὲ μιὰν πατριάν διακονήσεων τῷ Θεῷ επὶ ἡμέρας οκτώ, ἀπὸ αὐτρίδου επὶ σαββάτου.—Jud. Antig. lib. vii. cap. 11.
3 So St. Jerome ou Jonas ii. 1, Et erat Jonas in ventre pisces tribus diebus et tribus noctibus: 'Hujus loci mysterium in evangelio Dominus exposit: et superfluum est, vel ilipsam, vel aliud elocere quam exposuisse ipsa quae passus est. Ioc solum quarintum, quodmodo tres dies et tres noctes fuerit in corde terrae. Quidam parapsychique, quando, soli fugiente ab hora sexta usque ad horam nonam, non successit diei, in duos dies et noctes dividunt, et apponentes sabbatum, tres dies et tres noctes estimant supplantandus; nos vero synecdochices totum intelligimus a parte; ut ex eo quod in parapsychique mortuis est, man diam supputantem et noctem et sabbati alteram: tertiam vero noctem qua diem et Dominicae nuncupantur, rectam esse ex ordimento diei alterius; nam et in Genesii non praecedentis diei (aldeo non est, sed sequentia, id est, principium futuri, non firi praeteriti." To the same purpose

number of three days: the next consideration is, what day of the week that third day was on which Christ did actually rise, and what belongeth to that day in relation to his resurrection. Two characters there are which will evidently prove the particularity of this third day: the first is the description of that day in respect of which this is called the third, after the manner already delivered and confirmed; the second is the evangelists' expression of the time on which Christ rose.

16.—The character of the day in which our Saviour died is undeniable, for it is often expressly called the preparation; 1 as we read, they therefore laid Jesus in the garden, because of the Jews' preparation day, for the sepulchre was nigh at hand. 2 And the next day that followed the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees asked a guard. 3

1 Parasekev. "Parasceve interpretatur preparatio," saith St. Augustin, De conc. Evang. lib. iii. cap. 13; and in the Greek language it signifieth generally any preparation of what nature soever; but in this case it signifieth rather the time in which preparation was made, as Luke xxviii. 54: Ka| ημέρα ην παρασκευή; and that preparation among the Jews for the sabbath; as Mark xv. 42: Ἐπεις ην παρασκευή, ἦ ἔστι προσσαββατον and in the edict of Augustus Caesar: "Εγγύσα τε μη υμολογεῖν εν σάββατοι, η τη προ ταύτην παρασκευήν απὸ ωρας εναντίας. —Josephus, Jud. Antiq. lib. xvi. cap. 10; which is well expressed by Synopsis: Ημέρα μεν οὖν ην ην της ενεργειας ήμερος δε νύκτα τη μετ' αυτην ημέρα λογίζονται, καθ' ην ουδενί δεμες εστιν ενεργον εχειν την χειρα, αλλα τιμων τε διαφανεντο αυτην, αγοσειν ἄραξαν.—Epist. 4. This παρασκευή of the Hebrews was answerable to the cena pura of the Gentiles, as the old Glossary: Cena pura, προσσαββατον et in Gloss. Latino-Arabo, "Parasceve, cena pura, id est, preparatio quae sit pro sabbato." From whence some of the fathers did so interpret the eyes of the Jewish sabbaths; as Tertullian: "Dies observatis, et menses, et tempora, et annos, et sabbata, ut opinor, et cenas puras, et festa, et dies magnos." —Adv. Marcion. lib. v. cap. 4. "Acceleratam vult intellecti sepulchrum, ne advesperaceret: quando jam propter parascevem, quam cenan puram Judaei Latine usitatis apud nos vocant, facere tali quid non licebat." —S. August. Tract. 120 in Joann. And the ancient translators of the Greek fathers did use the Latin cena pura for the Greek παρασκευή. As the interpreter of St. Chrysostom: "Qua enim die conceptus est Dominus, cadem die et passus est; cadem ipsa die cena pura fuit, in qua et luna quarta-decima occurrit." —Serm. in Natalem Joann. Bapte. So likewise the old interpreter of Irenæus: "Parasceve, qua licet cena pura, id est, sexta feria, quam et Dominus ostendit passus in ea." —Adv. Hares. lib. v. cap. 19. "Mosen in sexta die dixisse, que est in cena pura," &c. —Ibid. ibid. I. cap. 10. As therefore the cena pura among the Gentiles was that time in which they prepared and sanctified themselves for their sacred solemnities, so the Jews did make use of that word to signify their sanctification, and of the Greek παρασκευή to testify the preparation of all things used on their holy days, upon the eve thereof, or day before. "Parasceve Latine preparatio est; sed isto verbo Graco liberius usitatur Judæi in hujusmodi observantibus, eliam qui magis Latine quam Graece loquantur," saith St. Augustin, Tract. 117 in Joann. So that the same father testifieth that the Jews speaking Latin in his time did sometimes use cena pura, for their "eve of preparation." Otherwise in their own language they called it רעב או הערל, by which generally they understood "the sixth day of the week, the day before the sabbath." For so they reckoned the days of the week in Beveskhil Rabba: המלך "the first of the week;" רעב, "the second;" המלך, "the third;" המלך, "the fourth;" המלך, "the fifth;" המלך, "the eve;" המלך, "the sabbath." Thus in Hebrew והבר, in Greek παρασκευή, in Latin cena pura, were used by the Jews for the same day, the Friday or sixth of the week; but not for that alone, but for the eve of any great festival which was answered to a sabbath; so that they had their הערל, as, παρασκευή του σαββάτου, and παρασκευή του πάσχα. And when a great festival fell upon the sabbath, then as the festivities were both one day, so the eve to both was the same Friday. And such was the day of preparation on which our Saviour was crucified. 1 John xix. 42. 3 Matt. xxvii. 62.

1 John xix. 42. 3 Matt. xxvii. 62.
diately before the sabbath, or some other great feast of the Jews called by them the eve of the sabbath, or the feast; and therefore called the preparation, because on that day they did prepare whatsoever was necessary for the celebration of the following festival: according to that command in the case of manna, It shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.¹ This preparation being used both before the sabbath and other festivals, at this time it had both relations: for First, it was the preparation to a sabbath, as appeareth by those words of St. Mark, Now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath; ² and those of St. Luke, That day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on.³ Secondly, it was also the eve of a festival, even of the great day of the paschal solemnity, as appeareth by St. John, who saith, when Pilate sat down in the judgment-seat, it was the preparation of the passover.⁴ And that the great paschal festivity did then fall upon the sabbath, so that the same day was then the preparation or eve of both, appeareth yet farther by the same evangelist, saying, The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, for that sabbath day was an high day;⁵ that is, not only an ordinary or weekly sabbath, but also a great festival, even a paschal sabbath. Now being the sabbath of the Jews was constant and fixed to the seventh day of the week, it followeth that the preparation or eve thereof must necessarily be the sixth day of the week, which from the day, and the infinite benefit accruing to us by the passion upon that day, we call Good Friday. And from that day being the sixth of one, the third must consequently be the eighth or the first of the next week.⁶

The Third Day.

17.—The next character of this third day is the expression of the time of the resurrection in the evangelists. When the sabbath was past, saith St. Mark, which was the day after the preparation on which he was buried, very early in the morning the first day of the week. 1 In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, saith St. Matthew. 2 Upon the first day of the week early in the morning, saith St. Luke. 3 The first day of the week early when it was yet dark, saith St. John. 4 By all which indications it appeareth that the body of Christ being laid in the sepulchre on the day of the preparation, which was the eve of the sabbath, and continuing there the whole sabbath following, which was the conclusion of that week, and farther resting there still and remaining dead the night which followed that sabbath, but belonged to the first day of the next week, about the end of that night early in the morning, was revived by the accession and union of his soul, and rose again out of the sepulchre.

18.—Whereby it came to pass that the obligation of the day, which was then the sabbath, died and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnal transmutation revived again at his resurrection. Well might that day which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the Egyptian servitude resign all the sanctity or solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appeared upon which a far greater redemption was confirmed. One day of seven was set apart by God in imitation of his rest upon the creation of the world, and that seventh day which was sanctified to the Jews was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from Egypt. At the second delivery of the law we find this particular cause assigned, Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day. 5 Now this could not be any special reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day: first, because in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation than any other number; secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendered in the body of the commandment itself. There was, therefore, a double reason rendered by God why the Jews should keep that sabbath which they did, one special, as to a seventh day, to show they worshipped that God who was the creator of the world; the other individual, as to that seventh day, to signify their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, from which that seventh day was dated.

Being then upon the resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought than

1 xvi. 1, 2 2 xxviii. 1 3 xxiv. 1 4 xx. 1 5 Deut. v. 15.
that of Egypt, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it than to that, the individual determination of the day did pass upon a stronger reason to another day, always to be repeated by a seventh return upon the reference to the creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of Egypt, by the command of God, This month, the month of Abib, shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year to you;¹ so at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the hebdomadal or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified. The first day, because on that Christ rose from the dead, and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day; For by him all things were created that are in heaven and that are in the earth, all things were created by him and for him.²

¹9.—This day did the apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God than any such inclination or intention of their own: for the same day, saith the evangelist, that is, the day on which Christ rose from the dead, at evening, being the first day of the week, the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews.³ The second observation was performed voluntarily, for after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them;⁴ the first day of the week, when Christ rose by the providence of God, the disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week they were all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. Again, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, which was also the first day of the week, they were all with one accord in one place,⁵ and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost they spake with tongues, preached the gospel, and the same day were added unto them above three thousand souls.⁶ The same practice of convening we find continued in the following years. For upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them;⁷ and the same apostle gave express command concerning the collection for the saints both to the churches of Galatia and of Corinth, Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him.⁸

From this resurrection of our Saviour, and the constant practice of the apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the Lord's day, and is so called by St. John, who says of himself

¹ Exod. xii. 2 ² Col. i. 16. ³ John xx. 19. ⁴ Verse 26. ⁵ Acts ii. 1. ⁶ Verse 41. ⁷ xx. 7. ⁸ Cor. xvi. 1, 2.
And thus the observation of that day, which the Jesus did sanctify, ceased, and was buried with our Saviour, and in the stead of it the religious observation of that day on which the Son of God rose from the dead, by the constant practice of the blessed apostles, was transmitted to the church of God and so continued in all ages.

This day thus consecrated by the resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetual badge and cognizance of his church. As God

spake by Moses to the Israelites, Verily my sabbath ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that do sanctify you; 1 thereby leaving a mark of distinction upon the Jews who were by this means known to worship that God whose name was Jehovah, who made the world, and delivered them from the hands of Pharaoh: so we must conceive that he hath given us this day as a sign between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God Jehovah, who did not only create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As, therefore, the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought than that of Egypt: as the Mahometans religiously observe the sixth day of the week in memory of Mahomet's flight from Mecca, whom they esteem a greater prophet than our Saviour: as these are known and distinguished in the world by these several celebrations of distinct days in the worship of God; so all which profess the Christian religion are known publicly to belong to the church of Christ by observing the first day of the week, upon which Christ did rise from the dead, and by this mark of distinction are openly separated from all other professions. 2

20.—That Christ did thus rise from the dead is a most necessary article of the Christian faith, which all are obliged to believe and profess, to the meditation whereof the apostle hath given a particular injunction, Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead. 3 First, because without it our faith is vain, and by virtue of it strong. By this we are assured that he which died was the Lord of life, and though he were crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. 4 By this resurrection from the dead he was declared to be the Son of God, 5 and upon the morning of the third day did those words of the Father manifest a most important truth, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. 6 In his death he assured us of his humanity, by his resurrection he demonstrated his divinity.

21.—Secondly, by the resurrection we are assured of the justification of our persons, and if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, it will be imputed to us for righteousness;

1 Exod. xxxi. 13.
2 “Quid hac die felicis, in qua Dominus Judaei mortuus est, nobis resurrexit? in qua synagogae cultus occubuit, et est ortus ecclesiae; in qua nos homines fecit securum surgere et vivere et sedere in celestibus, et impetum est illud quod ipse dixit in evangelio, Cum autem exaltatus fuerit a terra, sanctum traham ad me? Hae est dies quam fecit Dominus, exultemus et laetemur in ea. Omnes dies quidem fecit Dominus, sed eterni dies possunt esse Iudaeorum, possunt esse haereticorum, possunt esse Gentilium; dies Dominicae; dies resurrectionis, dies Christianorum, dies nostrae est.” — Explan. Ps. Psalm xxxii. sub nomine Hieron.
3 2 Tim. ii. 8. 4 2 Cor. xiii. 4.
5 Rom. i. 4. 6 Psalm ii. 7; Acts xiii. 33.
for he was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. ¹ By his death we know that he suffered for sin, by his resurrection we are assured that the sins for which he suffered were not his own: ² had no man been a sinner he had not died; had he been a sinner he had not risen again; but dying for those sins which we committed, he rose from the dead to show that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtain remission of our sins and justification of our persons, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, for sin condemned sin in the flesh, ³ and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave, did actually absolve and apparently acquit him from the whole obligation, to which he had bound himself, and in discharging him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. Who then shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again. ⁴

22.—Thirdly, it was necessary to pronounce the resurrection of Christ as an article of our faith, that thereby we might ground, confirm, strengthen, and declare our hope. For the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled. ⁵ By the resurrection of Christ his Father hath been said to have begotten him; and therefore by the same he hath begotten us, who are called brethren and coheirs with Christ. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. ⁶ He laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the head; if the head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the first-born from the dead, ⁷ and we the sons of the resurrection. ⁸ The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us the members of Christ, and by the same Spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our head. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us. ⁹ Thus the resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection by a double causality, as an efficient, and as an exemplary cause. As an effi-

¹ Rom. iv. 22, 24, 25.
² St. Chrysostom excellently upon that place: "Ora nos tēn aitian εἰπών τον θανάτου, τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ ἀπόδεικτης τῆς ἀναστάσεως ποιεῖται. Διὰ τι γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη, φησὶν; Οὐ δὲ οίκειαν ἀμαρτιάν καὶ δηλοῦν ἐκ τῆς ἀναστάσεως; εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἀμαρτωλὸς, πῶς ἀνέστη; Εἰ δὲ ἀνέστη, εὐθύλον ὦτι ἀμα-
³ Rom. viii. 3.
⁴ Rom. v. 10.
⁵ Luke xx. 34.
⁶ 1 Peter i. 3, 4.
⁷ Col. i. 18.
⁸ Rom. viii. 11.
cient cause, in regard our Saviour by and upon his resurrection hath obtained power and right to raise all the dead; For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. As an exemplary cause, in regard that all the saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the resurrection of Christ; For we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. He shall change our vile bodies that they may be like unto his glorious body: That as we have borne the image of the earthy, we may also bear the image of the heavenly. This is the great hope of a Christian, that Christ rising from the dead hath obtained the power, and is become the pattern, of his resurrection. The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gate, their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.

23.—Fourthly, it is necessary to profess our faith in Christ risen from the dead, that his resurrection may effectually work its proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our bodies, so it is also to our souls. When we were dead in sins, God quickened us together with Christ. And, as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life. To continue among the graves of sin while Christ is risen, is to incur that apprehension of the angel, why seek ye the living among the dead? To walk in any habitual sin, is either to deny that sin is death, or Christ is risen from the dead. Let then the dead bury the dead, but let not any Christian bury him who rose from death that he might live. Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light. There must be a spiritual resurrection of the soul before there can be a comfortable resurrection of the body. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in this first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power.

24.—Having thus explained the manner of Christ's resurrection, and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the dead, we may easily give such a brief account as any Christian may understand what it is he should intend when he makes profession of this part of the CREED; for he is conceived to acknowledge thus much, I freely and fully assent unto this as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute necessity, that the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and died for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself by re-uniting the same soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man; and this he did the

1 1 Cor. xv. 22. 2 Rom. vi. 5. 3 Phil. iii. 21. 4 Cor. xv. 49. 5 Micah vii. 13. 6 Eph. ii. 5. 7 Rom. vi. 4. 8 Luke xxiv. 5. 9 Eph. v. 14. 10 Rev. xx. 6.
third day from his death: so that dying on Friday, the sixth day of the week, the day of the preparation of the sabbath, and resting in the grave the sabbath-day, on the morning of the first day of the week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious observation until his coming again. And thus I believe the third day he rose again from the dead.

ARTICLE VI.

He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

CHAPTER I.

He ascended into Heaven.

1. THIS article hath received no variation, but only in the addition of the name of God, and the attribute Almighty; the ancients using it briefly thus, He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father.1 It containeth two distinct parts: one transient, the other permanent: one as the way, the other as the end. The first is Christ's ascension, the second is his session.

2. In the ascension of Christ these words of the Creed propound to us three considerations, and no more: the first of the person, He; the second of the action, ascended; the third of the termination, into heaven. Now the person being perfectly the same which we have considered in the precedent articles, he will afford no different speculation but only in conjunction with this particular action. Wherefore I conceive these three things necessary and sufficient for the illustration of Christ's ascension: first, to show that the promised Messias was to ascend into heaven; secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, did really and truly ascend thither; thirdly, to declare what that heaven is into which he did ascend.

1 "Ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dextram Patris."—RUFFIN. In Symb.; S. AUGUSTINUS, in Enchirid.; MAXIMUS TAURINENSIS; CHRYSOLOGUS; AUTHOR Expos. Symb., ad Catechumenos; VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS; the Latin and Greek MSS. set forth by the archbishop of Armagh's. St. Augustin, De Fide et Symb., hath it. "Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris;" to which was afterwards added, Omnipotentis. "Sedet ad dextram Patris Omnipotentis." EUSEBIUS GALLICAN. "Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris Omnipotentis."—ETHER. Uxam.; et AUCTOR Sermonum De Tempore; the Greek and Latin MSS. in Bene't-College library, Cambridge.
3.—That the promised Messias should ascend into heaven, hath been represented typically and declared prophetically. The high-priest under the law was an express type of the Messias and his priestly office; the atonement which he made was the representation of the propitiation in Christ for the sins of the world: for the making this atonement the high-priest was appointed once every year to enter into the holy of holies, and no oftener. For the Lord said unto Moses, speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the vail before the mercy-seat, which is upon the high, that he die not. None entered into that holy place but the high-priest alone, and he himself could enter thither but once in the year; and thereby showed that the high-priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, was to enter into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. The Jews did all believe that the tabernacle did signify this world, and the holy of holies the highest heavens; wherefore as the high-priest did slay the sacrifice, and with the blood thereof did pass through the rest of the tabernacle, and with that blood enter into the holy of holies, so was the Messias here to offer up himself, and being slain, to pass through all the courts of this world below, and with his blood to enter into the highest heavens, the most glorious seat of the majesty of God. Thus Christ’s ascension was represented typically.

4.—The same ascension was also declared prophetically, as we read in the prophet David, Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men: which phrase on high in the language of David signifying heaven, could be applied

---

1 Lev. xvi. 2. 2 Heb. ix. 11, 12. 3 Εί τις τής σκηνής κατανοήσει τήν τής, καὶ τὸν Ἱερόν ἵδι τὴν στολήν, τὰ τε σκεῦα τῶν τε περί τὴν ἕραργαν χρώματα· τῶν τε νυκτὸς εὐφέρησε θεόν ἄνδρα, καὶ ματαίως ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀλλων τὸς θανάσιμος ἄκουσας· ἐκαστὰ γὰρ τῶν εἰς ἀπομισασμένα καὶ διαπέπυκτων τῶν ἑλών, εἰτε ἄρθρως ἔθειον καὶ μετὰ συνέσεως σκοπεῖν, εὐφέρησι γεγονότα. Τῇ τοῦ γὰρ σκηνῆς τρίακοντα πηχῶν οὖναν, νεῖμαι εἰς τρία, καὶ δύο μέχρις πάντων ἀνείς τοῖς ἑκείνης, ὥστε βασιλεύον τινα καὶ κοινὸν τόπον, τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς ἁλασσαν ἀποσμαίνειν· καὶ γὰρ ταῖς πάσιν ἔστιν ἐπίβασα: τῆς δὲ τρίτης μορφὰς μόνω περιεγράφετο τῷ Θεῷ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνεπίστοτον εἶναι ἀνθρώπως.—JOSEPHUS. Jud. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. 8. Where it is to be observed, that the place which St. Paul calls "the first tabernacle," Josephus terms βεβηλυκόν των καὶ κοινὸν τόπον, "a common and profane place," as representing this world in which we live, and our life and conversation here: as the apostle seems to speak, Heb. ix. 1: Εἰ δέ παν ὁ τι καὶ ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ δεκαώιματα λατεσά, τὸ τῷ ἠγέαρ πορφυρόνων.

For ἄγεν κοσμικῶν, sanctum seculare, or as the Syriac, ιομινου δομων sancta mundana, may well be that part of the tabernacle which represented this world, and therefore termed "common and profane" in respect of that more holy part which represented heaven. 4 Psalm lxviii. 18. 5 This place must necessarily be understood of the Messias, by reason of that "high" place to which no other conqueror ascended. For that מִלְחָמָה in the language of the prophet is attributed to God; as Psalm vii. 8: "Return on high," that is, in the language of the Chaldee paraphrase דָיָם יָבִין וּבִין "Return to the house of thy majesty;" and Psalm xciii. 4: וַיִּנַּח הַמִּלְחָמָה יָבִין "The Lord on high is mighty;" Chal. בְּשֵׁם יָבִין וּבִין "in the upper heavens;" Psalm lxxxi. 19 "Thy righteousness, O Lord, is" usque ad excelsum; the Chaldee again לְרָצִיו קָרִים כָּלִים "In the same manner.

**[Art. VI.]**

On the Creed.
properly to no other conqueror but the Messiah; not to Moses, not to David, not to Joshua, not to any but the Christ, who was to conquer sin, and death, and hell, and triumphing over them to ascend unto the highest heaven, and thence to send the precious and glorious gifts of the Spirit unto the sons of men. The prophecy of Micah did foretell as much, even in the opinion and confession of the Jews themselves, by those words, The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gate and are gone out by it; and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord at the head of them. And thus Christ's ascension was declared prophetically as well as typically; which was our first consideration.

5.—Secondly, whatsoever was thus represented and foretold of the promised Messiah, was truly and really performed by our Jesus. That only-begotten and eternal Son of God, who by his divinity was present in the heavens while he was on earth, did by a local translation of his human nature really and truly ascend from this earth below on which he lived, into the heavens above, or rather above all the heavens, in the same body and the soul with which he lived and died and rose again.

6.—The ascent of Christ into heaven was not metaphorical or figurative, as if there were no more to be understood by it but only that he obtained a more heavenly and glorious state or condition after his resurrection. For whatsoever alteration was made in the body of Christ when he rose, whatsoever glorious qualities it was invested with thereby, that was not his ascension, as appeareth by those words which he spake to Mary, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father. Although he had said before to Nicodemus, No man ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven; which words imply that he had then ascended: yet even those concern not this

in this place, Thou hast ascended on high, the Chaldee Paraphrase translateth, Thou hast ascended the firmament; and he addeth immediately, O thou prophet Moses: yet there is a plain contradiction in that interpretation; for if it were meant of Moses, it cannot be the firmament; if it were the firmament, it cannot be understood of Moses, for he never ascended thither.

1 This "Breaker-up" is by the confession of the Jews the title of the Messiah. So the author of Sepher Abcath Rachal, in his description of the coming of the Messias, maketh use of this place. And the same appeareth farther by that saying of Moses Haddarshan in Beresith Rabba, The plantation from below is Abraham, the plantation from above is Messias, as it is written, The breaker is come up before them; &c. So he on Gen. xl. 9. Again the same Berekith Rabba, Gen. xlv. 18. א nodo אכ"ג מ "וה על ההובהו. "When shall we rejoice? When the feet of the Shechinah shall stand upon the Mount of Olives." And again, א nodo אכ"ג מ "וה על ההובהו. "When? When the captives shall ascend from hell, and Shechinah in the head, as it is written, (Micah ii. 13). Their King shall pass before them, and the Lord in the head of them." ii. 13.

2 John xx. 17. 3 John iii. 13.
ascension. For that was therefore only true, because the Son of man, not yet conceived in the Virgin’s womb, was not in heaven, and after his conception by virtue of the hypostatical union was in heaven; from whence, speaking after the manner of men, he might well say that he had ascended into heaven, because whatsoever was first on earth and then in heaven, we say ascended into heaven. Wherefore beside that grounded upon the hypostatical union, beside that glorious condition upon his resurrection, there was yet another and that more proper ascension; for after he had both those ways ascended, it was still true that he had not yet ascended to his Father.

Now this kind of ascension, by which Christ had not yet ascended when he spake to Mary after his resurrection, was not after to be performed; for at the same time he said unto Mary, Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father. And when this ascension was performed, it appeared manifestly to be a true local translation of the Son of man as man from these parts of the world below into the heavens above, by which that body which was before locally present here on earth, and was not so then present in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, and no longer locally present in earth. For when he had spoken unto the disciples, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them, and so was corporally present with them, even while he blessed them he parted from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight, and so he was carried up into heaven, while they looked stedfastly towards heaven as he went up. This was a visible departure, as it is described, a real removing of that body of Christ which was before present with the apostles, and that body living after the resurrection, by virtue of that soul which was united to it; and therefore the Son of God according to his humanity was really and truly translated from these parts below unto the heavens above, which is a proper local ascension.

7.—Thus was Christ’s ascension visibly performed in the presence and sight of the apostles, for the confirmation of the reality and the certainty thereof. They did not see him when he rose, but they saw him when he ascended; because an eye-witness was not necessary unto the act of his resurrection, but it was necessary unto the act of his ascension. It was sufficient that Christ showed

---

1 John xx. 17.
2 Luke xxiv. 50, 51; Acts i. 9, 10.
3 θεὸς οὐκ ὑπέκειται παρείλκε γὰρ ἑκείνῳ τῷ ἄρχῃ ἰδείν, αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρός φθεγγομένου παρόντος, καὶ τοῦ μητρὸς δηλούντος ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἑκείνα αὐτὰ τοῦτο λόγῳ ἐδεικνύει.—CHRYSOST. Hom. 2 in Act. Apost.
himself to the apostles alive after his passion; for being they knew him before to be dead, and now saw him alive, they were thereby assured that he rose again: for whatsoever was a proof of his life after death, was a demonstration of his resurrection. But being the apostles were not to see our Saviour in heaven, being the session was not to be visible to them on earth, therefore it was necessary they should be eye-witnesses of the act who were not with the same eyes to behold the effect.

8.—Beside the eye-witness of the apostles, there was added the testimony of the angels; those blessed spirits which ministered before, and saw the face of God in heaven, and came down from thence, did know that Christ ascended up from hence unto that place from whence they came: and because the eyes of the apostles could not follow him so far, the inhabitants of that place did come to testify of his reception; for behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven. We must, therefore, acknowledge and confess against all the wild heresies of old, that the eternal Son of God who died and rose again, did with the same body and soul with which he died and rose ascend up to heaven; which was the second particular considerable in this article.

9.—Thirdly, being the name of heaven admitted divers acceptations in the sacred scriptures, it will be necessary to inquire what is the true notion of it in this article, and what was the proper termination of Christ's ascension. In some sense it might be truly

1 Acts i. 3.
2 Επειδάν οίκ αρκοίον αι οξθίλμοι δειεί το ύψος, οὖν παύεισαι, πότερον είς τον οίραμον ἀνπλάθεν, ἢ ἐκ εϊς τον οίραμον, ορα τί γίνεται; ὅτι μεν αὐτὸς έστιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἤκεσαν εξ αν ιελέγετο προς αὐτούς (πόρρωθεν γάρ οिκ εύκα τόντας γίνωσκε;) ὅτι δε εις τον οίραμον ἀναλαμβάνεται, αὐτοί λοιποι ἔδιδασκον αι ἄγγελοι.—Idem, ibid. 3 Acts i. 10, 11.
4 The various histories in the primitive times, concerning the humanity of Christ extended into heaven, are briefly touched by Tertullian: "Ut et ill erubescat, qui admittat carmem in coelis vacuum sensat, ut vacinana, exempto Christo sedere; aut qui carmem et animam tantundem, aut tantummodo animam, carmen vero non jam."—De canae Christi, cap. 24. Of which Gregory Nazianzen: Ei της ἀποστεισθαι νυν την σάρκα λέγον, καὶ γνωμὴν εἰναι τὴν θεώτητα σωματος, ἀλλὰ μη μετα το προσληματος και εἴναι και ἦσει, μη ἰδον την δοξην της παροισίας.—Epist. i. ad Cedionitum. The Apelles taught that Christ left his body dissolved in the air, and so ascended into heaven without it: "Hunc Apellem dicit quidam etiam de Christo tam falsa sensisse, ut diceret eum, non quidem carnie duxisse de caro, sed ex elementis mundi acceptisse. que mundo redidit, cum sine carne reusgen in column ascendit."—S. Augustin. Patres. 23. This opinion of Apelles is thus delivered by Epiphanius in his own words: 'Εν τω ἐρέχθαι απο των ἐκουρασιων ἠθην εις την γην, καὶ συνήγαγεν ἑαυτω απο των τεσσάρων στοιχείων σωμα.—Ευδεκαν ο Χριστός ἑαυτον παθην εν αὐτω τω σώματι, καὶ εσταυρωθη εν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ζητεῖν αὐτὴν την σάρκα του εαυτου μαθητας; καὶ ἀναλι- σσον, ἡμιν, αυτὴν την εναντρωτήτων έστιν, ἀπεμέπτεσεν πάντες έκκοτο των στοιχείων του ιδιου αποκος, το δημον το θεριμ, το ψυχρόν το ψυχρόν το ψυχρόν το ψυχρόν το ψυχρόν και ουτω διαλυσατ απ αυτου παλιν το εισαρκον σωμα, ανετη εις του οιραμον, ρυθεν και ηκε.—Paters. xlv. § 2. Of whom Gregory Nazianzen is to be understood in that Epistle before cited: 'Η εις τον άρα εχυθη και διελυθη, ὥσ φωνης φύσεως, και ὑμήν ρύσα, καὶ αστρατης δρόμος ουκ ισταμένης.
said Christ was in heaven before the cloud took him out of the apostles' sight, for the clouds themselves are called the clouds of heaven;\(^1\) but that heaven is the first; and our Saviour certainly ascended at least as far as St. Paul was caught up, that is, into the third heaven;\(^2\) for we have a great High-priest that is passed through the heavens.\(^3\) And needs must he pass through the heavens, because he was made higher than the heavens:\(^4\) for he that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens.\(^5\) When, therefore, Christ is said to have ascended into heaven, we must take that word as signifying as much as the heaven of heavens, and so Christ is ascended through and above the heavens, and yet is still in heaven: for he is entered into that within the veil,\(^6\) there is his passage through the heavens; into the holy place, even into heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God;\(^7\) this is the heaven of heavens. For thus said the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool;\(^8\) and as Christ descended unto the footstool of his Father in his humiliation, so he ascended unto the throne of his Father in his exaltation. This was the place of which our Saviour spake to his disciples, What and if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?\(^9\) Had he been there before in body, it had been no such wonder that he should have ascended thither again: but that his body should ascend unto that place where the majesty of God was most resplendent; that the flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone, should be seated far above all angels and archangels, all principalities and powers, even at the right hand of God; this was that which Christ propounded as worthy of their greatest admiration. Whatsoever heaven then is higher than all the rest which are called heavens; whatsoever sanctuary is holier than all which are called holies; whatsoever place is of greatest dignity in all those courts above; into that place did he ascend, where in the splendour of his deity he was before he took upon him our humanity.

10—As, therefore, when we say Christ ascended, we understand a literal and local ascent, not of his divinity (which possesseth all places, and therefore being everywhere is not subject to the imperfection of removing any whither), but of his humanity, which was so in one place that it was not in another; so when we say the place into which he ascended was heaven, and from the expusions of the apostles must understand thereby the heaven of heavens or the highest heaven, it followeth that we believe the

---

1 Dan. vii. 13. 2 2 Cor. xii. 2. Vulg. : *Qui penetravit caelo.* Heb. iv. 14. 2 We read it indeed "into the heavens," but the original imports as much as "through." 3 *Διελθήσθα τούς ουρανούς.* 4 vii. 26. 5 Eph. iv. 10. 6 Heb. vi. 19. 7 ix. 12, 24. 8 Isai. lxvi. 1. 9 John vi. 62.
body with the soul of Christ to have passed far above all those celestial bodies which we see, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the sun.  

11.—It was necessary to profess this article of Christ's ascension, first for the confirmation and augmentation of our faith. Our faith is thereby confirmed, in that we believe in him who is received unto the Father, and therefore certainly came from the Father; his Father sent him and we have received the message from him, and are assured that it is the same message which he was sent to deliver, because he is so highly rewarded by him that sent him for delivering it. Our faith is thereby exalted and augmented, as being the evidence of things not seen.  

The further the object is removed from us, the more of faith hath that act which embraceth it: Christ said unto Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed: and that blessedness by his ascension he hath left to the whole church. Thus Christ ascended is the ground and glory of our faith; and by virtue of his being in heaven our belief is both encouraged and commended; for his ascent is the cause, and his absence the crown of our faith; because he ascended we the more believe, and because we believe in him who hath ascended, our faith is the more accepted.

12.—Secondly, it is necessary to believe the ascension of Christ for the corroboration of our hope. We could never expect our dust and ashes should ascend the heavens; but being our nature hath gone before in him, we can now hope to follow after him.

1 The Seleuciani and Hermiani taught that the body of Christ ascended no farther than the sun, in which it was deposited; of whom Philaenius, and out of him St. Augustin, thus: "Negant Salvatorem in carne redere ad dexteram Patris, sed ea se exuisset peribentibus, etcunque in sole posuisse, In sole posuit tabernaculum suum.—Herres. 59. The same opinion Gregory Nazianzen attributeth to the Manicheans: Πού γάρ το σῶμα νῦν, εἰ μὴ μετὰ τοῦ προσλαβόντος; Où γάρ δὴ κατά τοὺς Μανιχαίων λήποι τῷ ἡλίῳ εἰσα- τετεῖαι, να ἡμὶ ὁδια τῆς άτυχίας.—Epist. 1 ad Cledonium. And St. Augustin says they taught the sun to be Christ: Mani- chaei solem estum carnis visibilis, expositum, et publicum, non tantum homi- nibus, sed etiam pecoribus ad videum, Christum Dominum esse putarunt."—Tract. 34 in Joan.  

This was the old heresy of Hermogenes, as is related by Theodoret: Οὗτο [ο Ἑρμογένης] τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ εἰσε- τετέθηναι, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καὶ τοὺς δαιμόνιας εἰς τὸν ἐγνὸν ἀνακρίβεσθαι.—Iuxret, Pahl. lib. 1, cap. 19.  

2 "Magnum hic rigor est mentium, et valde fideliun lumen est animarum, incuncta- nter credere, quas corporc non videntur intuitu, et ibi figere desiderium, quo nequeas inferre conspectum. Hac autem pietas unde in nostris cordibus nasceretur, aut quomodo quisquam justificaretur per fidem, si in ilia tantum salus nostra consisteret, quae obitusibus subjaceter:—Lio, De Ascens. Serm. 2.  

3 "Fides, [qua] eorum qui Deum visiri sunt, quamdiu peregrinantur, corda mundantur, quod non videt credi; nam si vides, non est fides: credenti colligitur mori- titum, videnti redditur praemium. Eat ergo Dominus et pare locum; eat ne videatur lateat ut credatur: tum enim locum paratur, si ex fide vivatur: creditus desideretur, ut desideratus habeatur; desiderium dilectionis preparatio est mansionis."—S. August. Tract. 65 in Joan.  

4 John xx. 23.
He is our head, and where that is the members may expect admission; for in so great and intimate an union there is no fear of separation or exclusion. There are many mansions in his Father’s house. And when he spake of ascending thither, he said expressly to his disciples, I go to prepare a place for you, and will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may also be.

The first-fruits of our nature are ascended, and the rest is sanctified. This is the new and living way which he consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh. And hence we have our hope as an anchor of the soul both sure and stedfast, which entereth into that within the veil, whither the forerunner is for us entered. For if Christ in his ascension be the forerunner, then are there some to follow; and not only so, but they which follow are to go in the same way, and to attain unto the same place: and if this forerunner be entered for us, then we are they which are to follow and to overtake him there; as being of the same nature, members of the same body, branches of the same vine, and therefore he went thither before us as the first-fruits before those that follow, and we hope to follow him as coming late to the same perfection. As, therefore, God hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together by virtue of his resurrection, so hath he also made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, by virtue of his ascension. We are already seated there in him, and hereafter shall be seated by him; in him already as in our
head, which is the ground of our hope; by him hereafter, as by
the cause conferring, when hope shall be swallowed up into
fruition.

13.—Thirdly, the profession of faith in Christ ascended, is neces-
sary for the exaltation of our affections. For where our treasure
is, there will our hearts be also.\(^1\) If I be lifted up from the earth, I
will draw all men unto me, saith our Saviour;\(^2\) and if those words
were true of his crucifixion, how powerful ought they to be in
reference to his ascension? When the Lord would take up Elijah
into heaven, Elisha said unto him, As the Lord liveth, and as thy
soul liveth, I will not leave thee;\(^3\) when Christ is ascended up on
high, we must follow him with the wings of our meditations and
with the chariots of our affections. If we be risen with Christ, we
must seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the
right hand of God. If we be dead, and our life hid in Christ with
God, we must set our affection on things above, not on things on earth.\(^4\)
Christ is ascended into heaven to teach us that we are strangers
and pilgrims here, as all our fathers were, and that another country
belongs unto us: from whence we, as strangers and pilgrims, should
learn to abstain from fleshly lusts,\(^5\) and not mind earthly things; as
knowing that we are citizens of heaven, from whence we look for our
Saviour, the Lord Jesus;\(^6\) yea, fellow-citizens with the saints, and of
the household of God.\(^7\) We should trample upon our sins, and
subdue the lusts of the flesh, that our conversation may be corre-
spondent to our Saviour's condition; that where the eyes of the
apostles were forced to leave him, thither our thoughts may follow
him.

14.—Fourthly, the ascension of Christ is a necessary article of
the CREED in respect of those great effects which immediately
were to follow it, and did absolutely depend upon it. The blessed
apostles had never preached the gospel, had they not been indued
with power from above; but none of that power had they received
if the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner had not descended:
and the Holy Ghost had not come down, except our Saviour had
ascended first. For he himself, when he was to depart from his
disciples, grounded the necessity of his departure upon the cer-
tainty of this truth, saying, If I go not away the Comforter will not
come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you.\(^3\) Now if all
the infallibility of those truths, which we as Christians believe,
depend upon the certain information which the apostles had, and
those apostles appear to be no way infallible till the cloven tongues
had sat upon them, it was first absolutely necessary that the Holy

---
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Ghost should so descend. Again being it was impossible that the Spirit of God in that manner should come down, until the Son of God had ascended into heaven; being it was not fit that the second advocate should officiate on earth, till the first advocate had entered upon his office in heaven; therefore in respect of this great work the Son of God must necessarily ascend, and in reference to that necessity we may well be obliged to confess that ascension.

15.—Upon these considerations we may easily conclude what every Christian is obliged to confess in those words of our CREED, 

He ascended into heaven: for thereby he is understood to express thus much, I am fully persuaded that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, after he rose from the dead, did with the same soul and body with which he rose, by a true and local translation, convey himself from the earth on which he lived, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestial orbs, until he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the majesty of God. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ who ascended into heaven.

CHAPTER II.

And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

1.—The second part of the article containeth two particulars: the session of the Son, and the description of the Father; the first sheweth that Christ upon his ascension is set down at the right hand of God; the second assureth us that the God, at whose right hand Christ is set down, is the Father Almighty.

2.—For the explication of Christ's session three things will be necessary: first, to prove that the promised Messias was to sit at the right hand of God; secondly, to show that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true Messias, is set down at the right hand of God; thirdly, to find what is the importance of that phrase, and in what propriety of expression it belongs to Christ.

3.—That the promised Messias was to sit at the right hand of God, was both pretypified and foretold. Joseph, who was betrayed and sold by his brethren, was an express type of Christ, and though in many things he represented the Messias, yet in none more than in this, that being taken out of the prison he was exalted to the supreme power of Egypt. For thus Pharaoh spake to Joseph, Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people
be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. And Pharaoh
looked off the ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and
arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his
neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had,
and they cried before him, bow the knee; and he made him ruler over
all the land of Egypt. Thus Joseph had the execution of all the
regal power committed unto him, all edicts and commands were
given out by him, the managing of all affairs was through his
hands, only the authority by which he moved remained in Pharaoh
still. This was a clear representation of the Son of man, who by
his sitting on the right hand of God obtained power to rule and
govern all things both in heaven and earth (especially as the ruler
of his house, that is, the church), with express command that all
things, both in heaven and earth, and under the earth, should bow
down before him; but all this in the name of the Father, to whom
the throne is still reserved, in whom the original authority still
remains. And thus the session of the Messiah was pretypified.

4.—The same was also expressly foretold not only in the sense,
but in the phrase. The Lord said unto my Lord, saith the prophet
David, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy foot-
stool. The Jews have endeavoured to avoid this prophecy, but
with no success: some make the person to whom God speaks to
be Ezechias, some Abraham, some Zorobabel, others David, others
the people of Israel; and because the prophecy cannot belong to
him who made the Psalm, therefore they which attribute the pre-
diction to Abraham, tell us the Psalm was penned by his steward
Eliezer: they which expound it of David, say that one of his
musicians was author of it.

But first it is most certain that David was the penman of this

1 Gen. xli. 40, 42, 43. 2 Psalm cx. 1. 3 This Justin Martyr testifies of the Jews
in his age: Καὶ τοῦτον τὸν Ψαλμὸν ὅτι εἰς τὸν Εξηκοί
τον βασιλέα ἐγερθήσαι τολ-
μάτε, οὐκ ἅγιον, ἑπιείκων.—Diad. cum Tryph. p. 73. And out of him Tertullian, citing this Psalm: "Sed necesse est, ad medium
sententiam pertinere defendam eas scripturas, quas et Judaeis nobis avocare conantur. Dicunt
denique hunc Psalmum in Ezechiel cele-
nisse, quia sederit ad dextram templi, et

4 So St. Chrysostom, speaking of the Jews: Τίνα δὲν ἐκεῖνον τὸν λαῷ κατά
τὸν Θεὸν; τὸν ἀκούσας τὸν Ἀβραὰμ
ἐτερον δὲ τὸν Ζωροβάβελ, καὶ ἄλλοι ἑτερον.
—Ad locum. Παντὶ Σαλμωνικαί.: Οἱ δὲ
Ἰωναῖοι, τὸ γελωτέρον, εἰς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ
[ἐπιστᾶσθαι λέγουσιν:] καθῆσαν ἐκ δεῖκνον τοῦ
Σαλμωνικαί. And this exposition is now followed
by Solomon Jarchi and Lipmannus; Jarchi
knowing it to be ancient, {}

5 This is the exposition of the later rab-
bins, as of Aben Ezra and David Kimchi,
who attribute the subject of the Psalm to
David. And not only they, but the ancients
rabbins since our Saviour's time, as appeareth
by those words of St. Chrysostom: Καὶ τὰ
ἐπιστᾶτα δὲ δηλοῖ, ὅτι οὐδεὶς περὶ τούτων
Ζωροβάβελ ἐνταῦθα εἰρήνοι, οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ
Δαβίδ· οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτῶν εἰρωνύμην θετικώτατα.—Ad locum.

6 Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐτέρα τῶν λαγοὺς τούτων
ἐνδότερα· περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ λέγεσθαι ταῦτα
εἰρήναι· εὐ ταύτα ἤματος. Πέρι δὲ ἡ τῆς
Δαβίδ, ἡ τῆς Ζωροβάβελ, ἡ τῆς λαοῦ ταῦτα
ἐρωτήσεις;—S. Chrysost. ad locum.

7 To which purpose saith St. Chrysostom,
concerning the Jews of his time: Τί γὰρ
φασιν ἀλλοι πάλιν; Ὑπὲρ οὖν τοῦ 'Αβραὰμ
ταῦτα λέγει περὶ τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ ισπουτ.—
Ad locum.
Psalm; the title speaks as much, which is, *A Psalm of David:* from whence it followeth that the prediction did not belong to him, because it was spoken to his Lord. Nor could it indeed belong to any of the rest which the Jews imagine, because neither Abraham, nor Ezechias, nor Zorobabel, could be the Lord of David, much less the people of Israel (to whom some of the Jews referred it), who were not the lords, but the subjects of that David. Beside, he which is said to sit at the right hand of God is also said to be a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek; but neither Abraham, nor Ezechias, nor any which the Jews have mentioned, was ever any priest of God. Again, our Saviour urged this scripture against the Pharisees, saying, *What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? they say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, the Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? And no man was able to answer him a word.* From whence it is evident that the Jews of old, even the Pharisees, the most accurate and skilful amongst them, did interpret the Psalm of the Messias; for if they had conceived the prophecy belonged either to Abraham, or David, or any of the rest since mentioned by the Jews, they might very well, and questionless would have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the son of David. It was, therefore, the general opinion of the church of the Jews before our Saviour, and of divers rabbins since his death, that this prediction did concern the kingdom of Christ. And thus the session of the Messias at the right hand of God was not only represented typically, but foretold prophetically; which is our first consideration.

1 As for the objection which is made by Aben Ezra, that it is not the Psalm of David, but penned for and in the honour of David, because the title is as if it were a Psalm for David, not of David: it is by no means to be admitted, because it may not only very well signify a Psalm made by David, but if it do not, there is no title which shows any Psalm to be his; and some of them we are sure are his: Luke xx. 42.

2 *Tι οὖν, εἶπε Μωσῆς αὐτῷ, ἐστιν δὲ λόγος τοῦ Δαβίδ: καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι λόγον, ἢ καὶ αὐτῶς ἀντί μεγαλύτερα τιμῆς Δαβίδ κελέται;* — S. Chrysost. ad locum.

3 Psalm cx. 4.; Heb. v. 6.

4 This is the argument which the fathers used against the Jews; as Justin Martyr, in opposition to their pretence of Ezechias: *Iēreis dē ὅτι οὐκέταν ἐξεχαίρει, οὐκέταν ἀλώνος ἐρείπος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡσεὶ ὁμοίως αὐτοῖς τούλημα.* — Dial. cum Tryph. § 33. And from him Tertullian: *Quod et in Ipso tuis accepit, Tu a Sacros in ovum.*


5 Matt xxii. 42-46.

6 As in the Midrash Tibbon, Psalm xviii, 36, "יוֹרֵךְ בְּשֵׁם יֵהוָה הַנֶּחֶמ הַגֵּד תַּלְמִיד כִּי מָנוּש הַמַּהֲשֶׁתָּם לִמְיַסִּים שְׁם נָאָש וּלְדָמִי אֲלֹהִים בַּל תִּלְמוּד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם וּלְדָמִי אֲלֹהִים בַּל תִּלְמוּד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם וּלָמַד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם וּלָמַד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם וּלָמַד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם וּלָמַד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם וּלָמַד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם וּלָמַד וְלָקָט בָּא הָרוֹם הָרִים חַיָּם V.

7 "R. Joden in the name of Rabbi Chama said, that in the time to come God shall place Messias the King at his right hand, as it is written, (Psalm cx. 1.) The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand." So Moses Haddarshan in Gen. xviii. 4: "Hereafter God holy and blessed shall set the King Messias in his right hand as it is written, (Psalm cx.) The Lord said," 

8 ἠμισθησαίης, Μονοθείως, Παννονία ἐν εἰς ἀναγεννησιν, Μονοθείως, Παννονία ἐν εἰς ἀναγεννησιν.
5.—Secondly, we affirm that our Jesus, whom we worship as the true Messias, according unto that particular prediction, when he ascended up on high, did sit down at the right hand of God. His ascension was the way to his session, and his session the end of his ascension; as the evangelist expresseth it, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God; or as the apostle, God raised Christ from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places. There could be no such session without an ascension; and David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, let all the blind and wilful Jews be convinced of this truth, that God hath not set at his own right hand neither Abraham nor David, neither Ezechias nor Zorobabel, but hath made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ.

6.—This was an honour never given, never promised to any man but the Messias: the glorious spirits stand about the throne of God, but never any of them set down at the right hand of God. For to which of his angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? But Christ was so assured of this honour, that before the council of the chief priests and the elders of the people, when he foresaw his death contrived and his cross prepared, even then he expressed the confidence of his expectation, saying, Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. And thus our Jesus, whom we worship as the true promised Messias, is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God. Which was our second consideration.

7.—Our next inquiry is, what may be the utmost importance of that phrase, and how it is applicable unto Christ. The phrase consists of two parts, and both to be taken metaphorically. First, therefore, we must consider what is the right hand of God, in the language of the scriptures; secondly, what it is to sit down at that right hand. God being a Spirit, can have no material or corporeal parts; and consequently as he hath no body, so in a proper sense can he have no hands at all: but because God is pleased to descend to our capacity, and not only to speak by the mouths of men, but also, after the manner of men, he expresseth that which is in him by some analogy with that which belongs to us. The hands of man are those organical parts which are most

1 Mark xvi. 19. 2 Eph. i. 20. 3 Acts ii. 34-36. 4 Heb. i. 13. 5 Luke xxii. 69. 6 1 Peter iii. 22. 7 'Credimus etiam quod sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris. Nec ideo tamen quasi humana forma circumscriptum esse Deum Patrem arbitrandum est, ut de filo cogitandum dextrum aut sinistrum latus anima occurrat.' — S. August. De Fide et Symbol. cap. 7.
active, and executive of our power;¹ by those the strength of our body is expressed, and most of our natural and artificial actions are performed by them. From whence the power of God, and the exertion or execution of that power, is signified by the hand of God. Moreover being by a general custom of the world the right hand is more used than the left, and by that general use acquireth a greater firmitude and strength, therefore the right hand of God signifieth the exceeding great and infinite power of God.

Again, because the most honourable place amongst men is the right hand (as when Bathsheba went unto King Solomon, he sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the king’s mother, and she sat on his right hand²), therefore the right hand of God signifies the glorious majesty of God.

Thirdly, because the gifts of men are given and received by the hands of men, and every perfect gift comes from the Father of lights,³ therefore the right hand of God is the place of celestial happiness and perfect felicity; according to that of the psalmist, In thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand pleasures for evermore.⁴

8.—Now as to the first accession of the right hand of God, Christ is said to sit down at the right hand of the Father in regard of that absolute power and dominion which he hath obtained in heaven; from whence it is expressly said, Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power.⁵

As to the second accession, Christ is said to sit on the right hand of God in regard of that honour, glory, and majesty which he hath obtained there;⁶ wherefore it is said, When he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high:⁷ and again, We have an High-priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens⁸.

In reference to the third accession Christ is said to sit on the right hand of God, because now after all the labours and sorrows of this world, after his stripes and buffetings, after a painful and

¹ “Succedunt brachia et validi lacerto-rum tori, validae ad operandum manus, et praecribus digitis habiles ad tenendum. Hinc aptior usus operandi, hic scribendi elegantia, et ille calamus scribae velociter scribentis, quo Divina vocis exprimentur oracula. Manus est quo cibus ori ministrat: manus est quo praeclaris etiæ factis, que conciliatrix Divina gratiae sacrae infer-tur altaria, per quam offerimus et sumim-nus sacramenta celestia: manus est que operatur pariter atque dispensat Divina mysteria, cujus vocabulo non designatus est se Dei Filium declarari, acutne David, Dextra domini exaltavit me. Manus est que fecit omnia, sicut dixit Deus Omnipotens, Nonne manus mea fecit hanc omnia?”.—S. AMBROS, hexaém. lib. vi. cap. 9.
² 1 Kings ii. 19. ³ James i. 17. ⁴ Psalm xvi. 11. ⁵ Matt. xxvi. 54; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69.
⁶ “Secundum consuetudinem nostram illi consessus offertur, qui atque opera perfecto [victor adventiens] honoris gratia promere-tur, ut sedeat. Ita ergo et Homo Jesus Christus passione sua diabolum superans, resurrectione sua inferna reserans, tanquam perfecto opera ad coelos victor adventiens, audit a Deo Patre, Sede ad dextram meam.”—Max. TAURIN. Homil. i. De Penepoque.
⁷ Heb. 1. 3. ⁸ Heb. viii. 2.
And siteth on the right hand.

shameful death, he resteth above in unspeakable joy and everlasting felicity.\footnote{1}

9.—As for the other part of the phrase, that is, his session, we must not look upon it as determining any posture of his body in the heavens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs. For we read in the scriptures a more general term which signifies only his being in heaven, without any expression of the particular manner of his presence. So St. Paul, Who is even at the right hand of God;\footnote{2} and St. Peter, Who is gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God.\footnote{3} Beside, we find him expressed in another position than that of session: for Stephen looking stedfastly into heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God; and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.\footnote{4} He appeared standing unto Stephen, whom we express sitting in our CREED; but this is rather a difference of the occasion than a diversity of position. He appeared standing to Stephen, as ready to assist him, as ready to plead for him, as ready to receive him;\footnote{5} and he is often expressed sitting, not for any positional variation, but for the variety of his effect and operation.

\footnote{1} “Ad dextram intelligendum est sic dic
tum esse, in summâ beatitudine, ubi justitia et pax et gaudium est.” — S. August. De Fide et Symbol. cap. 7. “Quid est Patris dextra, nisi aerea ilia ineffabilsque felici-
tas, quo pervenit Filius hominis, etiam carnis immortalitate percepta?” — Idem, Con
is.” — De Symb. ad Catechum. lib. 1. cap. 4. “Salus temporalis et carnis in sinis-
trâ est, salus aeterna cum angelis in dextrâ est. Ideo jam in ipsâ immortalitate posuit Christus, dicitur sedere ad dextram Dei. Non enim Deus habet in selpso dextram aut sinistram; sed dextra Dei dicitur felici-

\footnote{2} Rom. vii. 34. \footnote{3} 1 Peter iii. 22. \footnote{4} Acts vii. 55, 56. \footnote{5} "Eten' òp' ei tov kalographiai 

fev'tov kai tov aitov tòv, tòv nêmov tòv tòv ekkástov kai lo-
gon, kai fuv' tov aitov iastos. — S. Chris
to. Homil. 18 in Act. Apost. "Si ma-

tor gratia et manifestor intelligens in 
Novo est quam in Veteri Testamento, quare 
Essai propheta sedentem in throno majes-
tis vidit Deum salvo? In Novo autem 
Stephanus primus martyr stantes se vidisse 
aet Jesum a dextris Dei? Quid est istud, ut 
hic subjectus videatur post triumphos, et 
ille quasi Dominus antequam vinceret? Prout 
causa erat fecisse, ita et Dominus se 
estendit. Prophetae enim visus est quasi 

rex corripiens plebeum; et hoc se estendit 

quad erat, hoc est, sedentem. In pace enim 
erat causa Divinitatis ejus. Stephano autem 
ut stans appareret, fecit calumniâ Judaco-

rum. In Stephano autem Salvatoris causa 
vin patietur. Ideo sedente Judice Deo, 
stans apparuit, quasi quid causam diceret; et 
quid bona causa ejus est, ad dextram Judi-
cis erat. Omnis qui causam dicit, stet ne-
cesse est.” — S. August. Quest. in Nov. Test. 88. "Sedere Judicantis est, stare vero 
pugetantis vel adjuvantis. Stephanus ergo 
in labore certaminis positus, stantem vidit 
quem Adjutorem habebat. Sed hunc post 
ascensionem Marcus sedere describit, quia 
post ascensionis suae gloriam Judae in fine 
videbitur.” — Greg. Magn. Homil. 29 in 
Evang. Maximum Taurinensis moves the 
question, "Qua sit ratio quod idem Domi-

nus a David sedens prophetaet, stans vero 
una Stephano praccdatur?” and then renders 
this reason: "Ut modo ejus omnipotentia, 
modo misericordia describatur. Nam utique 
pro potestate regis sedere dicitur, pro boni-
tate intercessors stare suggestur. Ait enim 
beatus apostolus, Quia Advocatum ha-

bemus apud Patrem Jesum Christum. Ju-
dex ergo est Christus cum residiet, Advo-
catus cum assurit, Judex plane Judaeis, 
Advocatus Christianis. Hic enim stans 
apeid Patrem, Christianum non pecun-
tium causas exort; ibi residi et Patre, 
Pharsasorum persequentium pecata con-
demnans. Illis indignans vehementer ulds-
citur, his interveniens intention misercet. 
Hic stat ut suscipiat Stephani martyrst spir-

ritum; ibi residi et condemnat Judae pro-
ditoriis admissionem.” — Hom. i. de Pentecoste.
10.—This phrase then to sit, prescinding from the corporal posture of session, may signify no more than habituation, possession, permanence, and continuance; as the same word in the Hebrew and Greek languages often signifies.¹ And thus our Saviour is set down at the right hand of God in heaven, because he which dwelt with us before on earth is now ascended up into heaven, and hath taken his mansion or habituation there; and so hath he seated himself, and dwelleth in the highest heavens.²

Again, the notion of sitting implieth rest, quietness, and indisturbance; according to that promise in the prophet, They shall sit every man under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid.³ So Christ is ascended into heaven, where resting from all pains and sorrows, he is seated free from all disturbance and opposition; God having placed him at his right hand, until he hath made his enemies his footstool.

Thirdly, this sitting implieth yet more than quietness or continuance, even dominion, sovereignty, and majesty;⁴ as when Solomon sat in the throne of his father, he reigned over Israel after the death of his father. And thus Christ is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.⁵ And St. Paul did well interpret those words of the prophet, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool,⁶ saying, He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.

11.—Fourthly, this sitting doth yet more properly and particularly imply the right of judicature, and so especially expresseth, putandum est per totum illud tempus in sella sedisse et non surrexisse. Hinc et sedes dicuntur, ubi habent commorationem quorum sedes sunt: habitatio quippe hoc nomen acceptit. — Quest. super Levit. 24. And this is as familiar with the Latins as the Hebrews: "Si venti essent, nos hic Corycae non sederemus" — Ciceronis Epist. ad Famil. lib. xvi. 7. "Id horreum fuit presidium Parensis sedentibus ad Trobiarn."— Livius, lib. xxi. cap. 40.

¹ “Sed。”
³ “Sed.”
⁴ “Sedet ad dextram Patris: crediti, sedere, intelligite habi
tare: quomodo dicitur: ad ilia patria sedet per tres annos. Dicit ilud et scrip-
tur, sedes quendam in civitate tantum tempus. Numquid sedet, et numquam sur-
rexit? Ideo hominum habitaciones sedes dicuntur. Ubi habitantur sedes, numquid
semper sedetur? non surgitur, non ambulatur, [non facetur?] e et tamen sedes vocantur. Sic ergo credite habitare Christum in dextera Del Patris ubi est." — S. August. De Symb. ad Catechum. lib. i. cap. 4.
⁵ “Sed.”
⁶ “Sed.”
⁷ “Sed.”
And sitting on the right hand.

a king that sitteth in the throne of judgment; as it is written, In mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgment, and hasting righteousness. And so Christ sitting at the right hand of God is manifested and declared to be the great Judge of the quick and the dead. Thus to sit doth not signify any peculiar inclination or flexion, any determinate location or position of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happiness of condition, regular and judiciary power; as in other authors such significations are usual.

12.—The importance of the language being thus far improved, at last we find the substance of the doctrine, which is, that sitting at the right hand of God was our Mediator’s solemn entry upon his regal office, as to the execution of that full dominion which was due unto him. For worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory and blessing. Wherefore Christ after his death and resurrection saith, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. For because he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth. And this obedience and submission was and is due unto him, because God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church.

13.—There was an express promise made by God to David,

1 Prov. xx. 8.  2 Isal. xvi. 5.  3 "Sedere quod dicitur Deus, non membrorum positionem, sed judiciorum signum est, potestatem, qua illa Majestas nunquam caret, semper digna dignis tribuo; quanvis in extremo judicio multo manifestus inter homines Unigenitus Filii Dei Judicis vivorum atque mortuorum claritas inulibata futura sit."—S. AUGUST. De Fide et Symb. cap. 1.  "Hoc quod Filias dictor sedere ad exitium Patris, demonstratur quod ipse homo, quem susceptit Christus, potestatem accepit judicantis."—Author. Lib. De Symb. et Cathecismum lib. iii. cap. 7.

4 Most anciently sedere did signify no more than esse, "to be" in any place; as Servius noteth on that place of Virgil:

5 Rev. v. 12.  6 Matt. xxxviii. 13.

Parvique sedebat
Succinctus trabebat—Enield. vii. 187;
quod est augurium, cum alios stantes induxerit: ergo sedebat, aut erat, aut coniubia capiebat, aut augurisbatur.

6 Eph. i. 20-22.
Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever. This promise strictly and literally taken was but conditional; and the condition of the promise is elsewhere expressed, Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore. Notwithstanding this promise this kingdom of David was intercepted, nor was his family continued in the throne: part of the kingdom was first rent from his posterity, next the regality itself; and when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but only ceased in the obligation of a promise, because the condition was not performed. The posterity of David did not keep the covenant and testimony of their God, and therefore the throne of David was not by an uninterrupted lineal succession established to perpetuity.

But yet in a larger and better sense, after these intercisions, the throne of David was continued. When they had sinned and lost their right unto the crown, the kingdom was to be given unto him who never sinned, and consequently could never lose it; and he being of the seed of David, in him the throne of David was without interpolation or succession continued. Of him did the angel Gabriel speak at his conception, The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Thus the throne of Christ is called the throne of David, because it was promised unto David, and because the kingdom of David was a type, resemblance, and representation of it; insomuch that Christ himself in respect of this kingdom is often called David, as particularly in that promise, I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them.

Now as David was not only first designed, but also anointed king over Israel, and yet had no possession of the crown; seven years he continued anointed by Samuel, and had no share in the dominion; seven years after he continued anointed in Hebron only king over the tribe of Judah; at last he was received by all the tribes, and so obtained full and absolute regal power over all Israel, and seated himself in the royal city of Jerusalem: so Christ was born King of the Jews, and the conjunction of his human

1 Sam. vii. 16. 2 Psalm cxxii. 11, 12. 3 Luke i. 33, 33. Jer. xxx. 9 ; Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25; Hosea iii. 5. 4 Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24 6 1 Sam. xvi. 13. 7 2 Sam. ii. 4.
nature with his divine in the union of his person was a sufficient unction to his regal office, yet as the Son of man he exercised no such dominion, professing that his kingdom was not of this world; but after he rose from the dead, then as it were in Hebron with his own tribe he tells the apostles, All power is given unto him, and by virtue thereof gives them injunctions; and at his ascension he enters into the Jerusalem above, and there sits down at the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn entry upon the full and entire dominion over all things; then could St. Peter say, Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ.

14.—The immediate effect of his regal power, the proper execution of this office, is the subduing of all his enemies; for he is set down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. This was the ancient custom of the Oriental conquerors, to tread upon the necks of their subdued enemies; as when Joshua had the five kings as his prisoners, he said unto the men of war which went with him, Come near, put your feet upon the necks of them. Thus to signify the absolute and total conquest of Christ, and the dreadful majesty of his throne, all his enemies are supposed to lie down before him, and he to set his feet upon them.

The enemies of Christ are of two kinds, either temporal or spiritual; the temporal enemies I call such as visibly and actually oppose him, and his apostles, and all those which profess to believe in his name. Such especially and principally were the Jews, who rejected, persecuted, and crucified him; who after his resurrection scourged, stoned, and despitefully used his disciples; who tried all ways and means imaginable to hinder the propagation and dishonour the profession of Christianity. A part of his regal office was to subdue these enemies, and he sat down on the right hand of God that they might be made his footstool; which they suddenly were according to his prediction, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. For within few years the temple, the city, and the whole polity of the Jews, were destroyed for ever in a revenging manner by the hands of the Romans, which they made use of to crucify the Lord of life. The Romans themselves were the next enemies, who first complied with the Jews in Christ’s crucifixion, and after in defence of their heathen deities endeavoured the extirpation of Christianity by successive persecutions. These were next to be made the footstool of the King of Kings, and so they

1 John xviii. 36. 2 Matt. xxviii. 18. 3 Acts ii. 36. 4 Heb. x. 12, 13. 5 Joshua x. 24. 6 Matt. xvi. 28.
were when Rome, the regnant city, the head of that vast empire, was taken and sacked; when the Christians were preserved and the heathens perished; when the worship of all their idols ceased, and the whole Roman Empire marched under the banner of Christianity. In the same manner all those persons and nations whatsoever which openly oppose and persecute the name of Christ, are enemies unto this King, to be in due time subdued under him, and when he calleth to be slain.

The spiritual enemies of this King are of another nature; such as by an invisible way make opposition to Christ's dominion, as sin, Satan, death. Every one of these hath a kingdom of its own, set up and opposed to the kingdom of Christ. The apostle hath taught us that sin hath reigned unto death; and hath commanded us not to let it reign in our mortal bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof. There is, therefore, a dominion and kingdom of sin set up against the throne of the immaculate Lamb. Satan would have been like the most high, and being cast down from heaven, hath erected his throne below; he is the prince of this world: the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience is the prince of the power of the air; and thus the rulers of the darkness of this world oppose themselves to the true light of the world. Death also hath its dominion, and, as the apostle speaks, reigned from Adam to Moses; even by one offence death reigned by one; and so set up a ruling and a regal power against the Prince of life.

15.—For the destruction of these powers was Christ exalted to the right hand of God, and by his regal office doth he subdue and destroy them all. And yet this destruction is not so universal, but that sin, Satan, and death shall still continue. It is true he shall put down all rule and authority and power; but this amounts not so much to a total destruction as to an absolute subjection: for as he is able, so will he subdue all things to himself. The principal end of the regal office of the Mediator is the effectual redemption and actual salvation of all those whom God hath given him, and whosoever or whatsoever opposeth the salvation of these is by that opposition constituted and become an enemy of Christ. And because this enmity is grounded upon that opposition, therefore so far as anything opposeth the salvation of the sons of God, so far it is an enemy, and no farther; and consequently Christ, by sitting at the right hand of God, hath obtained full and absolute power utterly to destroy those three spiritual enemies so far as they make this opposition; and farther than they do oppose they are not destroyed by him, but subdued to him: whatsoever

1 Rom. v. 21. 2 vi. 12. 3 John xii. 31. 4 Eph. ii. 2. 5 vi. 12. 6 John i. 9. 7 Rom. v. 14. 17. 8 Acts iii. 15. 9 1 Cor. xv. 24. 10 Phil. iii. 21.
hindereth and obstructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdom, for the demonstration of God's mercy, is abolished; but whatsoever may be yet subservient to the demonstration of his justice is continued.

Christ then, as king, destroyeth the power of sin in all those which belong unto his kingdom, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, destroying the dominion thereof by his actual grace, and taking away the spot thereof by grace habitual. But in the reprobate and damned souls the spot of sin remaineth in its perfect dye, the dominion of sin continueth in its absolute power, the guilt of sin abideth in a perpetual obligation to eternal pains; but all this in subjection to his throne, the glory of which consisteth as well in punishing rebellion as rewarding loyalty.

16.—Again, Christ sitting on the right hand of God destroyeth all the strength of Satan and the powers of hell: by virtue of his death, perpetually represented to his Father, he destroyeth him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. But the actual destruction of these powers of darkness hath reference only to the elect of God. In them he preventeth the wiles, those he taketh out of the snare; in them he destroyeth the works, those he preserveth from the condemnation of the devil. He freeth them here from the prevailing power of Satan by his grace, he freeth them hereafter from all possibility of any infernal opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned souls are continued slaves unto the powers of hell, and he which sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the devil and his angels, to be tormented with and by them for ever; and this power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the divine justice.

17.—Thirdly, Christ sitting on the throne of God at last destroyeth death itself; for the last enemy which shall be destroyed is death. But this destruction reacheth no farther than removing of all power to hinder the bringing of all such persons as are redeemed actually by Christ into the full possession of his heavenly kingdom. He will ransom them from the power of the grave, he will redeem them from death. O death, he will be thy plague; O grave, he will be thy destruction. The trump shall sound, the graves shall open, the dead shall live, the bodies shall be framed again out of the dust, and the souls which left them shall be reunited to them, and all the sons of men shall return to life, and death shall be swallowed up in victory. The sons of God shall then be made completely happy both in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternal life. Thus he who sitteth at

1 Heb. ii. 14. 2 Eph. vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 26; 1 John iii. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 6. 3 1 Cor. xv. 26 4 Hosea xiii. 14. 5 1 Cor. xv. 54.
the right hand of God hath abolished death; and brought life and immortality to light. But to the reprobate and damned persons death is not destroyed but improved. They rise again indeed to life, and so the first death is evacuated; but that life to which they rise is a second, and a far worse death. And thus Christ is set down at the right hand of God that he might subdue all things to himself.

18.—The regal power of Christ as a branch of the mediatorialship is to continue till all those enemies be subdued. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. But now we see not yet all things put under him. Therefore he must still continue there; and this necessity is grounded upon the promise of the Father and the expectation of the Son. Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool, saith the Father; upon which words we may ground as well the continuation as the session. Upon this promise of the Father the Son sat down at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. Being then the promise of God cannot be evacuated, being the expectation of Christ cannot be frustrated, it followeth that our mediator shall exercise the regal power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be subdued.

19.—When all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his kingdom, when those which refused him to rule over them shall be slain, that is, when the whole office of the mediator shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As, therefore, there shall no longer continue any act of the prophetical part to instruct us, nor any act of the priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no further act of this regal power of the mediator necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatiﬁcal vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actual defence and protection. As, therefore, the general notion of a mediator ceaseth when all are made one, because a mediator is not a mediator of one; so every part or branch of that mediatorialship, as such, must also cease, because that unity is in all parts complete. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

20.—Now though the mediatorialship of Christ be then resigned,

---

1 2 Tim. i. 10.  2 1 Cor. xv. 25.  3 Heb. ii. 8.  4 Psalm cx. 1.  5 Heb. x. 12, 13.  6 Gal. iii. 20.  7 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.
because the end thereof will then be performed; though the regal office as part of that mediatorial be also resigned with the whole; yet we must not think that Christ shall cease to be a king, or lose any of the power and honor which before he had. The dominion which he hath was given him as a reward for what he suffered; and certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is done. He hath promised to make us kings and priests, which honour we expect in heaven, believing we shall reign with him for ever, and therefore for ever must believe him king. The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever, not only to the modified eternity of his mediatorialship, so long as there shall be need of regal power to subdue the enemies of God's elect, but also to the complete eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future is coeternal to his divinity.

Lest we should imagine that Christ should ever cease to be king, or so interpret this article as if he were after the day of judgment to be removed from the right hand of God, the ancient fathers added those words to the Nicene Creed, whose kingdom shall have no end, against the heresy which then arose denying the eternity of the kingdom of Christ.

1 "Videamus an traditio regni defectio sit intelligenda regnandi; ut quod traditid Filius Patri tradendo non teneat." — S. Hil. De Trin. lib. xi. cap. 29.

2 2 Tim. ii. 12.

3 Rev. xi. 15.

4 Of the basileias is Iesu t电动. We find not these words in the Nicene Creed, as it was in itself before the additions at Constantinople. But not long after, St. Cyril expounds them in his Catechism; and Epiphanius in Anagoras, repeating two several Creeds, a shorter and a longer, (sections 120 and 121;) hath these words in both. After this they were added expressly in the Constantinopolitan Creed; and the reason of their insertion, without question, was that which St. Cyril insinuates in his explication, that is, the heresy which was then newly begun. "Cum post itinere acunysis lectionis, ut de t电动 Iesu basileia, mispersion in arieogov tou drakontov Iesu ather ephel, prosbathos per Iesu Galatian anaphyseia. "Egolmyse [15] Iesu legein, ut metax to t电动 tou kosmon h Cristos ou vasileiai; kai etokynountan eis en, ut h Lagon ek Patrof xeladion, oitos h Patrof palin anavuleis sousei esti." — Catech. 15.

This was the particular heresy of Marcellus, bishop of Antioch, followed by Photinus, born in the same place, and therefore termed by St. Cyril per Iesu Galatian anaphyseia. It consisted of two parts: First, That the kingdom of Christ did wholly cease at the end of this world; Secondly, That the Word was resolved again into the Father, and consequently did not only cease to reign, but also cease to exist. Which is yet more plainly expressed by Eusebius in his second book against Marcellus: Kai palin, toiston atrous panvndition, meta tov t电动 tis krites kepyon, tov men Logou einwmenon to vthe, ws me stren tov Logou. "Eis t电动 tis de sarakos, [he aneileiphevn,] epimeon kataliepyshomevns upo tov Logou, ws mity tov Xion tov Theou potet upostatav, mity tov Xion tov Anavgwou, ou aneilepse." — Cap. i. This heresy of Marcellus St. Basil properly calls an impiety, is the upostastion tov Kuriou hymon Iesou Xristov. — Epist. 78; And again: eis autin tis uparxei tis tis Monogevnion Thotistos. — Epist. 52; which he there more fully expresseth, "Ur [Mirkellos] Lagon men iverwshen tis Monogevnion divasis, kata hreian kai epis kepyon prelebavanta, palin de eis tis oden ephidhentan psantrodiananta, ouste pro tis ephodnon eisw, ouste metax tis epainon upostatan. "This existence of the Word and the kingdom of the Son, that heresy made co-eval; beginning when the Word came from the Father, that is, at the incarnation; and ending when the Word returned into the Father, that is, at the day of judgment. Which is manifestly delivered by the Eastern bishops in that profession of faith which they sent to those in Italy; "ALY ek tov Xristov autou xreontin na Kai Xion tov Tho- ou, eis ou tis hleteran ek tis pardeon sarka aneilefpar, pro teterakosion olin einai. "Ek tov taws tis Xristou arpn bai
21.—The profession of faith in Christ as sitting on the right hand of God is necessary: first, to mind us of our duty, which must needs consist in subjection and obedience. The majesty of a king claimeth the loyalty of a subject; and if we acknowledge his authority, we must submit unto his power. Nor can there be a greater incitation to obedience than the consideration of the nature of his government. Subject we must be whether we will or no; but if willingly, then is our service perfect freedom: if unwillingly, then is our averseness everlasting misery. Enemies we all have been; under his feet we shall be either adopted or subdued. A double kingdom there is of Christ: one of power, in which all are under him; another of propriety, in those which belong unto him: none of us can be excepted from the first, and happy are we if by our obedience we show ourselves to have an interest in the second, for then that kingdom is not only Christ's, but ours.  

22.—Secondly, it is necessary to believe in Christ sitting on the right hand of God, that we might be assured of an auspicious protection under his gracious dominion. For God by this exaltation hath given our Saviour to be the head over all things to the church; and therefore from him we may expect direction and preservation. There can be no illegality where Christ is the law-giver; there can be no danger from hostility where the Son of God is the defender. The very name of head hath the signification not only of dominion but of union, and therefore while we look upon him at the right
hand of God we see ourselves in heaven. This is the special promise which he hath made us since he sat down there, To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne. How should we rejoice, yea rather how should we fear and tremble at so great an honour!  

23.—Thirdly, the belief of Christ's glorious session is most necessary in respect of the immediate consequence, which is his most gracious intercession. Our Saviour is ascended as the true Melchisedec, not only as the King of Salem the Prince of peace but also as the Priest of the most high God; and whereas every priest, according to the law of Moses, stood daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which could never take away sins, this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. And now Christ being set down in that power and majesty though the sacrifice be but once offered, yet the virtue of it is perpetually advanced by his session, which was founded on his passion; for he is entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Thus, If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. What then remaineth to all true believers but that triumphant exclamation of the apostle, Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. For he which was accepted in his oblation, and therefore sat down on God's right hand, to improve this acceptance continues his intercession; and having obtained all power by virtue of his humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixtion; by an humble omnipotency, or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence, and presenting his postulations at the throne, of God.

---

1 Rev. iii. 21.  
2 'Ενωτε τον θρόνο τον βασιλέων, ἐνωτε της τιμής την ύπερβολήν τουτο και γενέσθαι, εἰγε βουλομένη, μάλλον υμᾶς φοβεῖται δυνάμει. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ γέεναι ἦν, τὸ τιμῆται πολλάτινα τιμήν αὐξίων εὑρεθήναι καὶ κακοῦς; τίνα οὖν ἄρ εἴγος κόλασιν; τίνα τιμωρίαν; Εὐφῶνον τίνος ἐγγὺς ἰ δικαῖος τον καθήγην, (τούτο μόνον καὶ ἀποκριθήναι πρὸς τὰς ωσίων), τίνος ἐν δειξιὼν ἑστι. — S. Chrysost. citidem.  
3 Heb. vii. 1.  
4 Heb. x. 11, 12.  
5 Heb. ix. 24.  
6 1 John i. 1.  
7 Heb. vii. 25.  
8 Rom. viii. 33, 34.  
9 St. Augustin, discoursing upon that place of St. Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 1: 'I exhort that, first of all, supplications, prayers, and intercessions be made for all men;' obsereth what is the nature of intercession: "Pro interpellationibus autem quod nostris habent, secundum codices, credo, vestros, postulationes posuisti. Hec interim duo id est, quod aliis postulationibus, aliis interpellationibus interpretati sunt, numun verbum transvere voluerunt, quod Grecus habet, ευφωπον. Et profecto adverstis: sed nosti alid esse interpellare, alid postulare. Non cuin selemus dicere, postulant interpellaturi, sed interpellant postulaturi: veruntamen ex vicinitate verbum usurpatum, cu propinquitas ipsa imprecat intellectum, non est velut censoris notatione culpandum. Nam
24.—Having thus explicated the session of our Saviour, we are next to consider the description of him whose right hand he is set down, which seems to be expressed in the same terms with which the CREED did first begin, *I believe in God the Father Almighty,* and indeed, as to the expression of his essence, it is the same name of *God,* as to the setting forth his relation, it is the same name of *Father,* but as to the adjoining attribute, though it be the same word, it is not the same notion of *Almighty.* What, therefore, we have spoken of the nature of God and the person of the Father, is not here to be repeated but supposed; for *Christ is set down at the right hand of that God and of that Father,* which we understand when we say, *I believe in God the Father.*

25.—But because there is a difference in the language of the Greeks between that word which is rendered *Almighty* in the first article, and that which is so rendered in the sixth, because that peculiarly signifies authority of dominion, this more properly power in operation, therefore we have reserved this notion of omnipotency now to be explained.

26.—In which two things are observable: the propriety, and the universality; the propriety in the potency, the universality in the omnipotency: first, that he is a God of power; secondly, that he is a God of infinite power. The potency consisteth in a proper, innate, and natural force or activity, by which we are assured that God is able to act, work, and produce true and real effects, which do require a true and real power to their production; and in respect of this he is often described unto us under the notion of a *mighty* God. The omnipotency or infinity of this power consisteth in an ability to act, perform, and produce whatsoever can be acted or produced, without any possibility of impedi-

1 In the first Article it is Παντοκράτωρ, in the sixth Παντοδύναμος. See p. 72. And this distinction is very material, and much observed by the Greeks; as Dionysius Areopagita (whosoever that is) in his book De Divinis Nominiibus, in the eighth chapter, explicates the δυναμωμῖαν, or Παντοδύναμον, and in the tenth chapter Παντοκράτωρ, as two distinct names with different notions of God. Of the Παντοκράτωρ, which we have already considered, he gives this account: Τὸ μὲν γὰρ λέγεται, διὰ τὸ πάντων αὐτοῦ εἶναι παντοκρατορικὴν ἕδραν, συνεχόμεθα καὶ περιέχομεν τὰ ὅλα, καὶ ένδορύσαν καὶ θεμελίωσαν καὶ περισφέγγοναν, καὶ ἀφάγας ἐν ἐαυτῷ τὸ παράπτωμα καὶ ἀπετελόσαν, καὶ εἰς ἐαυτῷ τὰ χαθεῖσα, πρὸ τοῦ παντοκρατορικῆς, προέγγοσαν, καὶ εἰς ἐαυτῷ τὰ πάντα, καθάπερ εἰς μιθεῖα παντοκρατορικῆς, ἐπιστρέφονται καὶ συνέχοισαν αὐτὰ, ὡς πάντων ἑδραν παγκράτει τὰ συνεχόμενα πάντα κατὰ μίαν ὑπερέχουσαν πάντα συνοψίμα αἰσθησιολογείται, καὶ οὐκ ἐσθοῦμα αὐτὰ διεξεπέσουσα ἐαυτῷ, ὡς εἰ παρέτειλεν ἐστίς κυνούμενα παραπολεόθεν. But of the δυναμωμῖα he gives another account, as we shall see hereafter.
ment or resistance; and in this respect he is represented to us as an Almighty. And therefore such an omnipotency we ascribe unto him; which is sufficiently delivered in the scriptures: first, by the testimony of an angel, _For with God nothing shall be impossible_; secondly, by the testimony of Christ himself, who said, _With men it is impossible, but not with God_; for _with God all things are possible_.

Now be, to whom all things are possible, and to whom nothing is impossible, is truly and properly omnipotent. Thus whatsoever doth not in itself imply a repugnancy of being or subsisting, hath in reference to the power of God a possibility of production; and whatsoever in respect of the power of God hath an impossibility of production, must involve in itself a repugnancy or contradiction.

This truth, though confessed by the heathens, hath yet been denied by some of them; but with poor and insufficient arguments, that we shall need no more than an explication of the doctrine to refute their objections.

27.—First, then, we must say God is omnipotent, because all power whatsoever is in any creature is derived from him; and well may he be termed _Almighty_, who is the fountain of all might. There is no activity in any agent, no influence of any cause, but what dependeth and proceedeth from the principal agent, or the first of causes. There is nothing in the whole circumference of the universe but hath some kind of activity, and consequently some power to act (for nothing can be done without a power to do it); and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their several and various powers flow from the first of powers; and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend of any but an

---

1 Luke i. 37. 2 Mark x. 27. 3 The arguments which the Heathen used are briefly touched by Plutarch, but were more largely delivered by Pliny. _'Arqof'syv égor (φρασιν) ὅ ποντικός λήρος, σύν Καλλι-μάχῳ τῷ λέγοντι._

---

1 Luke i. 37. 2 Mark x. 27. 3 The arguments which the Heathen used are briefly touched by Plutarch, but were more largely delivered by Pliny. "_Εἰ Θεον οὐσία, ἵδι οὐκ ὥδε ἔχει τὰς αὐτὸς δυνάμεις τὰς ἂν θεοῦ τινVectorizer; "Plutarchus De Plac. Philosoph. lib. i. cap. 7. _Imperfecta vero in homine natura precipua solatia, ne Deum quidem posse omnia. Namque nec sibi potest mortem consciscere, si velit, quod homini deedit optimum in tantis vita peculiis: nec mortales interrnate douare, aut revocare defunctos: nec facere, ut qui vivit, non vixerit: qui honores gessit, non gesserit; nullumque habere in pretiora jus, praestequam oblivionis atque (ut facies quoque argumentis societas haec cum Deo copuletur) ut bis dena vigilant non sint, ac multa similiter efficere non posse: per quos declaratur hand dubie nature potentia, idque esse quod Deum vocamus." Plinius, Nat. Hist. lib. ii. cap. 7. Add unto these that objection of Elymas the sorcerer, recorded by Dionysius: _Κατὰ φρασιν Ἔλμας ὁ μάγος, Ἐι Παντοδύναμος ἐστιν ὁ Θεος, πῶς λέγεται τι µὴ δύνασθαι πρὸς τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς θεόλογον; Λοιπόν δε τῶν Παυλὸς ὄψαμαι, µὴ δύνασθαι τον Θεόν οινοτὸν αρήσασθαι._ — _De Divin. Nom. cap. 8._

4 _'Η ἀπεξοδύναμος τοῦ Θεοῦ διάδοσις εἰς πάντα τὰ ὄντα χωρεῖ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐστι τῶν ὄντων ὁ πνεῦμα ὧμία ἄρπηρται τὸ ἔχει τινὰ δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ νοεῖν, τὸ λογεῖν, τὸ αἰσθητοῖν, τὸ συνήκων, τὸ πεποίθηκεν, τὸ σύνειδον δύναμιν ἔχει καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ, ἡ θεϊκαν εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον δύναμιν, εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον ἐβαίνει τῷ ὑπερουσίῳ δύναμιν._ — _Dionys. Areopag. De Divin. Nom. cap. 8._
On the Creed. [Art. VI.

infinite essence, so all these powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite power.

28.—Secondly, God may be called omnipotent, because there can be no resistance made to his power, no opposition to his will, no rescue from his hands. 1 The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back? 2 He doth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou? 3 According to the degrees of power in the agent and the resistant is an action performed or hindered; if there be more degrees of power in the resistant than the agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, not wholly hindered or suppressed. But if there be no degree of power in the resistant in reference to the agent, then is the action totally vigorous; and if in all the powers beside that of God there be not the least degree of any resistance, we must acknowledge that power of his being above all opposition, to be infinite. As Jehosaphat said, In thine hand, O God, is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee? 4 From hence there is no difficulty with God to perform anything, no greater endeavour or activity to produce the greatest than the least of creatures; but an equal facility in reference unto all things; which cannot be imagined but by an infinite excess of power above and beyond all resistance. 5

29.—Thirdly, God is yet more properly called omnipotent, because his own active power extendeth itself to all things; 6 neither is there anything imaginably possible which he cannot do. Thus when God several ways had declared his power unto Job, Job answered the Lord and said, I know that thou canst do everything: 7 Now that must needs be infinite activity which answereth to all kinds of possibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extensively, in respect of its object, which is all things; for whatsoever effects there be of his power, yet still there can be more produced: intensively, in respect of the action or perfection of the effect produced; for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible is within the sphere of God’s omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatsoever is simply and absolutely possible, whatsoever is in itself such as that it may be; and so possible everything is

1 “Neque enim ob allud veracter vocatur Omnipotens, nisi quomiam quidquid vult potest, nec voluntate cujusplam creature voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus.”—S. August. Enchir. ad Laur. de Fide, &c. cap. 96.
2 Isai. xiv. 27.
3 Dan. iv. 35.
4 2 Chron. xx. 6.
5 “Nisi omnipotens esset, non uia altitudine, sed omni quaerahtia et quoniam invidia aliqua.”—Petrus. De Fide ad Petrum, cap. 3.
6 “Quis est omnipotens, nisi qui omnium potest?”—S. August. De Trin. lib. iv. cap. 29.
7 Job xiii. 1, 2.
which doth not imply a contradiction. Again, whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible, and therefore is not within the object of the power of God, because impossibility is the contradiction of all power. For that is said to imply a contradiction, which if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be. But it is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be at the same time and in the same respect, and therefore whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible. From whence it followeth that it may be truly said, God cannot effect that which involveth a contradiction, but with no derogation from his power; and it may be as truly said, God can effect whatsoever involveth not a contradiction, which is the expression of an infinite power.

30.—Now an action may imply a contradiction two ways, either in respect of the object, or in respect of the agent. In respect of the object it may imply a contradiction immediately or consequentially. That doth imply a contradiction immediately, which plainly and in terms doth signify a repugnancy and so destroys itself, as for the same thing to be and not to be, to have been and not to have been. And therefore it must be acknowledged that it is not in the power of God to make that not to have been, which hath already been;¹ but that is no derogation to God's power, because not within the object of any power. And he may certainly have all power, who hath not that which belongeth to no power. Again, that doth imply a contradiction consequentially, which in appearance seemeth not to be impossible, but by necessary consequence if admitted, leadeth infallibly to a contradiction. As that one body should be at the same time in two distinct places, speaks no repugnancy in terms; but yet by consequence it leads to that which is repugnant in itself, which is that the same body is but one body, and not but one. Being then a covert and consequential contradiction is as much and as truly a contradiction as that which is open and immediate, it followeth that it is as impossible to be effected, and therefore comes not under the power of God.

That doth imply a contradiction in respect of the agent which is repugnant to his essential perfection; for being every action floweth from the essence of the agent, whatsoever is totally repug-

¹ To γεγονός οὐκ εἶναι εὑδέχεται μὴ γενέσθαι 
διὸ ὁρθὸς Ἀγάθων.

Munum γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θεος στεριάκεται, 
Ἀγάντη ποιών ἄγο οὐ ἢ παρασχέμενα.

* Quisquis dicit, 'Si Omnipotens est Deus, faciat ut quae facta sunt, facta non fuerint;' non videt hoc se dicere, 'Si Omnipotens est, faciat ut ea quae vera sunt, et ipso quo vera sunt falsa sint.'"—S. August. Contra Vaali. lib. xxvi. cap. 5. It is grounded, therefore, to be true, which Pliny objects. "Deum non facere ut qui vivit, non vixerit; qui honores gessit, non gesserit." — Nat. Hist. lib. ii. cap. 7: as this proves nothing against omnipotency, because it is no act of possibility. Had the act objected been feasible, and God had not the power to effect it, then he wanted some power, and consequently had not been Omnipotent. But being [seeing] it is not want of power in the agent, but of possibility in the object it proved no deficiency in God.
want to that essence must involve a contradiction as to the agent. Thus we may say God cannot sleep, God cannot want, God cannot die; he cannot sleep whose being is spiritual, he cannot want whose nature is all-sufficient, he cannot die who is essentially and necessarily existent. Nor can that be a diminution of his omnipotency, the contrary whereof would be a proof of his impotency, a demonstration of his infirmity. Thus it is impossible for God to lie, to whom we say nothing is impossible; and he, who can do all things, cannot deny himself. Because a lie is repugnant to the perfection of veracity, which is essential unto God as necessarily following from his infinite knowledge and infinite sanctity. We who are ignorant may be deceived, we who are sinful may deceive; but it is repugnant to that nature to be deceived which is no way subject unto ignorance; it is contradictory to that essence to deceive which is no way capable of sin. For as it is a plain contradiction to know

1 “Neque enim et vitam Dei et prae-
scientiam Dei sub necessitate ponimus, si dicamus necesse esse Deum semper vivere, et cuncta prescire: sicut nec potestas ejus minuitur, cum dicitur mori fallique non posse. Sic enim hoc non potest, ut potius, satis possit, minoris esset utique potestatis. Recte quippe Omnipotens dicitur, qui tamen mori et fallit non potest. Dicitur enim Om-
nipotens faciendo quod vult, non patiendo quod non vult: quod ei si accideret, nequa-
quam esset Omnipotens. Unde propeterea quadam non potest, quia Omnipotens est.”
—S. Augustinus De Civitate Dei, lib. v. cap. 10. “Nam ego dico quanta non pos-
sit. Non potest mori, non potest peccare, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. Tanta non potest: quae si posset, non esset Omni-
potens.”—Author Sermon. De Temp. exix.

2 “Nuncquidnam mentitur Deus? Sed non mentitur, quia impossibile est mentiri Deum. Impossibile autem istud nuncquid-
im infinitatis est? Non utique. Nam quomodo omnia potest, si alliquid efficere non potest? Quid ergo ei impossible? Illud utique quod naturae ejus contrarium est, non quod virtuti arduum. Impossibile, inquitat, est ei mentiri; et impossibile istud non infinitatis est, sed virtutis et majestatis; quia veritas non recipit mendacium, nec Dei virtus levitatis errorrem.”—S. Ambrosius, Annot. in Num. “Si voluerit inuenire quod Omnipotens non potest, habent prorsus, ego dicam, mentiri non potest. Credamus ergo quod potest, non credendo quod non potest.”

3 This was the argument of Elymas the sorcerer before-mentioned, to which Dionys-ius gives this answer: ‘H εστιον άρησεις εκποποιως αληθειας Αστικν, ή δε αληθεια με εστι, και η της αληθειας εκποποιως του αυτου άρησεως. Ει τωνσυ ιαληθεια συ Άστικν, η

δε άρησεις της αληθειας του άνωτας εκποποιως, έκ του άνωτας εκποποιως ο Θεος ου δυναται και τη μη ειναι ουκ έστιν, ου συ της φατη, το μη δυναςαι ου δυναςαι, και το μη ειναι κατα στερησιν ουκ οδηγει. —De Dithm. Nim. cap. 8. Φαμεν δε και οτι ου δυναται αισχρα α αθεος, ετε εσται α Θεος δυναμενους μη ειναι Θεος: ει γαρ αισχρον τ ε δε ο Θεος, ουκ εστι Θεος. —Oktia. Contra Cele. lib. v. Jobius gives this solution to the same objection: "Α φαμεν μη δυνασαι το θειον, ταυτα των μητε άνωτων εστιν, μητε δυνατων ουκ υπε-

σταιναι το γαρ υπεστηκε το αρνησασθαι τον Θεον εαυτου, η τη τροπη, η τη της αγα-

θητης εκποποιως, η τη αληθειας ψευδος γενεσθαι; Παντοδυναιως δε υπεικαιται και λεγεται, ως τα τε πρεποντα αυτο και συ-

τηρια των δημιουργιατων πατα θαυμαζε

νους, ωτε βουλεται.—Joan. De Verit. Ipsarn. lib. iii. cap. 13, aruid Pios in Biblioth. Αυτο ο πατοελοτος φησι περι του Θεο και Πα-

τρος, "Εν οις αδιανοιαν ψευσασθαι Θεον ουκ ασθενειαν τινα καταγρον της παγκρατου δυναμεως, αλλα μεγιστην ρωμην, ωτε ανεπι-

δεικτος εστι το αρνησασθαι τον θειον ουκ εστι της αληθειας Πα-

τρη και αλλαχος δε ταυτην υμηραν την ενοικων εδω. 'Εαν αρνησωμενα αυτων, εκει-

νοι πιστος μενει αρνησασθαι γαρ εαυτου ου δυναται. Και τουτο γαρ ουκ ασθενειαν εστιν αποειδελεις αλλα ανπερβλητου ισχυρος, ητι ουκ εχωριζε την Θειον συνε θαυμ ουν αρνησασθαι. —Isidores Peliustota, Epist. 335, lib. iii. Theodoret, upon that place of St. Paul, “It is impossible for God to lie;” Ουκ ασθενει το αδιανοιαν, αλλα αγαν αυτο δεικνυων δυνατων. Ουτω γαρ, φησιν, εστιν αληθες, ως αδιανοια αυτου ευ δυνασαι γενεσθαι ποτε. Το δυνατον αρα (ια

λεγε, πον αδιανοιαν ου) της αληθειας Αδα του αδιανοια σημαινεται. And upon that, "He

cannot deny himself;" Παλαιον ου, το ου δυναται, της απειρου δυναμεως ιταρει δηλω-

τιων, &c.—Infal. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 13.
all things and to be ignorant of anything; so it is to know all things and to be deceived; as it is an evident contradiction to be infinitely holy, and to be sinful, so is it to be infinitely holy and deceive. But it is impossible for any one to lie who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Therefore it is a manifest contradiction to say that God can lie, and consequently it is no derogation from his omnipotency that he cannot. Whatever God cannot do, whatsoever is impossible to him, doth not any way prove that he is not Almighty, but only show that the rest of his attributes and perfections are as essential to him as his power; and as his power suffereth no resistance, so the rest of his perfections admit no repugnance. Well therefore may we conclude him absolutely omnipotent, who by being able to effect all things consistent with his perfections showeth infinite ability; and by not being able to do anything repugnant to the same perfections, demonstrateth himself subject to no infirmity or imbecility. And in this manner we maintain God's omnipotency, with the best and eldest, against the worst and latest of the heathen authors.2

Thus God is omnipotent, and God only. For if the power of all

---

1 Theodoret, having proved that there were many things which fell not under the power of God, at last thus concludes: Πολλὰ τοῖς ευρήκαμεν ἀδύνατα δύνατα τῷ Παντοδυνάμῳ Θεῷ. — Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ δυνηθῆναι τοιοῦτον, ἀπειροῦν δυνάμεως, οὐκ ἀσθενεῖς, τεκμηρίζον τὸ δὲ γε δυνηθῆναι, ἀδύναμοι δρῦσθην, οὐ δυνάμεως.—Οὐτὶ τούτων ἐκαστο- τοῦ ἄρπετον τοῦ Θεοῦ κρύπτει καὶ ἀναλ- λοίων.—Ibid. 3. And Origen, Contra Celts. lib. iii., gives this for the Christian's general rule: Δύναται καθ' ἡμᾶς πάντα ο Θεός, ἀπερ δυνάμεως, τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ ἁγάθου εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ σοφοῦ εἶναι οὐκ εξισταται. And the words of Celsus, though ill intended, are yet very true: Αὐτὸς γὰρ (ὁ Θεός) ἐστὶν ὁ πάντων τῶν ὄντων λόγος, οὐδὲν οὐκ οἴσι το παράλογον οὐδὲ παρ' εαυ- τῶν ἐργασάσαι; and so Origen in his an- swer confesses: Ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ’ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν οἴσι το παράλογον οὔτε παρ' εαυτ' ἐστὸν ἐργα- σάσαι ἑστὶν ο Θεός.—Contra Celts. lib. v. 2 It was the constant opinion of the most ancient Heathens, as appeareth by Homer, who expresseth it plainly: —

---

Χαλεπὸν δὲ τ' ἀφύσεων Ἀνδρατές γε ποντυίας: Θεῖοι δὲ τ' πάντα δύναμαι.—Od. K. 303.

And the same sense is attributed to Linus in a distich cited for his by Stobæus, but may rather be thought to have been made by some of the Pythagoreans. For this was the plain doctrine of Pythagoras, who taught his scholars to believe miracles, and to doubt of nothing said to be done by the gods, because all things were possible to them. Οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τὰ μὲν δυνατὰ τῶν

---

Of God the Father Almighty.
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things beside God be the power of God, as derived from him and subordinate unto him, and his own power from whence that is derived can be subordinate to none, then none can be omnipotent but God.

31.—Again, we say that God the Father is almighty; but then we cannot say that the Father only is almighty. For the reason why we say the Father is almighty, is because he is God; and therefore we cannot say that he only is almighty, because it is not true that he only is God. Whosoever then is God, hath the same reason and foundation of omnipotency which the Father hath, and consequently is to be acknowledged properly and truly omnipotent as the Father is. But we have already showed that the Son of God is truly God, and shall hereafter show that the Holy Ghost is also God, and that by the same nature by which the Father is God. The Father therefore is almighty, because the Father is God; the Son almighty, because the Son is God; and the Holy Ghost almighty, because the Holy Ghost is God. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God by the same divinity; therefore the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are omnipotent by the same omnipotency. The Father then is not called almighty by way of exclusion, but is here mentioned with that attribute peculiarly, because the power of God answereth particularly to the right hand of God, as being the right hand of power. The Father therefore is here described by the notion of almighty, to show that Christ, having ascended into heaven, and being set down at the right hand of God, is invested with a greater power than he exercised before; and that power which was then actually conferred upon him acknowledged no bound or limits; but all power in the ultimate extent of its infinity is given unto him, who is set down on the right hand of him who is God the Father: and, being so, is therefore truly and properly almighty.

32.—It is necessary to profess belief in God almighty: First, because the acknowledgment of his omnipotency begetteth that fear and reverence, submission and obedience, which is due unto his infinite majesty. Our God is a great God, a mighty, and a terrible; therefore terrible because mighty. I will forewarn you,
saith our Saviour, whom ye shall fear: Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; I say unto you, fear him.\(^1\) Three times we are commanded to fear, and one only reason rendered, but sufficient for a thousand fears, the power of him who is able eternally to punish us. God gave a general command to Abraham, and with it a powerful persuasion to obedience, when he said unto him, I am the almighty God, walk before me and be thou perfect.\(^2\) It was a rational advice which the apostle giveth us, Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time.\(^3\) And it is a proper incentive to the observation of the law of God to consider that he is the one law-giver who is able to save and to destroy.\(^4\)

33.—Secondly, the belief of God's omnipotency is absolutely necessary as the foundation of our faith. All the miracles which have been seen were therefore wrought, that we may believe; and never miracle had been seen if God were not omnipotent. The objects of our faith are beyond all natural and infinite power, and did they not require an infinite activity, an assent unto them would not deserve the name of faith. If God were not almighty, we should believe nothing; but being he is so, why should we disbelieve anything?\(^5\) What can God propound unto us, which we cannot assent unto, if we can believe that he is omnipotent?

34.—Thirdly, it is not only necessary in matters of bare faith and notions of belief, but in respect of the active and operative reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of Abraham the Father of the faithful, who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith giving glory to God, and being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform.\(^6\) The promises of God are therefore firm and sure, because he is both willing and able to perform them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to do what they have promised, or cannot do what they intend; in the first we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But being God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend

\(^1\) Luke xii. 5.  \(^2\) Gen. xvii. 1.  \(^3\) 1 Peter v. 6.  \(^4\) James iv. 12.  \(^5\) This was the argument which the Pythagoreans used, who believed many miraculous actions, which others looked upon as fabulous; because they would disbelieve nothing which was referred to the Divine power: and the reason of that was, because they thought all things possible to God, as we showed before. Τῶν τοιούτων δὲ (saith Iamblichus, having related several strange actions, either fabulous or miraculous) τῶν ἀρκουντων μυθικῶν ἀπομηνωμένων, \(\dot{\omega}\) μηδὲν ἀπεσταυνεῖ τὸ, τι ᾧ εἰς τὸ Θείον ἀνάγγειλεν. And whereas others looked upon them as weak and simple people for giving credit to such fabulous relations, Πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐχι αὐτὸς εὐθὺς εὐνοεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀπεσταυνεῖ. — IAMBICHUS De Vita Pythagore, cap. 23.  \(^6\) Rom. iv. 20, 21.  \(^7\) "In Dei promissis nulla est falsitas, quia nulla est [Omnipotenti] in facienda difficultas aut impossibilitas." — FULGENT, Ad Monim. ibid. 1, cap. 12.
by breaking his promises to deceive us; therefore if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the apostle, I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.\(^1\) I am assured that if I be a sheep and hear my Saviour’s voice, the powers of darkness and the gates of hell can never prevail against me, for it was the voice of the Son of God, My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand.\(^2\)

35.—Lastly, the belief of God’s omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as if God himself were not almighty, he could not effect. And therefore in that form of prayer which Christ hath taught us, we conclude all our petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgment, For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory.\(^3\) Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midst of all our temptations than that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that worketh in us.\(^4\)

36.—After this explication of our Saviour’s session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be supposed to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that Christ is set on the right hand of God the Father almighty. For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I assent unto this as a most infallible and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ ascending into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our redemption, did rest in everlasting happiness; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetual habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a judge and as a king, according to his office of mediator, unto the end of the world, according to that which he merited by his mediatorship, to all eternity; which hand of God the Father almighty signifieth an omnipotent power, able to do all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father almighty.

\(^1\) 2 Tim. i. 12.  
\(^2\) John x. 29.  
\(^3\) Matt. vi. 13.  
\(^4\) Eph. iii. 21.
ARTICLE VII.

From thence He shall come to Judge the Quick and the Dead.

1.—THIS article containeth in it four particular considerations, and no more: First, that Christ, who is gone from us, shall come again. Secondly, that the place from whence he shall then come is the highest heaven, to which he first ascended; for from thence he shall come. Thirdly, that the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is to judge: for from thence he shall come to judge. Fourthly, that the object of that action, or the persons whom he shall judge, are all men, whether dead before, or then alive; for from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

2.—For the illustration of the first particular two things will be necessary, and no more: first, to show that the promised Messias was to come again after he once was come; secondly, to declare how our Jesus (whom we have already proved once to have come as the true Messias) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

3.—That the Messias was to come again, was not only certainly but copiously foretold; the scriptures did often assure us of a second advent. As often as we read of his griefs and humility, so often we are admonished of his coming to suffer; as often as we hear of his power and glory, so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fancy with the Jews a double Messias, one the son of Joseph, the other of David; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of Judah; but we must take that for a certain truth which they have made an occasion of their error; that the Messias is twice to come, once in all humility, to suffer and die, as they conceived of their son of Joseph; and again in glory, to govern and judge, as they expect the son of David. Particularly, Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied of his advent, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his angels. And more particularly Daniel saw the representation of his judiciary power and glory. I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days, and

1 Or, "from whence;" the Latins sometimes inde, sometimes unde. And the Greek is ἐδε, unde, both in the ancient ms. in Sir Robert Cotton's library, and in the Creed of Marcellus. But, ἐκεῖθεν εἰρημένον, in the later ms. in Benet-College Library. Others neither ἐδε, nor ἐκεῖθεν, but πάλιν, as Justin Martyr: Πρεσβύτερος Χριστός Υἱόν Θεοῦ σταυρωθήτα καὶ ἀναστάτα, καὶ ἀνεληφθή λυθότα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ πάλιν παραγεγραμμένον Κρίτην πάντων ἀπόλοις ἀνθρώπων μέχρις αὐτοῦ Ἀδάμ.—Dial. cum Tych. § 132. Others, without inde or unde, only venit; as the Nicene Creed, εἰρημένον κρίνων, others, πάλιν εἰρημένον, or ἠχοντα πάλιν, and Fortunatus, leaving out inde venitutur, hath only judicatura vitae at mortuos. 2 Jude 14.
they brought him before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. This Son of man the Jews themselves confess to be the promised Messiah, and they take the words to signify his coming, and so far give testimony to the truth, but then they evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying that if the Jews went on in their sins, then the Messiah should come in humility, according to the description in Zachary, lowly and riding upon an ass; but if they pleased God, then he should come in glory, according to the description in the prophet Daniel, with the clouds of heaven. Whereas these two descriptions are two several predictions, and therefore must be both fulfilled. From whence it followeth that, being Christ is already come lowly and sitting upon an ass, therefore he shall come gloriously with the clouds of heaven. For if both those descriptions cannot belong to one and the same advent, as the Jews acknowledge, and both of them must be true, because equally prophetic; then must there be a double advent of the same Messiah, and so his second coming was foretold.

4. That our Jesus, whom we have already proved to have come once into the world as the true Messiah, shall come the second time, we are most assured. We have the testimony of the angels, This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come

1 Dan. vii. 13, 14.
2 R. Saadhas Gaon ad locum, speaking of the Messiah and the genealogy concluding (1 Chron. iii. 21) with Anani the youngest of the seven sons of Eileonai, the author asks this question, "And who is this Anani?" and answers it thus "This is the Messiah, as it is written, Dan. vii. 13: 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with Anani,' that is, the clouds of heaven;" Solomon Jarchi ad locum.
3 R. Aben Ezra, ibidem, speaking of the Messiah.
4 The author of Tavor Hammar, speaking of the Messiah, according to that of Daniel, "He came as the Son of man." This place is mentioned for one of the calculations which speak of the Messiah in the Midrash Tzillim, Psalm ii. And the Midrash upon Psalm xxl. 7: "The Messiah shall be among the clouds of heaven, and among the clouds of glory.

446

On the Creed. [Art. VII.
in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.\(^1\) We have the promise of Christ himself to his apostles, *If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself: ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away and come again unto you.*\(^2\) He it is which from the beginning was to come; that express prophecy so represented him, the name of Shiloh was obscure, but the notion of the comer, added to it, was most vulgar. According to this notion once Christ came, and being gone he keeps that notion still; he is to come again. *For yet a little while and he that shall come will come.*\(^4\) Our Jesus then shall come, and not only so, but shall so come, as the Messias was foretold, after the same manner, in the same glory of the Father, as the *Son of man coming in his kingdom.*\(^5\) This was expressed in the prophetical vision by coming with clouds, and in the same manner shall our Jesus come; for *Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.*\(^6\) Those clouds were anciently expounded by the Jews of the glorious attendance of the angels,\(^7\) waiting upon the Son of man; and in the same manner with the same attendance do we expect the coming of our Jesus, even as he himself hath taught us to expect him, saying, *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels.*\(^8\) And thus our Jesus as the true Messias shall come again, which was our first consideration.

5.—The place from whence he shall come is next to be considered, and is sufficiently expressed in the CREED by reflection upon the place whither he went when he departed from us; for he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, and from thence shall he come: that is, from and out of the highest heaven (where he now sitteth at the right hand of God) shall Christ here-

---

\(^1\) Acts i. 11.
\(^2\) John xiv. 3, 28.
\(^3\) Gen. xlix. 10.
\(^4\) "Ο ἐπιστάμενος ἤσαν ἢ τὸ ἱερὸν τοὐτὸ ἐπιστάμενος, he which did once come into the world to make that notion good, is still to be known by the same appellation, and therefore will come again. This was it which made the apostles ask that question, Matt. xxiv. 3: "When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Heb. x. 37.
\(^5\) Matt. xvi. 28.
\(^6\) Rev. i. 7.
\(^7\) As R. Saadias Gaon upon that place of Dan. vii. 13: מַלַּא לָהוּ מִין שָׁמַיִם וּמִין אֶרֶץ "The clouds of heaven, they are the angels of the host of heaven; this is the great majesty and power which God shall give unto the Messias." From hence is that exposition in Midrash Tillim, Psalm xxi. 7:

---

"Rabbi Barachia said in the name of Rabbi Samuel, One scripture saith, (Dan. vii. 13) 'And, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.' And another scripture saith, (Jer. xxx. 21,) 'And I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me.' Behold, in what manner! The angels shall bring him into the midst of them"
after come to judge both the quick and the dead. For him must the heaven receive till the time of the restitution of all things; and when that time is fulfilled, from that heaven shall he come. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God. Our conversation ought to be in heaven, because from thence we look for our Saviour, the Lord Jesus. Our high-priest is gone up into the holy of holies not made with hands, there to make an atonement for us; therefore as the people of Israel stood without the tabernacle expecting the return of Aaron, so must we look unto the heavens and expect Christ from thence, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels. We do believe that Christ is set down on the right hand of God: but we must also look upon him as coming thence, as well as sitting there; and to that purpose Christ himself hath joined them together, saying, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Thus shall the Saviour of the world come from the right hand of power, in fulness of majesty, from the highest heavens, as a demonstration of his sanctity, that by an undoubted authority and unquestionable integrity he might appear most fit to judge both the quick and the dead; which is the end of his second coming, and leads me to the third consideration, the act of his judging, From whence he shall come to judge.

6.—For the explication of this action, as it stands in this article, three considerations will be necessary: First, how we may be assured that there is a judgment to come, that any one shall come to judge. Secondly, in case we be assured that there shall be a judgment, how it appeareth that he which is ascended into heaven, that is, that Christ shall be the judge. Thirdly, in case we can be assured that we shall be judged, and that Christ shall judge us, it will be worthy our inquiry in what this judgment shall consist, how this action shall be performed; and more than this cannot be necessary to make us understand that he shall come to judge.

7.—That there is a judgment to come after this life will appear demonstrable, whether we consider ourselves who are to undergo it, or God who is to execute it. If we do but reflect upon the frame and temper of our own spirits, we cannot but collect and conclude from thence that we are to give an account of our actions, and that a judgment hereafter is to pass upon us. There is in the soul of every man a conscience, and whosoever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to do, and the subsequent or reflective conscience warns us

1 Acts iii. 21. 2 1 Thess. iv. 16. 3 Phil. iii. 20. 4 2 Thess. i. 7. Matt. xxvi. 64
what we are to receive. Looking back upon the actions we have
done, it either approves or condemns them; and if it did no more,
it would only prove that there is a judgment in this life, and every
man his own judge. But being it doth not only allow and approve
our good actions, but also doth create a complacency, apology, and
confidence in us; being it doth not only disprove and condemn our
evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us and breed a fearful
expectation and terror in us; and all this prescinding from all
relation to anything either to be enjoyed or suffered in this life: it
followeth that this conscience is not so much a judge as a witness,
bound over to give testimony for or against us at some judgment
after this life to pass upon us. For all men are a law unto them-
selves, and have the work of the law written in their hearts, their
conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile
accusing or excusing one another, in the day when God shall judge the
secrets of men.¹

8.—Again, if we consider the God who made us and hath full
dominion over us, whether we look upon him in himself, or in his
word, we cannot but expect a judgment from him. First, if we
contemplate God in himself, we must acknowledge him to be the
judge of all mankind, so that a man shall say, verily he is a God
that judgeth in the earth.² Now the same God who is our judge is,
by an attribute, necessary and inseparable, just; and this justice
is so essential to his godhead, that we may as well deny him to be
God as to be just. It was a rational expostulation which Abraham
made, Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?³ We may there-
fore infallibly conclude that God is a most just judge; and if he
be so, we may as infallibly conclude that after this life he will
judge the world in righteousness. For as the affairs of this present
world are ordered, though they lie under the disposition of provi-
dence, they show no sign of an universal justice. The wicked and
disobedient persons are often so happy, as if they were rewarded
for their impieties; the innocent and religious often so miserable,
as if they were punished for their innocency. Nothing more
certain than that in this life rewards are not correspondent to
the virtues, punishments not proportionable to the sins of men.
Which consideration will enforce one of these conclusions: either
that there is no judge of the actions of mankind; or if there be a
judge, he is not just, he renders no proportionable rewards or
punishments; or lastly, if there be a judge, and that judge be just,
then is there a judgment in another world, and the effects thereof
concern another life. Being then we must acknowledge that there
is a judge which judgeth the earth; being we cannot deny but

¹ Rom. ii. 14-16. ² Psalm lvi. 1. ³ Gen. xviii. 25.
God is that judge, and all must confess that God is most just; being the rewards and punishments of this life are no way answerable to so exact a justice as that which is divine must be; it followeth that there is a judgment yet to come, in which God will show a perfect demonstration of his justice, and to which every man shall in his own bosom carry an undeniable witness of all his actions.

From hence the heathen, having always had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man and of the exactness of the justice of God, have from thence concluded that there is a judgment to come. Insomuch that when St. Paul reasoned of righteousness and temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled. 1 The discourse of righteousness and temperance touched him who was highly and notoriously guilty of the breach of both, and a pre-conception which he had of judgment after death, now heightened by the apostle's particular description, created horror in his soul and trembling in his limbs. The same apostle discoursing to the Athenians, the great lights of the Gentile world, and teaching them this article of our Creed, that God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead; 2 found some which mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, but against the day of judgment none replied. That was a principle of their own, that was confessed by all who either believed themselves, or a conscience, or a deity. 3

1 Acts xxiv. 25. 2 Acts xvii. 31, 32. 3 This principle of a judgment to come, Justin Martyr propounds to the Gentiles, as generally acknowledged by all their writers, and as the great encouragement of his Apology for the Christian religion: 'Estei toisw' hymw 5 pei tis alphow theosbeias prokev-tai logw, hs oude, oimea, protimwteron tois akandwbus bion proqhmenous einai nevomw- tais, diai thn melilwpan metat thn telentwr toude thn bion esesvai krisw' hoi ov mnnon ois hemeteroi kata Theow kurtwoutws prwgonoi, prwothtai te kai nvmwthta, alla kai oi par' umwn nwmwstheies einai sofai, oi pougetai mnnon, alla kai phlwsofoi ois thn alphw kai Theian evaggellemwnu par' wmin edeugw gnw- swnv.—Cohortatio ad Graecos, § 1. Tertullian shows the same, not only from the writings, but the constant conversation and language even, of the Gentiles: "Anima, licet car- cere corporis pressa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta, licet libidinibus ac con- cupiscientibus evigorata, licet falsis diis exan- ciliata, cum tamen resipiscit, ut ex cruspa, ut ex somno, ut ex aliqua valentudine, et sa- nitationem suam patitur, Deum nominat, hoc solo [nomine] quia proprio Dei veri. Deus magnus, Deus bonus, et, Quod Deus dederit, omnium vox est. Judicem quoque contes- tatur illum, Deus videt, et, Deo commendo, et, Deus mihi reddet. O testimonium ani- mo naturaliter Christianae!'—Apologia, ad. Gentes, cap. 17. Indeed the ancient Gentiles have expressed this judgment to come very exactly: as Philemon, cited by Justin Martyr, De Monarch. Del. § 3:—


And Plato especially hath delivered it according to their notion most particularly, whose places to that purpose are faithfully collected by Eusebius and Theodoret, and may be read in them: — Euseb. De Prep. Evang. lib. xi. cap. 38, et lib. xii. cap. 61; Theodoret. Serm. de Fine & Judicio; where after the citation of several places he concludes, Ovtws akribw episctewn o Pla- ton evnei t a ev boun krithia.
9.—But yet, beside the consideration of the eternal power of conscience in ourselves, beside the intuition of that essential attribute, the justice of God (which are sufficient arguments to move all men), we have yet a more near and enforcing persuasion grounded upon the express determination of the will of God. For the determinate counsel of the Almighty actually to judge the world in righteousness is clearly revealed in his word. It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment. There is a death appointed to follow this life, and a judgment to follow that death, the one as certain as the other. For in all ages God hath revealed his resolution to judge the world.

Upon the first remarkable action after the fall, there is a sufficient intimation given to angry Cain, If thou dost well shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou dost not well, sin lieth at the door; which by the most ancient interpretation signifieth a reservation of his sin unto the judgment of the world to come. Before the Flood Enoch prophesied of a judgment to come, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him. His words might have an aim at the waters which were to overflow the world; but the ultimate intention looked through that fire which shall consume the world preserved from water.

The testimonies which follow in the law and the prophets, the predictions of Christ and the apostles, are so many and so known, that both the number and the plainness will excuse the prosecution. The throne hath been already seen, the judge hath appeared sitting on it, the books have been already opened, the dead small and great have been standing before him; there is nothing more certain in the Word of God, no doctrine more clear and fundamental, than that of eternal judgment. I shall therefore briefly conclude the first consideration from the internal testimony of the conscience of man, from the essential attribute, the justice of God,

1 Heb. ix. 27. 2 Gen. iv. 7.
3 So the Targum of Jonathan renders it:
4 Jude 14, 15. 5 Heb. vi. 2.
from the clear and full revelation of the will and determination of God, that after death, with a reflection on this and in relation to another life, there is a judgment to come, there shall some person come to judge.

10.—Our second consideration followeth (seeing we are so well assured that there shall be a judgment), who that person is which shall come to judge, who shall sit upon that throne, before whose tribunal we shall all appear, from whose mouth we may expect our sentence. Now the judiciary power is the power of God, and none hath any right to judge the subjects and servants of God, but that God whose servants they are. The law by which we are to be judged was given by him, the actions which are to be discussed were due to him, the persons which are to be tried are subject to his dominion; God therefore is the judge of all. He shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil; and so the last day, that day of wrath, is the revelation of the righteous judgment of God. Now if God, as God, be the judge of all, then whosoever is God is judge of all men, and therefore being we have proved the Father and the Son, and shall hereafter also prove the Holy Ghost to be God, it followeth that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost shall judge the world; because the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in respect of the same divinity have the same autocratical power, dominion, and authority.

11.—But notwithstanding in that particular day of the general judgment to come, the execution of this judiciary power shall be particularly committed to the Son, and so the Father and the Holy Ghost shall actually judge the world no otherwise but by him. For God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained. It is God who judgeth, it is Christ by whom he judgeth. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son. There is therefore an original, supreme, autocratical judiciary power; there is a judiciary power delegated, derived, given by commission. Christ as God hath the first together with the Father and the Holy Ghost; Christ as man hath the second from the Father expressly, from the Holy Ghost concomitantly. For the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment because he is the Son of man; not simply because he is a man, therefore he shall be judge (for then by the same reason every man should judge, and consequently none, because no man could be judged if every man should

1 Heb. xii. 23.  2 Eccles. xii. 14.  3 Rom. ii. 5.  4 Πάσης τούτων ἐν τῇ κρίσει τότε ὁ Θεός.  5 John v. 28.  6 Acts xvii. 31.  7 John v. 27.
only judge), but because of the three persons which are God, he only is also the Son of man,¹ and therefore for his affinity with their nature, for his sense of their infirmities, for his appearance to their eyes, most fit to represent the greatest kindness and sweetness of equity in the severity of that just and irreproachable judgment.

12.—Nor was this a reason only in respect of us who are to be judged, but in regard of him also who is to judge; for we must not look only upon his being the Son of man, but also upon what he did and suffered as the Son of man. He humbled himself so far as to take upon him our nature, in that nature so taken he humbled himself to all the infirmities which that was capable of, to all the miseries which this life could bring; to all the pains and sorrows which the sins of all the world could cause; and therefore in regard of his humiliation did God exalt him, and part of the exaltation due unto him was this power of judging. The Father therefore, who is only God, and never took upon him either the nature of men or angels, judgeth no man (and the same reason reacheth also the Holy Ghost), but hath committed all judgment to the Son; and the reason why he hath committed it to him is because he is not only the Son of God, and so truly God, but also the Son

¹ This explication I thought necessary to insert, because it seems to me the only way to end that controversy which is raised upon the interpretation of those words of St. John, which we ordinarily read thus, verse 27: *Kai ἐξουσιὰν ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν τοιεῖν,* ὁτι Υἱὸς Ἀνθρώπου ἐστι. Verse 28: Μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. By which distinction, those words, "Because he is the Son of man," have reference to the precedent sentence. But anciently they have been otherwise distinguished: Καὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν τοιεῖν. Ὁτι Υἱὸς Ἀνθρώπου ἐστι, μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. So the old Syriac translation, v. 27: אֲנֻפָּר יַעְשֵׁהַ הָעֵבְרִי וְאִשְׁתֵּהוּ, וְאִשַּׁתִּי הָעֵבְרִי And St. Chrysostom is so earnest for this reading, that he chargeth the former distinction upon Paulus Samosatenus, as invented by him in favour of his heresy, that Christ was nothing else but purely man. Ὁτι Υἱὸς Ἀνθρώπου ἐστι, μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. Παῦλος μὲν ὁ Σαμοσατέως ὁ γὰρ σωτὴρ φρονοῦσα ἄλλα πως; Ἐξουσιαὶ ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν τοιεῖν, ὁτι Υἱὸς Ἀνθρώπου ἐστιν, ἄλλα ὑπεδιδήμα ἀκολουθὶα ἐξεῖ τοῦτο ὁ σωτὴρ λεγόμενον (so he argues against that reading); οὐ γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἔλαβε κρίσιν, ὅπως ἄνθρωπος ἐστιν (εἰπε, τί ἐκλείπει πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι κριτές;) ἀλλ' ἐπείδη θέλει ἡ ἄρχοντος οὐσίας τέκνων ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς, διὰ τοῦτο ἐστι κριτῆς. Οὕτω
of man, and so truly man; because he is that Son of man, who suffered so much for the sons of men.

13.—From whence at last it clearly appeareth not only that it is a certain truth that Christ shall judge the world, but also the reasons are declared and manifested unto us why he hath that power committed unto him, why he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. For certainly it is a great demonstration of the justice of God so highly to reward that Son of man as to make him judge of all the world, who came into the world and was judged here; to give him absolute power of absolution and condemnation, who was by us condemned to die, and died that he might absolve us; to cause all the sons of men to bow before his throne, who did not disdain for their sakes to stand before the tribunal and receive that sentence, let him be crucified; which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, Christ himself did show at the same time when he stood before the judgment seat, saying, Nevertheless I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

Again, if we look upon ourselves which are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before, rather than him who is of the same nature with us? If the children of Israel could not bear the presence of God as a lawgiver, but desired to receive the law by the hand of Moses, how should we appear before the presence of that God judging us for the breach of that law, were it not for a better mediator, of the same nature that Moses was and we are, who is our judge? In this appeareth the wisdom and goodness of God, that making a general judgment, he will make a visible judge, which all may see who shall be judged. Without holiness no man shall ever see God, and therefore if God, as only God, should pronounce sentence upon all men, the ungodly should never see their judge.  

1 John v. 22, 23, 27.
But that both the righteous and unrighteous might see and know who it is that judgeth them, Christ who is both God and man is appointed judge; so as he is man all shall see him, and as he is God they only shall see him who by that vision shall enjoy him.

Christ Jesus then, the Son of God, and the Son of man, he which was born of the Virgin Mary, he which suffered under Pontius Pilate, he which was crucified, dead, and buried, and descended into hell, he which rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and is set down on the right hand of God; he, the same person, in the same nature, shall come to judge the quick and the dead. For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works.1 He then which is to come is the Son of man, and when he cometh it is to judge. The same Jesus which was taken up from the apostles into heaven, shall so come in like manner as they saw him go into heaven.2 That Son of man then, which is to judge, is our Jesus, even the same Jesus, and shall come in the same manner, by a true and local translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead.3 He then which ascended into heaven was the same which was raised from the dead, and by that resurrection God assured us that the same man should judge us. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be the Lord both of the dead and living.4 It appeareth therefore by God's determination, by Christ's resurrection and ascension, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed judge.

14.—This office and dignity of the Son of man was often declared by several figurative and parabolical descriptions. John the Baptist representeth him that cometh after him by his delineation of an husbandman, Whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.5 The Son of man describes himself as an householder saying to the reapers in the time of harvest, Gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn: and this harvest is the end


of the world. He representeth himself under the notion of a fisherman casting a net into the sea, and gathering of every kind; which, when it was full, he drew to the shore and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. He is the bridegroom who took the wise virgins with him to the marriage, and shut the door upon the foolish. Lastly, he is the shepherd, and is so expressly described in relation to this judgment. For when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit down upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left. Being then the Son of man is thus constantly represented as making the great decretory separation, and the last judicatory distinction between man and man, as an husbandman separating the wheat, sometime from the chaff, sometime from the tares; as a fisherman gathering the good fish, casting the bad away; as a bridegroom receiving the wise, excluding the foolish virgins; as a master distinguishing the servants of his family, rewarding the faithful, punishing the unprofitable; as a shepherd dividing his sheep from the goats, placing one on the right hand the other on the left; it plentifully proveth that the same Son of man is appointed the judge of all the sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who shall be the judge, which is the second consideration subservient to the present explanation.

15.—Thirdly, it being thus resolved that the Son of man shall be the judge, our next consideration is, what may the nature of this judgment be; in what that judicial action doth consist; what he shall then do, when he shall come to judge. The reality of this act doth certainly consist in the final determination and actual disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternal condition; and in what manner this shall particularly be performed is not so certain unto us, but that which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judicatory process. In which first there is described a throne, a tribunal, a judgment-seat; for in the re-

---

2 Verses 47, 48. 3 Matt. xiv. 10.
4 Verses 19, 21, 30. 5 Verses 31-33.
6 St. Augustin, speaking of the particulars foretold to be exhibited at the day of judgment, concludes them in this manner: "Quae omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est: sed quibus modis et quo ordine veniant, magis tunc docebit rerum experientia, quam nunc valet consequé ad perfectum hominum intelligentiam." —De Civitate Dei, lib. xii. cap. 30.
He shall come to Judge

generation the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory: and
that this throne is a seat not only of majesty but also of judicature,
appeareth by the following words spoken to the apostles, ye also
shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. As in
that vision in the Revelation, I saw thrones and they sat upon them,
and judgment was given unto them. And I saw a great white throne,
and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled
away. This throne of Christ is expressly called his judgment-seat,
when the apostle tells us, we shall all stand before the judgment-seat
of Christ, and, we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ.
In respect then of the Son of man, he shall appear in the proper
form and condition of a judge, sitting upon a throne of judicature.
Secondly, there is to be a personal appearance of all men before
that seat of judicature upon which Christ shall sit, for we must all
appear, and we shall all stand before that judgment-seat. I saw the
dead, saith the apostle, stand before the throne of God. Thus all
nations shall be gathered before him. He shall send his angels with a
great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from
the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. For the coming
of our Lord Jesus Christ is our gathering together unto him. Thirdly,
when those which are to be judged are brought before the judgment-
seat of Christ, all their actions shall appear: he will bring to
light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the coun-
sels of the hearts; he will bring every work into judgment with every
secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil. To this end in
the vision of Daniel, when the judgment was set, the books were
opened; and in that of St. John, the books were opened, and the
dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books
according to their works.
Fourthly, after the manifestation of all their actions, there followeth a definitive sentence passed upon all
their persons according to those actions which is the fundamental
and essential consideration of this judgment; the sentence of ab-
solution, in these words expressed, Come ye blessed of my Father,
inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the
world; the sentence of condemnation, in this manner, Depart
from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and
his angels. Lastly, after the promulgation of the sentence fol-
loweth the execution. As it is written, And these shall go away
into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.

1 Matt. xix. 28. 2 Rev. xx. 4, 11. 12 "Dominus non accepta persona judicat
2 Rom. xiv. 10. mundum; unusquisque secundum quae fecit
Rev. xx. 12. accipiet. Si fuerit bonus, bonitas eum ante-
7 Matt. xxiv. 21. cedit; si nequam, merces nequitiae eum
9 1 Cor. iv. 5. sequitur."—Barn. Epist. cap. 4.
1 Dan. viii. 10. 14 Matt. xxv. 34. 15 Verse 41. 16 Verse 46.
13 Rev. xx. 12.
appeareth Christ's majesty by sitting on the throne, his authority by convening all before him, his knowledge and wisdom by opening all secrets, revealing all actions, discerning all inclinations, his justice in condemning sinners, his mercy in absolving believers, his power in his execution of the sentence. And thus the Son of man shall come to judge, which is the last particular subservient to the third consideration of this article.

16.—The fourth and last consideration is what is the object of this action, who are the persons which shall appear before that judge and receive their sentence from him, what is the latitude of that expression, the quick and the dead. The phrase itself is delivered several times in the scriptures, and that upon the same occasion; for Christ was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead;¹ and so his commission extendeth to both: he is ready to judge the quick and the dead;² his resolution reacheth to each: and as he is ordained and ready, so shall he judge the quick and the dead;³ the execution excludeth neither. But although it be the scripture language, and therefore certainly true, yet there is some ambiguity in the phrase, and therefore the intended sense not evident.

The Holy Ghost speaketh of death in several notions, which makes the quick and the dead capable of several interpretations. Because after death the soul doth live, and the body only remaineth dead; therefore some have understood the souls of men by the quick,⁴ and their bodies by the dead; and then the meaning will be this, that Christ shall come to judge immediately upon the resurrection, when the souls which were preserved alive shall be joined to the bodies which were once dead; and so men shall be judged entirely both in body and soul for all those actions which the soul committed in the body. Now though this be a truth that men shall be judged when the souls and bodies are united; though they shall be judged according to those works which their souls have acted in their bodies; yet this is not to be acknowledged as the interpretation of this article, for two reasons: first, because it is not certain that all men shall die, at least a proper death, so that their bodies shall be left any time without their souls; secondly, because this is not a distinction of the parts of man, but of the persons of men.

Again, because the scripture often mentioneth a death in tres-

¹ Acts x. 42. ² 1 Peter iv. 5. ³ 2 Tim. iv. 7.
⁴ So Theophylact testifieth; Τούς δὲ καὶ ταραχρίσαν.—Com. in 2 Tim. iv. 1. Indeed Isidore of Pelusia giveth this as the first Interpretation: Το κρίνεσθαι.
The Quick and the Dead.

pres and sins, and a living unto righteousness, others have conceived by the quick to be understood the just,¹ and by the dead the unjust: so that Christ shall judge the quick; that is the just, by a sentence of absolution; and the dead, that is the unjust, by a sentence of condemnation. But, though the dead be sometimes taken for sinners, and the living for the righteous; though it be true that Christ shall judge them both; yet it is not probable that in this particular they should be taken in a figurative or metaphorical sense, because there is no adjunct giving any such intimation, and because the sense affordeth a fair explication; further yet, because the scripture in the same particular naming the quick and the dead sufficiently teacheth us that it is to be understood of a corporeal death, Whether we live or die, saith the apostle, we are the Lord's: for to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.²

Thirdly, therefore by the dead are understood all those who ever died before the time of Christ's coming to judgment, and by the quick such as shall be then alive:³ so that the quick and the dead literally taken are considered in relation to the time of Christ's coming; at which time there shall be a generation living upon the face of the earth, and before which time all the generations passed

¹ This is the second exposition delivered by Isidorus Pelusitola to such as are not satisfied with the first: Ei de et alios ζητεις, οὕτω διακρίνεις, ζωντας, τοὺς ἀέεινων βίον καὶ θεωρής μετελθόντας, καὶ ἀποδόναι αὐτοῖς ἀπελευθέρωσεν ἄμαξάς, κρίναι τοὺς νεκρούς τούς ἀμαρτήμας, καὶ τὸ διόνυ τοὺς πάλιν ὡσ ἐν παρῷ τῇ ἐαυτῶν καταλεπτάντας παθηματικα, καὶ ἐμφάνιζαι αὐτούς,—Ibid. ² Rom. xiv. 8. ³ This is the third exposition of Isidorus Pelusitola: Ei de et alios, οὕτω, κρίναι τοὺς τότε ζωντας καταλεπτάντας, καὶ τοὺς ἀδικίας πρὸ αὐτῶν κοιμήσασθαι.—Lib. i. Ep. 222. Others of the fathers give the second and the third explication, leaving it indirect, and preferring neither; as St. Chrysostom: Ἡγεί οἱ μισσικα τοὺς ἐκκαίνιαν, ήτοι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους καὶ τοὺς σὺν ὄντας, ὅτι τούτοις καταλεπθούνται ζωντες.—Com. in 2 Tim. in 1. "Dioebus autem modis accepit potest, quod vivos et mortuos judicaret: sive ut vivos intelligamus, quos hic nondum mortuos, sed adhuc in ista carne viventes inventurus est ejus adventus; mortuos autem, qui de corpore, primum veniant, exierunt vel exitur sint: sive vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos; quoniam justi quoque judicabantur."—S. Augustini Enchir. cap. 54. "Credimus etiam unde venirem conveniens tasstimo tempore, et judicaturus vivos et mortuos; sive istus nominibus justi et pecatores significatur; sive quos tunc ante mortem in terris inventurum est appellati sint vivi, mortui vero qui in ejus adventu resur-rectur sunt."—Idem, De Fide et Synb. cap. 8. "Inde veniunt judicavere vivos et mortuos. Vivos, qui superierint; mortuos, qui praecesserint. Postet et sic intelligi: vivos, justos; mortuos, injustos: utrosque enim judicet, sua culpa retributionem. Justis dicturus est in judicio, Venite, benedicti, de, —Sinistris quid? In fine ipse, de. Sic judicabuntur a Christo vivi et mortui."—Author Lib. i. De Symbolo ad Catechum. cap. 4. "Dioebus modis haec sententia accipitur: vivi et mortui in anima; item vivi et mortui in corpore. Secundum priorem, judicabit vivos in anima, credentes; et mortuos in anima, fidem nullam habentes; secundum posteriorem, judicabit vivos in carne, quos praesens invenerit ejus adventus; judicabit et mortuos in carne, quos resuscitetur in Deum Excebus."—Author Lib. iv. De Symbol. ad Catechum. cap. 8. But although these two expositions were thus indirectly proposed, yet the former ought by no means so to be received as any way to evacuate or prejudice the latter. "Quod autem dicimus in Symbolo, in adventu Domini vivos ac mortuos judicandos; non solum justos et peccatores significari, (sicut Dioebus putat,) sed et vivos eos qui in carne inveniendi sunt, credimus, quia adhuc moriturum creduntur, vel immutandi sunt, ut ali volent, ut suscitant continuo, vel reformat, cum ante mortuos judicentur."—Gennadius De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis cap. 8.
since the creation of the world shall be numbered among the dead. And this undoubtedly is the proper and literal sense of the article, that Christ shall come to judge not only those which shall be alive upon the earth at his appearing, but also all such as have lived and died before. None shall be then judged while they are dead: whosoever stand before the judgment-seat shall appear alive; but those which never died shall be judged as they were alive; those which were dead before, that they may be judged, shall rise to life. He shall judge, therefore, the quick, that is those which shall be then alive when he cometh, and he shall judge the dead, that is those which at the same time shall oe raised from the dead.

17.—The only doubt remaining in this interpretation is, whether those shall be found alive when our Saviour cometh shall still so continue till they come to judgment; or upon his first appearance they shall die, and after death revive, and so together with all those which rise out of their graves, appear before the judgment-seat. The consideration of our mortality and the cause thereof (that it is appointed for all men once to die, in that death hath passed upon all,) might persuade us that the last generation of mankind should taste of death as well as all the rest that went before it; and therefore it hath been thought, especially of late, that those whom Christ at his coming finds alive shall immediately die; and after a sudden and universal expiration shall be restored to life again, and joined with the rest whom the graves shall render, that all may be partakers of the resurrection.

But the apostle's mentioneth of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea rather excluseth it. For we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the

---

1 This is the clear interpretation of Theodoret, without the least mention of any other: Nekrois kai εώντας Κριτην των Κύριον κεκληκεν, ετειθα και τους νεκρους άνιστραι, και εις το κρητηριαν άγει, και τους κατα των της σωματειας καιρων ευρισκομενους ενυδων την αφθοραιαν, απαιτει τας ευθυνας. Πάντες γαρ, φησιν, ου κοιμηθησομεθα, πάντες δε αλλαγησομεθα.—Com. in 2 Timoth. iv. 1. "Vivi agnoscentur qui in corpore crunt in adventu Domini, mortui qui ex hac iucne migraverunt." — AUCTOR Expos. Symb. sub nomine S. Chrysost.

2 This is cleared by the author of the Questions and Answers under the name of Justin Martyr: Ει το της αναστασεως δωρον πασι τοις θεονομουν δ Θεος διδοναι υπεσχετο, και παντες εκ των ταφων αναστασες της Κριτη παριστασθαι μελλουσαι, ποις πληρωθησει το, κρινων νεκρους και ζωντας τον Κυριον; Πως δε νεκροι κρινθηναι διαθητησαι, ον τα μεν σωματα ενυδων συνεπαιται, αι δε φυσι των σωματων κεφαλαιειναι εισιν; Resp. Ου παντες, φησιν, κοιμηθησομεθα; κρινειν ουν ζωνται μεν, τους της ζωντων νεκρων δε, τους ανεσταμενους εκ των νεκρων. — Quos. 109.

3 Omnimenum hominum erit resurrectionis. Si omnium erit, ergo omnes moriuntur, ut mors ab Adam ducta omnibus filiis ejus domincur; et maneat illud privilegium in Domino, quod de eo specialiter dictum, Non dabis Sanctum tuum videre corruptionem. Hanc rationem maximam patrum turbata tradente susceplimus." — GENNADIUS Μ on Dogmat. Exod. cap. 7.
The Quick and the Dead. 

In which words they which remain unto the coming of the Lord, are not said to die or to rise from the dead, but are distinguished from those which are asleep and rise first; yea being alive are caught up together with them, having not tasted death.

The same is farther confirmed by the same apostle, saying, Behold I show you a mystery, we shall not all sleep but we shall all be changed. Which being added to the former puttheth this doctrine out of question: for the living which remain at the coming of Christ are opposed to them which are asleep, and the opposition consists in this, that they shall not sleep; which sleep is not opposed to a long death but to death itself, as it followeth, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we (which shall not sleep) shall be changed, so that their mutation shall be unto them as a resurrection. And the collation of these two scriptures maketh up this conclusion so manifestly, that I conceive no man had ever doubted or questioned

1 Thess. iv. 15-17.
2 This is the observation of St. Epiphanius, who from these words proves as much: for, having repeated the text, he thus infers: 'Από τῶν συνεξεμάντων ἐκστάσεις λέονς ἐστιν ίδέα τὰ εἰπεῖρα. διαιρώ γὰρ ὁ ἀγός ἀπόστολος τῶν ὑπὸ πρόσω τοῦ εἰδός, εἰς μιᾶν ἑλπίδα συνήγαγεν, ἀπὸ τούτου, Ἥμεις ἀρπαγμόσφυλα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς συνάπτησιν αὐτοῦ ἑνὶ ἐνερ γίνετο τοῦ τούτο τοῦ σῶμα, καὶ μὴ ἤτερον παρὰ τοῦτον ὁ γὰρ ἁρμανεσ εὖσα πηθάνειν.'—Irenæus. ix. 9. 70.
3 1 Cor. xv. 51. 4 Verso 52.
4 "Nam et in hoc ingeniosunum, domitii nostrum, quod de ceclo est, superindul desiderantes: sitiudum indui et non nudi inveniamur: id est, ante volumus superinduire virtutem coelestem aternitatis, quam canem exanamur. Hujus enim gratiae privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini diaprehendentre in carne, et preter duritas temporum antichristi merebuntur, compen dio mortis per deponentationem expunctae, ec tc excurrere cum resurgentibus, sicut Thessalonicienses scripti."—Tertull. De Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 41. "Sancti, qui die consummationis atquejudicii in corporibus reperi endi sunt, cum aliis sanctis, qui ex mortuis resurrecturi sunt, rapientur in nubibus obviam Christo in æve, et non gustabant mortem, eruntque semper cum Domino, gravis sima mortis necessitate calcata: unde ait apostolus, Omnes qui dixium non dormientes, omnes autem immutabimur."—Theod. Hæclocetes, Com. ad loc. opud S. Hieron. Epist. 152. "Apolllinaris, liceat aliis verbis, edam, que Theodorus, assurit; quodam non esse mortuoros, sed de præsentia vitæ rapie ndos in futurum; ut, mutatis glorificatis que corporebus, sint cum Christo."—S. Hieron. ibid. "O δὲ λέγει τὸν ἅγιον: Οὐ πάντες μὲν ἁπαθανομέθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλα γημομέθα, καὶ οἱ μὴ ἁπαθηθασκόντες: θυντοί γὰρ κἀκεῖνοι. Μη τοῖνυς ἐπειδῆ ἀποθνησκόμενοι, διὰ τοῦτο δείχτες, ἕρησιν, ὡς οὐκ ἀνάστροφον ἐστίν, γάρ, τίνες εἰσίν; οὐ καὶ τοῦτα διαβεβεβηκαίντα καὶ ὁμοὺς οὐκ ἀρκεῖ τοῦτοι αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐκείνην, αὖ δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνα τὰ σωματα τὰ μὴ ἀποθνησκότα αὐλαγάνη, καὶ εἰς ἀφθονίας μετατείνεται."—S. Cyprianus, ad locum. So St. Jerome speaking of that place, I Thess. iv.: "Hoc ex ipsius loci continentiae scribi potest, quod sancti, qui in adventu Salvatoris fuerint deprehensi in corpore, in hisdem corporibus occurring et, ita tamen ut inioriorum, et corrigivm, et mori tule, gloriam, et incorruptibile, et immortalitate mutetur: ut, qualia corpora mortuorum resurrectura sint, in talem substantiam etiam virorum corpora transformatur."—S. Hieron. Epist. 148 ad Marcell. And St. Augus tin, in relation to the same place: "Re ver, quantum ad verba beati apostoli pertin et, videtur assere quodam in fine seculi adventiente Domino, cum futura est resur rectio mortuorum, non esse mortuos, sed vives repertos, in illam immortalitatem, que sanctis etiam ceteris datur, repente mutan dos, et simul cum aliis rapiendos, sicut dicit in nubibus. Nec aliqui aliud mihi visum est, quoies de his verbis volui cogitare."—S. Augustin. Ad tertiam Quast. Dulcitii. These and others of the ancients have clearly delivered this truth; so that Gennadius, notwithstanding his maxima patrum turba for the contrary, did well confess, "Verum quia sunt et aliis aquiri catholic et erudit viri, qui credunt, animam in corpore manente, immutandos ad incorruptionem et immortalitatem eos qui in adventu Domini vivi inveniendi sunt; et hoc eis reputari pro resurrectione ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem præsens vitæ immutazione deponent, non morte: quolibet quis acquisisset modo, non est hæreticus, nis ex contentione hæreticus fiat."—De Domo. Eccles. cap. 7.
On the Creed. [Art. VII.

the truth of it, had they not first differed in the reading of the text."

Wherefore being the place to the Thessalonians sufficiently proves it of itself, being that to the Corinthians, as we read it, incivically confirmeth the same truth, I conclude that the living when Christ shall come, are properly distinguished from all those which die

1 There have been observed three several readings of that place, 1 Cor. xv. 51; one of the Latin, two of the Greek. "Illd autem breviter in fine commoneo, hoc, quod in Latinis codicibus legitur, Omnes quidem resurgam, non omnes autem immutabimur, in Graecis voluminibus non haberi; sed vel, Omnes dornimius, non autem omnes immutabimur; vel, Non omnes dormienius, omnes autem immutabimur."—S. Hieron. Epist. 152. Indeed Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, doth not only acknowledge this reading, but saith it was in most copies: "Dicamus primum de eo, quod magis in plurimis codicibus inventur: Force, mysterium dico vobis: Omnes quidem dormiernius, non omnes autem immutabimur."—S. Hieron. ibid. The Alexandria ns, may confirm this lection, which reads it thus, Oi pantes meon ou kougethraswba, ou pants de allagn ofthe for the first ou is not written in the line, but above it. And the Ethiopic version to the same purpose, omnes nos mortiemur, sed non omnes nos immutabimur. The third reading, Non omnes dormiernius, ec. though it were not anciently in the Latin, yet it was frequently found in the Greek copies. Acacius testifieth thus much: "Transseamus ad secundum lectionem, que ita fertur in pluris codicibus: Non quidem omnes dornienius: omnes autem immutabimur."—S. Hieron. ibid. It was so anciently read in the time of Origen, as appeareth by the fragment taken by St. Jerome out of his Ευρήκτικα upon the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, (which he mentioneth himself in his second book against Celsus,) and by his words in the fifth against Celsus: Οιχυτολοβατ, μετα των απορων ελεγεων παρα το ἀποστόλων του Ισραη το. Ου παντες εκοιηθησινα, παντες δε αλλαγοτελεα. The same is acknowledged by Theodorus, Heracleotes, Apollinaris, Dihymus, St. Chrysostom, Theodore, Theophylact, and Cosmenius. The same is confirmed by the ancient Syriac translation: یلا فل نم فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل یلا فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل فل Фл as also by the Arabic. Being [seeing] then of the three readings but two: were anciently found in the Greek copies; ("Quaritis, quo sensu dictum sit, et quod modo in primâ ad Corinthios Epistolâ Paul apostoli sit legendum, Omnes quidem dormiernius, non autem omnes immutabimur; aut juxta quadem exemplaria, Non omnes dornienius, omnes autem immutabimur; utrum quod enim in Graecis codicibus inventur."—S. Hieron. ibid.) being [seeing] of those two but one is now to be found, and the Greek fathers successively have acknowledged no other; being [seeing] that which is left agrees with the most ancient translations we have no reason to doubt or question it.
before his coming; because death itself hath passed upon the one, and only a change different from death shall pass upon the other, and so conceive that Christ is called the lord and judge of the quick and dead, in reference at least to this expression of the CREED. For although it be true of the living of any age to say that Christ is lord and judge of them and of the dead, yet in the next age they are not the living but the dead which Christ shall come to judge, and consequently no one generation but the last can be the quick which he shall judge. As, therefore, to the interpretation of this article I take that distinction to be necessary, that in the end of the world all the generations dead shall be revived, and the present generation living so continued, and Christ shall gather them all to his tribunal seat, and so shall truly come to judge both the quick and the dead. 1

18.—To believe an universal judgment to come is necessary: first, to prevent the dangerous doubts arising against the ruling of the world by the providence of God, that old rock of offence upon which so many souls have suffered shipwreck. That which made the prophet David confess, his feet were almost gone, his steps had well nigh slipped; hath hurried multitudes of men to eternal perdition. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent miseries of the righteous, the frequent persecution of virtue, and eminent rewards of vice, the sweet and quiet departures often attending upon the most dissolute, and horrid tortures putting a period to the most religious lives, have raised a strong temptation of doubt and mistrust whether there be a God that judgeth the earth. Nor is there anything in this life considered alone which can give the least rational satisfaction in this temptation. Except

1 This was well observed by St. Austin: * Si autem in his verbis apostoli nullus alius sensus poterit reperiri, et hoc cum intelligi voluisse claruerit, quod videntur ipsa verba clamare; id est, quod futuri sint in fine seculi, et secundo adventu Domini, qui non expollentur corpore, sed superinduantur immortalitate. ut absque mortali a vita; buie sententiae proculdubio convenet, quod in regulari fideli confiteantur, ventrum Domi-
num, judicatrum vivos et mortuos: ut non hic intelligamus vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quamvis judicandit sint justi et in-
justi; sed vivos quos nondum exisse, mortuos autem quos jam exisse de corporebus, adventus ejus inventet."—Ad tertiam Quest. Dulciiti. And Origen long before did make the same exposition of these words, “That he might be Lord both of the dead and living.” (Rom. xiv. 9.) * Orac. yap ev tovtes, óv, ápexevn
 Ἰησούς, ὅπα νεκρῶν κυρεύση, καὶ ἀνέστη, ἵνα μὴ λάνον νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζωτῶν κυρεύσῃ. καὶ οἴδη γε ὁ ἀπόστολος
 μετος μέν, ὃς κυρεύει ὁ Χριστός, τοὺς οὕτω kateilegménous en tý prós Korvínwos pro-
téra. (Σαλησία γάρ, καὶ οἱ νεκροί ἑγερθή-
σονται ἀβάθαρτοι,) ζώοντας δὲ αὐτούς, καί
τοὺς ἀλλαγημαικούς, ἐτέρους ὄντας τῶν
ἐγερθηματικών νεκρών. Ἡμέρες δὲ καὶ περὶ
tou tov ἡ λέξεις οὕτως. Καί ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγη-
σμένα, ἐξῆς εἰρήμεν ἡ τώ, οἱ νεκροί ἑγερ-
θήσονται πρῶτοι. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς
θεσαλονίκης προτέρα ἐν ἑτέρω λέξει
τῆς αὐτῆς διαφορὰμ παραστάς, φθαίνου ἄλ-
lous μὲν εἶναι τοὺς κυομεμενούς, ἅλλους
de tōuς κωστᾶς, λέγων, τ. c.—Contra Cels.
lib. ii. Which exposition is far more proper than that of Methodius: 'Επὶ τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων παραληπτέων ζώοτων
μέν τῶν ψυχῶν, καθὼς ἄδανατοί, νεκρῶν δὲ
tῶν σωμάτων. —Phot. in Bibliothec. Cod. 234. And Ruffinus: "Quid autem dicitur
judicatrum vivos et mortuos, nisi quod alii
vivi, alii mortui, ad judicium veniant? Sei
anima simul judicabuntur et corpora. In
quibus vivos animas, corpora mortuos com-
navit."—Expositio in Synodum.
Psalm lxxiii. 2.
there be a life to come after such a death as we daily see, except in that life there be rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed than here they are, how can we ground any acknowledgment of an over-ruling justice? That, therefore, we may be assured that God who sitteth in heaven ruleth over all the earth; that a divine and most holy providence disposeth and dispenseth all things here below; it is absolutely necessary to believe and profess that a just and exact retribution is deferred; that a due and proportionable dispensation of rewards and punishments is reserved to another world; and consequently that there is an universal judgment to come.

19.—Secondly, it is necessary to believe a judgment to come, thereby effectually to provoke ourselves to the breaking off our sins by repentance, to the regulating our future actions by the Word of God, and to the keeping a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. Such is the sweetness of our sins, such the connaturalness of our corruptions, so great our confidence of impunity here, that except we looked for an account hereafter, it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, renounce his complacencies, and by a severe repentance create a bitterness to his own soul. But being once persuaded of a judgment, and withal possessed with a sense of our sins, who will not tremble with Felix? who will not flee from the wrath to come?¹ what must the hardness be of that impenitent heart which treasureth up unto itself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God?² We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills and the inclination of our own hearts: all external rules and prescriptions are burthen-some to us, and did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfy any other desires than our own; especially the dictates of the Word of God are so pressing and exact, that were there nothing but a commanding power, there could be no expectation of obedience. It is necessary then that we should believe that an account must be given of all our actions, and not only so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule of God’s revealed will, that God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel.³ There is in every man not only a power to reflect, but a necessary reflection upon his actions; not only a voluntary remembrance, but also an irresistible judgment of his own conversation. Now if there were no other judge beside our own souls, we should be regardless of our own sentence and wholly unconcerned in our own condemnations. But if we were persuaded that these reflections of conscience are to be so many wit-

¹ Matt. iii. 7. ² Rom. ii. 5. ³ Rom. ii. 16
fessses before the tribunal of heaven, and that we are to carry in our own hearts a testimony either to absolve or condemn us, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and endeavour above all things for a good conscience. For seeing that all things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God.\(^1\) Reason itself will tell us thus much; but if that do not, or if we will not hearken to our own voice, the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.\(^2\)

20.—Thirdly, it is necessary to profess faith in Christ as judge of the quick and the dead for the strengthening our hope, for the augmenting our comfort, for the establishing our assurance of eternal life. If we look upon the judgment to come only as revealing our secrets, as discerning our actions, as sentencing our persons according to the works done in the flesh, there is not one of us can expect life from that tribunal, or happiness at the last day. We must confess that we have all sinned, and that there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no proportion to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgment, as such, there can be nothing but a fearful expectation of eternal misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happiness. It is necessary, therefore, that we should believe that Christ shall sit upon the throne, that our Redeemer shall be our judge, that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigour of the law, but the mildness and mercies of the gospel; and then we may look upon not only the precepts but also the promises of God: whatsoever sentence in the sacred scripture speaketh anything of hope, whatsoever text administereth any comfort, whatsoever argument drawn from thence can breed in us any assurance, we may confidently make use of them all in reference to the judgment to come; because by that gospel which contains them all we shall be judged. If we consider whose gospel it is, and who shall judge us by it, \textit{we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;} \(^3\) for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren.\(^4\) As one of our brethren he hath redeemed us,\(^5\) he hath laid down his life as a ransom for us. He is our high-priest who made an atonement for our sins, a merciful and faithful high-priest in all things; being made like unto his brethren.\(^6\)

\(^1\) 2 Peter iii. 11, 12. \\
\(^2\) Titus ii. 11-13. \\
\(^3\) Eph. v. 30. \\
\(^4\) Lev. xxv. 48. \\
\(^5\) Heb. ii. 17. \\
\(^6\) 11.
is judge is also our advocate; and who shall condemn us, if he shall pass the sentence upon us who maketh intercession for us? Well, therefore, may we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him unto the throne of that judge, who is our brother, who is our redeemer, who is our high-priest, who is our advocate, who will not by his word at the last day condemn us, because he hath already in the same word absolved us, saying, Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.

21.—Having thus explained the nature of the judgment to come and the necessity of believing the same, we have given sufficient light to every Christian to understand what he ought to intend, and what it is he professeth, when he saith, I believe in him who shall come to judge the quick and the dead. For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much:—I am fully persuaded of this as of an infallible and necessary truth, that the eternal Son of God, in that human nature in which he died, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, shall certainly come from the same heaven into which he ascended, and at his coming shall gather together all those which shall be then alive, and all which ever lived and shall be before that day dead; when causing them all to stand before his judgment-seat, he shall judge them all according to their works done in the flesh, and passing the sentence of condemnation upon all the reprobates, shall deliver them to be tormentcd with the devil and his angels, and pronouncing the sentence of absolution upon all the elect, shall translate them into his glorious kingdom, of which there shall be no end. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead.

ARTICLE VIII.

I believe in the Holy Ghost.

In this article we repeat again the first word of the Creed, I believe: whereas a conjunction might have been sufficient, but that so many particulars concerning the Son have intervened. For as we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, so do we make confession of our faith, saying, I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and the ancients,

1 Eph. iii. 12. 2 John v. 21. digestis vocibus et literis Domini, admonet. 3 Sed enim ordo rationis et auctoris, nos post hae credere etiam in Spiritum
whose creed was something shorter, made no repetition of the act of faith, but only an addition of the object, And in the Holy Ghost. And as we repeat the act of faith in this article, so some did also in the second, I believe in Jesus Christ. 2 Wherefore being this word, I believe, is taken here only by way of resumption or repetition, and consequently must be of the same sense of importance of which it was in the beginning of the Creed, it may well receive the same explanation here which it received there: to that, therefore, the reader is referred.

For although the ancient fathers did frequently make use of this language to prove the divinity of the Spirit, and did thence argue that he is really and truly God; because we believe in the Holy Ghost; yet being that language is not expressly read in the scriptures in relation to the Spirit, as it is in reference to the Son; being to believe in the Holy Ghost, is only the expression of the Sanctum, olim Ecclesia repromissum, sed statutis temporum opportunitatis reditum. — Novatianus De Trin., cap. 29. Schleiermacher the Socinian, in his preface to the Polonian Confession of Faith, endeavoured to persuade us that this Article of the Holy Ghost is not so ancient as the rest; which being diametrically opposite to that original of the Creed which I have delivered, the baptismal words, "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," it will be necessary to examine his reason, which is drawn only from the authority of Tertullian: who in his book, De velando, Virg., recting the rule of faith, makes no mention of the Holy Ghost; and, De Præsc. flere., propounds this Article no otherwise, quam ut credamus Christum in eodem receptum sedevisse, et proximam promissionem mississe vicariam vm Spiritus Sancti. — Cap. 13. But this objection made for the novelty of this Article is easily answered. For Ireneus before Tertullian hath it expressly in his Confession, lib. 1, cap. 2, and calls it the faith in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum: and also declares, that the church received that faith, and preserved it, through the whole world.


2 As the ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus.

3 Gregory Nazianzen, disputing for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, propounded that he is no creature thus: 'Al'a e'm en ktimata, pos eis autò pistewomen; h en autò te-leoumena; Où yar totin epti pistewen ej ti, kai per autò pistewen to mèn yar esti Theòtws, to ò e'pi teòtws prágmatos.—Orat. 37. Epiphanius seems to speak thus much, showing that though the fathers of the Nicene council had determined nothing particularly of the Holy Ghost, yet they sufficiently show that he is God by those words: Kai eis Pisteus 'Agion. Esthws yar h èktwès òmologei, kai ouk arigetai. Pistewomen yar eis ena Theon Patéra Par-tokratora. To ò e'pi teòtws, ouk apòs eiprsta, alla hè pneuma eis ton h ena Kýro. Iosioin Xristo, ouk apòs eiprsta, alla hè Theon h hè pistes. Kai eis to 'Agion Pisteus, ouk apòs eiprsta, alla hè miàn doxologiai, kai eis miàn enosou Theòt- tos, kai miàn omousiostatis, eis trà teleia, miàn de Theòtta, miàn oustiai, miàn doxologias, miàn kawmòtattos, apò tou pistewomen, kai pistewomen, kai pistewomen, — Hilece, Ixiv. § 14. "Agnoscanam verbi ipsum privilegium. Credere illi quilibet potest hominum; credere vero in illum, soll debere de Majestati noveris. Sed et hoc ipsum aliquid est Deus credere, aliquid est credere in Deum. Esse Deum et diabolus credere dicitur, secondum Apostolum.—Num et daemones credunt et contrinemunt.—In Deum ergo credere, hoc est fidelius eum querere, et totum in eum dilectione transire. Credere ergo in illum, hoc est dicere, Confiteor illum, colo illum, adoro illum, totum me in Jus ejus ac dominium trado, atque transundo. In professor, haud reverteri, universal Divino Nomine, debita continentur obsequia." — Paschianus in Profin. Operis de Spiritu Sancto.
church contained in the Creed; being in the same Creed many of the ancients, without any reprehension, have used the same phrase in the following articles expressly, and, where the preposition is not expressed, it may very well be thought it was understood; therefore I think fit to acquiesce in my former exposition, and lay no great force on the preposition.

It will, therefore, be sufficient for the explanation of this article, if we can declare what is the full and proper object of our faith contained in it, what we are obliged to believe concerning the Holy Ghost. And as to this we shall discharge our undertaking, and satisfy whatsoever is required in this exposition, if we can set forth these two particulars, the nature and the office of that blessed Spirit. For the name of GHOST or GAST in the ancient Saxon language signifieth a Spirit, and in that appellation of the Spirit of God his nature principally is expressed. The addition of holiness though it denote the intrinsical sanctity essentially belonging to that Spirit, yet notwithstanding it containeth also a derivative notion, as signifying an emanation of that holiness and communication of the effects thereof; and in this communication his office doth consist. Whatsoever, therefore, doth concern the Spirit of God, as such, and the intrinsical sanctity which belongeth to that Spirit, may be expressed in the explication of his nature; whatsoever belongeth to the derivation of that sanctity, may be described in his office; and consequently more cannot be necessary than to declare what is the nature, what the office, of the Spirit of God.

For the better indagation of the nature of the Holy Ghost, I shall proceed by certain steps and degrees, which, as they will render the discourse more clear, so will they also make the reasons more strong and the arguments more evident. And first, as to the existence of the Spirit of God, it will be unnecessary to endeavour the proof of it; for although the Sadducees seemed to deny it, who said that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit;¹ though it hath been ordinarily concluded from thence that they rejected the Holy Ghost,² yet it cannot be proved from those words that they denied the existence of the Spirit of God, any more than that they denied the existence of God, who is a Spirit; nor did the notion which the Jews had of the Spirit of God any way incline the Sadducees, who denied the existence of the angels and the souls of men, to reject it. The resurrection, angel, and spirit which the Sadducees

¹ Acts xxiii. 8.
² As Epiphanius Πνεύμα Ἄγιον ὑπὲρ υἱόν οὐκ ἔχεις ἑαυτοῦ, ὅπως τοιαύτας περί αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίας. — Iren. xiv. And Gregory Nazianzus: Τὸ Πνεύμα τοῦ Ἁγίου Σαρακέντιος ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ διακήρυξε—Οὐασίδε ἑαυτῷ.
refused to acknowledge, were but two particulars, for it is expressly added that the Pharisees confessed both; of which two the resurrection was one, angels and spirits were the other; 1 wherefore that which the Sadducees disbelieved was the existence of such created spiritual natures, as the angels and the souls of men are conceived to have. And as for those disciples at Ephesus, who had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost, 2 if they were Gentiles, it is no wonder, because they never had that notion in their religion; if they were Jews, as they seem to be, because they were baptized with the baptism of John, it signifies not that they never heard of the Spirit of God, but only that they had not heard of the giving of it, which the apostle mentioned. As we read elsewhere, that the Holy Ghost was not yet; 3 not denying the existence, but the plentiful effusion of it. For, whatsoever the nature of the Spirit of God may be thought to be, no man can conceive the apostle should deny his existence before Christ's glorification, whose operation was so manifest at his conception. Howsoever, the apostle asked those ignorant disciples, Unto what then were ye baptized? 4 intimating that if they were baptized according to the rule of Christ, they could not be ignorant that there is a Holy Ghost, because the apostles were commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 5 It is, therefore, presumed that every one who professeth the name of Christ, from the first baptismal institution acknowledgeth that there is a Holy Ghost; and the only question consists in this, what that Holy Ghost is, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom according to our baptism we profess in the CREED to believe.

In order to the determination of which question, our first assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, described to us in the Word of God, and joined with the Father and the Son in the form of baptism, is a person. We are all baptized in the name of three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and the public confession of our faith hath relation to those three. We all confess that two of these, the Father and the Son, are persons; that which we now assert is only this, that the Holy Ghost, who is of the three the third, is also a person as the other two. That blessed Spirit is not only an energy or operation, 6 not a quality or power, but a spiritual

1 Tρωσατῶν δὲ, φασιν, ὑμολογοῦσα τὰ ἄμφότερα· καὶ μὴν τριά εἶστι· τῶν οὖν λεγέν δι' ἄμφότερα· η ὡς πνεῦμα καὶ ἐγενεῖς εἰς εἰστί·—S. Cyprianos, ad locum.
2 Acts xix. 2.
3 John vii. 39.
4 Acts xix. 3.
5 Matt. xxviii. 19.
6 To conclude the nature of the Holy Ghost, which is not so immediately expressed in the scriptures, it will be needful so to place our assertions, as they may occur to all other misconceptions. Now the old notions (and more they cannot now have) were thus delivered by Gregory Nazianzen, that great divine, so much concerned in this subject: Των δὲ καθ' ὑμᾶς σοφῶν, οἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαν τούτο (τὸ Πνεῦμα) ὑπέλαβον, οἱ δὲ κτίσμα, οἱ δὲ Θεόν, οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἐγρωσαν ἁπάντων τούτων, αἰδοὶ τῆς γραφῆς, ὡς φασιν, οὐ δεύτερον σοφῶν διηλώσασιν. These were the three particular and opposite opinions.
and intellectual subsistence. If we conceive it is an operation only,\(^1\) then must it only be actuated and not act; and when it is not actuated, it must not be at all. If we say that it is a quality, and not a substance, we say that it is that which we cannot prove to have any being. It seemeth to me strangely unreasonable that men should be so earnest in endeavouring to prove that the Holy Ghost which sanctifieth them is no substance, when they cannot be assured that there is anything operative in the world beside substantial beings, and consequently if they be not sanctified by that, they can be susceptible of no holiness. By what reason in nature can they be assured, by what revelation in scripture can they be confident, that there is a reality deserving the name of quality distinguished from all substance, and yet working real and admirable effects? If there were no other argument but this, that we are assured by the Christian faith that there is a Holy Ghost existing; and we cannot be assured, either by reason or faith, that there is a quality really and essentially distinguished from all substance; it would be sufficient to deter us from that boldness to assert the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, to be nothing else but a quality.

But we are not left to guess at the nature of the Spirit of God; the word of God which came from that Spirit hath sufficiently delivered him as a person. It is, indeed, to be observed that in the scriptures there are some things spoken of the Holy Ghost which are proper and peculiar to a person, as the adversaries confess; others, which are not properly and primarily to be attributed to a person, as we cannot deny; and it might seem to be equally doubtful, in relation to the scripture-expressions, whether the Holy Ghost were a person or no, and that they which deny his personality may pretend as much scripture as they which assert it. But in this seeming indifferency we must also observe a large diversity, inasmuch as the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is not always taken in the same propriety of signification: nor do we say that the Holy Ghost, which signifieth a person, always signifies so much. It is, therefore, easily conceived how some things may be attributed to the Spirit in the scriptures which are not
either the Spirit is an operation, or a created substance, or God; the fourth is but a doubt or hesitation which of the three is true. The first of these is thus propounded by way of question: Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιον, ὅ τοις καθ' ἐαυτῷ υφεστηκότων πάντως υποθέτει, ὅ τοις εἰς ἑτέρου ἑρωμένους, ὅ ποι ὁμοίως καλοῦσιν οἱ περὶ τούτων δενοῦ, τὸ δὲ συμβεβηκός. — Orat. 37. “Either it is subsisting in itself, as a substance; or in another, as an accident.” This was the first question then, and still is.

\(^1\) This is the argument of the same father: Εἰ μὲν οὖν συμβεβηκέν, ἐνέργεια τούτῳ ἀν εἰς Θεοῦ· τί γάρ ἐτεροὶ ἡ τίνος; τοῦτο γάρ ποιο μᾶλλον, καὶ θειεγε σύνθεσιν καὶ ἐν ἑνεργείᾳ, ἐνεργηθῆσαί διηλοκώτα, οὐκ ἐνεργήσατι, καὶ ὅμως τὸ ἑνεργηθήναι, παῦσαντας τοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἑνεργεία. Πῶς οὖν ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ τάδε λέγει, καὶ ἀδιάφορες, καὶ λυπεῖται, καὶ παροξυνόμεναι, καὶ οὐκ ἑνεργεῖ τοῦ σαφῶς ἀστίν, οὐ κυνήσεως; — Orat. 37.
proper to a person, and yet the Spirit be a person, because sometimes the Spirit is taken for that which is not a person, as we acknowledge. Whereas, if ever anything be attributed to the Holy Ghost, as to a person, which cannot be otherwise understood of the Spirit of God than as of a person, then may we infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a person. This, therefore, we shall endeavour fully and clearly to demonstrate: first, that the scriptures declare unto us the Holy Ghost as a person, by such attributes and expressions as cannot be understood to be spoken of the Spirit of God any other way than as of a person; secondly, that whatsoever attributes or expressions are used in the scriptures of the Holy Ghost, and are objected as repugnant to the nature of a person, either are not so repugnant, as is objected, or if they be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifies not a person.

First, then, the Holy Ghost, or good Spirit of God, is clearly and formally opposed to those evil spirits, which are and must be acknowledged persons, of a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. As, the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him. Now, what those evil spirits from the Lord were, is apparent from the sad example of Ahab, concerning whom we read, there came out a spirit and stood before the Lord and said, I will entice him: and the Lord said unto him, wherewith? and he said, I will go out and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets; and the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail; go out and do even so. From whence it is evident that the evil spirits from God were certain persons, even bad angels, to which the one good Spirit as a person is opposed, departing from him to whom the other cometh.

Again, the New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personal dispositions, and with such operations, as are as evident marks and signs of a person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, which are unquestionable persons, and whatsoever terms are spoken of the Spirit by way of quality, are spoken as well of those which are acknowledged persons. We are exhorted by the apostle not to grieve the Spirit of God, and grief is certainly a personal affection of which a quality is not capable. We are assured that the same Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered, and we can understand what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly personal; for he searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God, and so he knoweth all things, even the things of

1 1 Sam. xvi. 14. 2 2 Chron. xviii. 20, 21. 3 Eph. iv. 30. 4 Rom. viii. 26. 5 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.
God, which can be no description of the power of God; he worketh all the spiritual gifts dividing to every man severally as he will; in which the operation, discretion, distribution, and all these voluntary, are sufficient demonstrations of a person. He revealeth the will of God and speaketh to the sons of men, in the nature and after the manner of a person; for the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee. Arise therefore and get thee down, and go with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them: 1 and the Holy Ghost said unto the prophets and teachers at Antioch, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. 2 We cannot better understand the nature of the Holy Ghost than by the description given by Christ which sent him: and he said thus to his disciples, The Comforter (or the Advocate), which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world, and he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he shall show you things to come; he shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. 3 All which words are nothing else but so many descriptions of a person, a person hearing, a person receiving, a person testifying, a person speaking, a person reproving, a person instructing.

The adversaries to this truth, acknowledging all these personal expressions, answer that it is ordinary in the scriptures to find the like expressions, which are proper unto persons, given unto those things which are no persons: 4 as when the apostle saith, Charity suffereth long and is kind, charity envieth not, charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh none evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. 5 All which personal actions are attributed to charity which is no person, as in other cases it is usual, 6 but belonging to that person which is charitable;

1 Acts x. 19, 20. 2 Acts xiii. 2. 3 John xiv. 26; xv. 26, 27; xvi. 7, 8, 13, 14. 4 The present adversaries to this truth are the Socinians, and their opinion was thus first delivered by Socinus: "Quod in testimonio sacris, que adversarii citant, Spiritui Sancto actiones tribuantur, et ca quae personarum sunt propria; ex hoc nihil concluci potest, cum alius rebus, quas personas non esse constat, similiter in scripturis sacris actiones tribuantur, et ca quae sunt propria personarum. Cujus rei plenisestimam idem facere potest vel locus ille Pauli, 1 Cor. xiii. a ver. 4, usque ad 8, ubi perpetuo de charitate tanquam de persona aliqua loquitur, illi permulta tribuens quae revera non nisi in personam cadunt."— FAUSTUS SOCINUS, Responsio ad Wick. cap. 10. 5 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7. 6 So the Racovian Catechism doth enlarge this answer, stating the question thus: "Qui vero si scripturae loci accipienda sunt in quibus Spiritui Sancto actiones personarum propriae et ad Deum ipsum spectantes attribuuntur?" And returning this solution: "Ad eum modum, quo in scripturis rebus ilid
because that person which is so qualified doth perform those actions according to, and by virtue of, that charity which is in him. In the same manner, say they, personal actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no person, but only the virtue, power, and efficacy of God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; because that God the Father is a person, and doth perform those personal actions, attributed to the Holy Ghost, by that virtue, power, and efficacy in himself which is the Holy Ghost. As when we read the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee; arise therefore and get thee down and go with them doubting nothing; for I have sent them: we must understand that God the Father was the person which spake those words, and which sent those men; but because he did so by that virtue which is the Holy Ghost, therefore the Holy Ghost is said to speak those words and send those men. In the same manner when we read, the Holy Ghost said unto those at Antioch, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them; we must conceive it was God the Father who spake those words, who had called Barnabas and Saul, and to whom they were to be separated; but because God did all this by that power within him which is his Spirit, therefore those words and actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost. This is the sum of their answer; and more than this I conceive cannot be said in answer to that argument which we urge from those personal expressions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a person. But this answer is most apparently insufficient, as giving no satisfaction to the argument. For if all the personal actions, attributed in the scriptures to the Spirit, might proceed from the person of God the Father, according to the power which is in him, then might this answer seem satisfactory; but if those actions be personal, as they are acknowledged and cannot be denied, if the same cannot be attributed to the person of God the Father, whose Spirit it is, if he cannot be said to do that, by the power within

attributur sepemnumero quod personarum est, neque tamen res ille propterea persona sensetur; ut peccato, quod de desperit, et occidit; (Rom. vii. 11;) et legi, quod loquatur; (Rom. iii. 19;) et scriptura, quod prospiciat et pronuntiet; (Gal. iii. 8;) et charitati, quod sit longanimus, &c.; (1 Cor. xiii. 4-7;) denique spiritui, i.e., vento, quod spirit ut velit."—Cap. 6. Vide Socini Epist. 3, ad Petrum Statorium.  

1 Quod si quis dixerit atti constare Paulum eo in loco figurat eum, et charitatis nomine eum intelligere qui charitate est pruditus, quatenus eae est pruditus; respon- 2 2, cum Spiritus Sanctus sit Spiritus Dei, utamur; si alioqui spiritum alleluja pers- 2 Acts xiii. 2. non posse esse personam ab eis, eae est spiritus, distinctum, non minus constare, cum Spiritum Sanctum ab tribuntur, quam personae et simul Ipsi Dei sunt propriis, nihil aliud intelligentium nomine Spiritus Sancti esse, quam ipsum Deum spiritu suo, id est, virtute atque efficaciam, aegens et atque operantem."—F. Socini. Resp. ad Wiel, cap. 10. "Quoniam vero Spiritus Sanctus virtutem Dei est, hinc fit ut ca quae Dei sunt, Spiritum Sanctum attribuantur, et sub nomine Spiritus Sancti sapere Deum ipse intelligatur, quatenus suam virtutem Deum per spiritu summ exercit."—Catech. Racov. cap. 6.
him, which is said to be done by the Holy Ghost, then is that
defence not to be defended; then must the Holy Ghost be ac-
knowledged a person. But I shall clearly prove that there are
several personal attributes given in the sacred scriptures expressly
to the Holy Ghost which cannot be ascribed to God the Father,
which God the Father, by that power which is in him, cannot be
said to do, and consequently cannot be any ground why those
attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a person.

To make intercession is a personal action, and this action is
attributed to the Spirit of God, because he maketh intercession for
the saints according to the will of God. But to make intercession
is not an act which can be attributed to God the Father, neither
can he be said to intercede for us according to that power which
is in him; and therefore this can be no prosopopeia, the Holy
Ghost cannot be said to exercise the personal action of interces-
sion for that reason because it is the Spirit of that person which
intercedeth for us. To come unto men, as being sent unto them,
is a personal action, and so the Comforter, or Advocate, who is
the Holy Ghost, did come being sent; when the Comforter is come
whom I will send you from the Father, saith Christ; and again, If
I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart,
I will send him to you. But to come unto men as being sent,
cannot be ascribed to God the Father, who sendeth, but is never
sent: especially in this particular, in which the Father is said
expressly to send, and that in the name of the Son (whom the Father
will send in my name, saith our Saviour). When, therefore, the
Holy Ghost cometh to the sons of men, as sent by the Father in
the name of the Son, and sent by the Son himself, this personal
action cannot be attributed to the Father as working by the power
within him, and consequently cannot ground a prosopopeia, by
which the virtue or power of God the Father shall be said to do it.

To speak and hear are personal actions, and both together attri-
buted to the Spirit, in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed
to God the Father. When he, saith Christ, the Spirit of truth is
come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of him-
self: but whatever he shall hear, that he shall speak. Now to speak
and not of himself cannot be attributed to God the Father, who
doth all things of himself; to speak what he heareth, and that of
the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorify
him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as Christ
speaketh of the Holy Ghost, He shall glorify me, for he shall receive
of mine, and show it to you; is by no means applicable to the
Father; and consequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghost

1 Rom viii. 27. 2 John xv. 26. 3 John xvi. 7. 4 John xvi. 13. 5 John xvi. 14
I believe in the Holy Ghost.

is therefore said to do these personal actions, because that person, whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is, doth those actions by and according to his own power, which is the Holy Ghost. It remaineth, therefore, that the answer given by the adversaries of this truth is apparently insufficient, and consequently that our argument, drawn from the personal actions attributed in the scriptures to the Spirit, is sound and valid.

I thought this discourse had fully destroyed the Socinian prosopopeia; and indeed, as they ordinarily propound their answer, it is abundantly refuted. But I find the subtility of Socinus prepared another explication of the prosopopeia to supply the room where he foresaw the former would not serve. Which double figure he groundeth upon this distinction: The Spirit, that is, the power of God, saith he, may be considered either as a propriety and power in God, or as the things on which it worketh are affected with it. If it be considered in the first notion, then if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is there taken for God, and by the Spirit God is signified: if it be considered in the second notion, then if any personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is taken for that man in which it worketh, and that man, affected with it, is called the Spirit of God.

So that now we must not only show that such things which are attributed to the Holy Ghost cannot be spoken of the Father, but we must also prove that they cannot be attributed unto man, in whom the Spirit worketh from the Father. And this also will be very easily and evidently proved. The Holy Ghost is said to come unto the apostles as sent by the Father and the Son, and to come as so sent is a personal action, which we have already showed cannot be the action of the Father, who sent the Spirit; and it is as certain that it cannot be the action of an apostle who was affected with the Spirit which was sent, except we can say that the Father and the Son did send St. Peter an Advocate to St. Peter; and St. Peter, being sent by the Father and the Son, did come unto

1 "Credo me satis ostendisse, Spiritum Sanctum non esse personam, non magis quam alia vel proprietates vel effecta Dei sunt personae: cum nihil sit aliud quam peculiaris quaedam virtus et efficacia Dei: quae si, ut ipsius Dei proprietas, et vis per quam agit, consideratur et accipitur, figura metonymiae aut prosopopeiae accommodatissimus est locus; et metonymiae quidem, si Spiritus Sancti nomine ipse Deus, cuius est spiritus, quique per eum agit, significetur; prosopopeiae vero, ut quando Deus per Spiritum Sanctum agit, ipsi Spiritui Sancto Dei actio tribuatur. Sin autem hoc virtus et efficacia Dei consideratur et accipitur ut res in quibus agit ab ipso afficiatur, utrique isti figuras similiter aptissimus est locus; quandoquidem commodissime per metonymiam est, qui a Spiritu Sancto aliquo modo accipit quidpium agit, quatenus id agit, Spiritus Sanctus est Spiritus Dei metonymicè dici potest; ut factum est apud Paulum, cum ait, (1 Cor. ii. 10,) Spiritum (sub Dei) omnium scrutari, etiam pro funda Dei: ubi Spiritus Dei nomine sine dúbio intellecti hominem Spiritu Dei preedium, quatenus, videlicet, ab Isto Spiritu afficiatur. - Jam per prosopopeiam ipsi Spiritui Sancto actionem tribuit, quia ipsius Spiritus ope ab homine fiat, adeo est proelive ut nihil magis." - F. Socin. Resp. ad Wick. cap. 10.
St. Peter. Again, our Saviour speaking of the Holy Ghost, saith, 
He shall receive of mine, therefore the Holy Ghost in that place is 
not taken for the Father; and show it unto you, therefore he is not 
taken for an apostle: in that he receiveth the first Socinian pros-
opoeia is improper; in that he showeth to the apostle, the second 
is absurd. The Holy Ghost then is described as a person distinct 
from the person of the Father, whose power he is, and distinct 
from the person of the apostle in whom he worketh, and conse-
sequently neither of the Socinian figures can evacuate or enervate 
the doctrine of his proper and peculiar personality.

Secondly, for those attributes or expressions used of the Holy 
Ghost in the sacred scriptures, and pretended to be repugnant to 
the nature of a person, either they are not so repugnant, or if they 
be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it significeth not the person but 
the gifts or effects of the Spirit. They tell us that the Spirit is 
given, and that, sometimes in measure, sometimes without mea-
sure, that the Spirit is poured out, and that men do drink of it 
and are filled with it, that it is doubled and distributed, and some-
time is taken from it, and that sometimes it is extinguished; and 
from hence they gather that the Holy Ghost is not a person, 
because these expressions are inconsistent with personality. But 
a satisfactory answer is easily returned to this objection. It is 
true that God is said to have given the Holy Ghost to them that obey 
him; but it is as true that a person may be given: so we read in 
the prophet Isaiah, unto us a Son is given, and we are assured that 
God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, and cer-
tainly the Son of God is a person. And if all the rest of the 
expressions be such as they pretend, that is, not proper to a person, 
yet do they no way prejudice the truth of our assertion, because 
we acknowledge the effects and operations of the Spirit to have in 
the scriptures the name of the Spirit, who is the cause of those 
operations. And being to that Spirit, as the cause, we have already 
shown those attributes to be given which can agree to nothing but 
a person; we, therefore, conclude against the Socinians and the 
Jews that the Holy Ghost is not a quality, but a person; which is 
our first assertion.

1 John xvi. 14. 2 Spiritum Sanctum non esse Deitatis 
partem, hinc dissero; primum quod 
aeque Spiritui Sancto in scripturis attribu-
untur, nulla prorsus ratione, persona con-
veniant; ut sunt, quod detur, quod ex eo 
detur, iisque aut secundum mensuram, aut 
asbus omni mensura, quod effundatur ipse 
et ex ipso effundatur, et quod eo poten-
tur homines, quod augeat, quod in duplo 
detur, in partes distribuantur, tollatur ipse 
et ex ipso tollatur: et quæ illa ex scripturis ex-
tant."—Catech. Racco. cap. 6, quæst. 12.
3 Acts v. 32. 4 1 Sa. &. ix. 6.
5 John iii. 16. 6 6 The opinion of the Jews was, that the 
Holy Ghost was nothing else but the a\phi-
tus or energy of God; and therefore they 
which denied the substantiality of the Spirit 
were looked upon as symbolizing with the 
Jews in this particular. "Laetaniius in 
libris suis, et maxime in Epistulis ad De-
metrianum, Spiritus Sancti omnino negat 
substantiam, et errore Judaico dictum sermonemve
Our second assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is not a created, but a divine and uncreated, person. And for the proof of this assertion, we shall first make use of that argument which our adversaries have put into our hands. The Spirit of God which is in God is not a created person. But the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God which is in God, and therefore not a created person. This argument is raised from those words of the apostle, For who knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.¹ That this Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost I find denied by none. That the same Spirit is in God, appeareth by the apostle's discourse, and is granted by the Socinians; ² that it is so the Spirit of God, and so by nature in God that it cannot be a creature, is granted by the same. It followeth, therefore, undeniably that the Holy Ghost is no created person; inasmuch as that cannot be a created person which hath not a created nature, and that can neither have nor be a created nature which by nature is in God. Wherefore although it be replied by others that it is not said in the text that the Spirit is in God, yet our adversaries' reason overweighs their negative observation; and it availeth little to say that it is not expressed, which must be acknowledged to be under-

¹ Patrem referri, vel ad Filium, et sanctificationem utrisque personae sub ejus nomine demonstrari."—S. Hieron. Epist. 65. Moses Maimonides sufficiently declareth the opinion of the Jews, who delivering the several significations of מ"ל maketh the fifth and sixth to be these: "Quinto significat Influentiam illam Intellectualem Divinam a Deo prophetae instillatam, cujus virtute prophetaet. Sexto significat propositum, et voluntatem." And then concludes: "Vox hec מ"ל, quando Deo attribuatur, ubique sumitur partim in quinta, partim in sexta significatone, quatenus voluntatem significat."—Main. More Nevechim. p. 1. cap. 40.

² The Socinians, endeavouring to prove from this place, that the Holy Ghost is not a person, lay the foundation of their argument in this, that he is the Spirit of God, and by nature in God, so that those things which are proper to the divine nature are attributed and belong to him; and because there is another person in the divine essence, and, as they say, there can be but one, therefore the Holy Ghost is not a person. "Deinde idem (sillicit, Spiritum Sanctum non esse personam) ex eo patet, quod non sit extra Deum natura, sed in ipso Deo. Nisi enim natura Deo inesset, non potuisse Paulus Spiritum Dei cum spiritu hominis qui homini inest natura conferre, idque eo in loco. (1 Cor. ii. 11) ubi alt., Quis homo-

num novit qua sunt hominis nisi spiritus hominis qui est in homine? Ita quae sunt Dei nemo novit nisi Spiritus Dei. Quoniam vero Spiritus Sanctus in Deo est, nec tamen in Spiritu Sancto reciprocè dicit potest esse Deum, hinc appareat Spiritum Sanctum non esse personam. Praeterea cum superius demonstratum sit unam tamen esse in Delate personam, et Spiritus Sanctus sit Dei virtus, ut verba Christi ad apostolos indicant, (Luc. xxiv. 49,) efficitur Spiritum Sanctum non esse personam Divinam. Denique si Spiritus Sanctus esset persona, essentiam quoque Divinam eum habere operetur. Nam ea attribuuntur illi quae propria sunt essentiae Divinae: at superius docuimus substantiam Divinam unam esse numero, nec tribus personis esse posse communem. Quanobrem Spiritum non esse Deiatis personam planum est,"—Catech. Iacob. cap. 6. To the same purpose doth Socinus argue against Wickus, that the nature of the Spirit is the nature of God, and that the Spirit cannot therefore be a person, because there can be but one person in the nature of God. Whereas therefore, independently from this place, we have proved, that the Holy Spirit is a person; and from this place have inferred, with them, that the same Spirit is in God, and of the Divine nature; it followeth that he is no created spirit, inasmuch as nothing in the Divine nature can be created.
stood. The Holy Ghost then is a person (as I have proved), and is not of a nature distinguished from that which is in God (as is confessed, and only denied to be in God, because it is not said so when it is implied), therefore he is no created person.

Secondly, the Holy Ghost is such a one as against whom a sin may be committed, and when it is so, cannot be remitted. But if he were no person, we could not commit that sin against him; and if he were a created person, the sin committed against him could not be irremissible. Therefore he is a person, and that uncreated. The argument is grounded upon the words of our Saviour, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world neither in the world to come. By which words it appeareth there is a sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost distinct from all other sins and blasphemies committed against God the Father or the Son of God; that this sin hath an aggravation added unto it beyond other sins and blasphemies: but if the Holy Spirit were no person, the sin could not be distinct from those sins which are committed against him whose Spirit he is; and if he were a person created, the sin could receive no such aggravation beyond other sins and blasphemies.

To this they answer, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is not therefore unpardonable, because he is God, which is not to our purpose; but they do not, cannot show that it can be unpardonable if he were not God. It is not therefore simply, and for no other reason unpardonable, because that person is God against whom it is committed; for if so, then any sin committed against any person which is God, would be unpardonable, which is false. But that sin, which is particularly called blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is a sin against God, and in such a manner aggravated, as makes it irremissible; of which aggravation it were uncapable, if the Spirit were not God.

Thirdly, every created person was made by the Son of God as God, and is now put under the feet of the Son of God as man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the Son of God, nor is he now put under the feet of the Son of man. Therefore the Spirit

1 "Qui is det audient inter omnia numerat Spiritum Sanctum? quando ipse Dominus dixerit, qui blasphemaverit in Filium Hominis, remittetur ei; qui autem blasphemaverit in Spiritum Sanctum, nec hic nec in futurum remittetur ei. Quomodoigitur inter constructus audet quisquam Spiritum computare? Aut quis sic se obligat, ut ei creaturaderogaverit, non putet sibi hoc aliqua venia relaxandum?" — S. Ambrosii De Spiritu Sancto, lib. i. cap. 3. Matt. xii. 31, 32.
of God can be no created person. All things were made by the Word, and without him was not anything made that was made; therefore every created person was made by the Word. God hath put all things under the feet of Christ, and when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him; and being none is excepted beside God, every created person must be under the feet of the Son of man. But the Spirit of God in the beginning was not made, yea, rather in the beginning made the world, as Job speaks of God, By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens; nor is he under the feet of Christ, now set down at the right hand of God, who with supreme authority together with the Father sent the prophets, as Isaiah testifieth, saying, Now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me, and with the same authority, since the exaltation of our Saviour, sent forth such as were separated to himself, as appeareth in the case of Barnabas and Saul, and with the same authority giveth all spiritual gifts, dividing to every man severally as he will, so that in this kingdom of Christ all things are done by the power of the Spirit of God.

Fourthly, he, by whose operation Christ was conceived in the

1 John i. 3. 2 1 Cor. xv. 27. 3 Those which anciently did believe the Spirit of God to be a created person, did also teach that he was made by the Son, as Epiphanius testifieth of the Arians: Piasti touto dehun estin, oti omologouoous ton aggelous upo tou yios sunevnei, kai yap kai peri tou Pneumatos blasaqhdhsmos, kai toloymos legewn kextisqtha upo tou yios.—Iren. Ixix. § 52. 4 Ariani, ab Ario, in eo sunt notissimi errore, quo Pairum et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum nolunt esse unius ejusdemque naturae; sed esse Filium creaturam, Spiritum vero Sanctum creaturam, hoc est, ab ipso Filio creaturam, volunt.”—S. August. Iren. 49. 5 As Eusebius: To de Paraklhtov “Agion Pneumata, oute Theos, oute Yios: etei mi ei tov Patros omous to Yios, kai autou tov genishin elapher. 6 De ti ton deia tov Yios, genomwnos tuyxh, hti, de piata de autou elygeto, kai choroi autou elygeto oude ev. —De Ecles. Thcld. III. cap. 6. 7 O de Dios monos, patre fhmov. 8 Hsodoig incidence tsemonos, pouzikos ei eis kai emouarchias tis tov ygeiwv apataov, oraivos te kai oraoivos, kai de kai autis tis tou Paraklhtov Pneumatos upsardoiv. 9 Panta gar de autou elygeto, kai choroi autou elygeto oude ev. —Ibid. Where it is worth our observation, that Eusebius, citing the place of St. John to prove that the Holy Ghost was made by the Son, leaves out those words twice together by which the catholicks use to refute that heresy of the Arians, namely, o yegonoiv. All things which were made, were made by the Son; but the Holy Ghost was not amongst them as yegonoiv, which v mne made,” and therefore was not made by the Son. The "Agion yhor Pneumiva ktiymantov ktiymatos fasin einai, dia do, dia tov yios to panta gegevneitha, ois eipen h grafo, asunvovc tmais diaprasdavous, ou kados eirei tao rhotov elygetai, allla kawos uponwouc, kai ap to rhotov to kawos eiremenvon kato tnu kaiju autovn uponoic parapivenvontos: ou yor to Theos eluphasis perI tou Pneu- matov erh, allla peri patroiv tis ktiymatos, ou tis tis ktiymatos, dia tis tou Logou ge- g nephai, kai upo tou Logov. Ta yor panta de autov elygetai, kai choroi autov elygeto oude ev, parakteinoymenp tis anagwnumenos, eiceti "O yegonoiv, iverous, ou autov yegonoiv, ou autov elygeto, ou autov elygeto oude ev."—S. Epiphanivs, Iren. Ixix. § 56. 10 Job xxvi. 13. 11 Isai. xlviii. 16. 12 Taista panta energei to ev kai to autov Pneumata, diaironon iverous ekastov kados bouquetai. Kados bouquetai, iverous, ou kados prostatetivei, iverous, ou dieragonymen monethv, ou iverous ekdeivn, upokrhisenven tnu yhor autn, 'exousian, hiper emarturhpei tis Patrini, taunthk kai to Agion Pneumati ana- tithsui o Paulv, kai iverous epist tis Pato- rov yegonoiv. 'O de Theos estin to energei tis panta ev plastov, ouv kai ouv tis tou Agiou Pneumatos. Taista de plastov, yegonoiv, energei to ev kai to autov Pneumata, diaironon iverous ekastov kados bouquetai: iverous apetidmeran 'ex- oustov tnu yor h iverous mi, dhlon kai ouv tis ekdeivnetai mia kai ouv eisotonos h iverous, to- ton kai ouv daimous kai h iverous mna...—S. Cyril. De sanct. Gentilist. Iren. ii. 7 1 Cor. xii. 11. 8 Rom. xv. 10.
womb of the Virgin, was no created person; for by virtue of that conception he was called the Son of God: whereas if a creature had been the cause of his conception, he had been in that respect the son of a creature, nay, according to the adversaries' principles, he had taken upon him the nature of angels. But the Holy Ghost it was by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin. For it was an angel that said to Mary (not that an angel, but that), the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. Therefore the Spirit of God is no created person; which is our second assertion against the ancient but newly-revived heresy of the Arians and Macedonians.

1 Luke i. 35.
2 This express notion of the Spirit of God, that he was a person, as a ministering spirit, and created, was acknowledged the doctrine of the Arians, as may appear out of the former testimonies, and is evident by those which followed his opinions. Which being of two kinds, the Anomoeans, or pure Arians, (such as were Abitius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius,) and the Homoleousians or Semi-Arians, (such as Eusebius and Macedonius,) they both alike denied the Divinity, and asserted the creation, of the Holy Ghost. The opinion of the Anomoeans is clear out of the words of Eunomius, who very subtilely delivered it, as if it had been the opinion of the ancients. Tην των ἄγνως ἐν ὑμῖν φωλασσόντος διδασκαλίαν, παρά ὑμᾶς τριτὸν αὐτὸ ἀξιώματι καὶ τάξει μαθόντες, τριτόν εἶναι καὶ τῇ φύσει πεπειστείκαμεν. The confession of the ancients was, that the Holy Ghost was the third person in the Trinity in order and dignity; and Eunomius, pretending to follow them, added, that he was also third in nature; which the ancients never taught. And what this third in nature was, he thus declared: Τριτόν τάξει καὶ φύσει, προστάγματι μὲν τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐνεργεία δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γενέμων, τρίτη χώρα τιμώμενον, ὡς πρῶτον καὶ μείζων ἀπώνιω, καὶ μόνον τοιοῦτον τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ποίημα, Θεότητος καὶ δημιουργικῆς δύναμεως ἀπολειπόμενον. And again: Ἐι μή κύσιν ἐστίν, οὐκοῦν γενέμων, ἡ ἀγενέμων εἰς ἀναρ- χος Θεός καὶ ἀγενεμέων: οὔτε μή γενήμων, ἐπίστευται οὖν κύσιμα καὶ ποίημα αὐτὸ ὑμομοίωνο. — Aeph. S. Basil. Adv. Eunom. lib. iii. So Gregory Nyssen repeats the words of the same Eunomius: Πουσεδομένους εἰς τὸν Παράκλητον, γενέμων ἀπὸ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς, and declares that their ordinary language was ἄντι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Καίσαρος τιμώμενος καὶ τύμπανος καὶ ἐργὸν ἐργὸν ὑμομοίων.—Orat. 1 conf. Eunom. Besides these, the Semi-Arians, and some of those which were orthodox as to the Divinity of the Son, were of the same heresy as to the nature of the Holy Ghost, and therefore were called Πνευματομάγους, (as Ephiphanes derives them, in the description of that heresy, ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ ὅρθοδοξῶν.—Hereses. ii. 10.) and afterward Macedonians. "Macedonians are a Macedonian Constantinopolitan church, and others the Πνευματομάγους Graecid dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu Sancto litigant. Nam de Patre et Filio recte sentunt, quod unius sit unction substantiae vel essentiae; sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes." — S. Augustin. Heres. 52. This heresy was first condemned by the council of Alexandria: Ἐνετὰ τὸ Ἀγγεῖον Πνεῦμα θεολογησάντων, τῇ οἰκουμένῃ Τριάδι συναναλαμβάνοντο.—Soclat. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 7. Afterwards by the council held in Êlyricum: Ἰησοῦς δὲ ξεροφθέουσα λόγος καὶ οὐδενός εις τὴν γένεσιν ἑνὸς καὶ τῆς γένεσιν τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἀγγείου Πνεύματος, ἐν τρισὶ προσώποις, τριστήντως, ἐν τρισὶ τελείαις ὕποτάσσεσθαι.—Aeph. Theol. Patr. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. 8. The synod held at Rome with the Gallican bishops under Damasus: Ἡστε τοῦ Πατρία καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ μίας οὐσίας, μίας Θεότητος, μίας ἀρετῆς, μίας δυναμεώς, καὶ ἐνὸς χαρακτῆρος πιστεύειν χρῆ, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὕποτάσσεσθαι καὶ οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἀγγείου.—Aeph. Eundem. lib. ii. cap. 22. Another synod held under the same Damasus at Rome: Ἐνετὰ τοῦ Ἀγγείου Πνεύματος τὸν Ἀγγέλον ποιήμα, ἡ διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ γεγενήθη αἰώνακα έστω.—Aeph. Eundem. lib. v. cap. 11. After and upon these particular synods, this heresy was fully condemned in the second general council, held at Constantinople, in which these words were added to the Nicene Creed: Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀγγέλον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸ τοῦ Πατρός ἐκτελομένον, στὴν Πατρί καὶ Χριστὸν συμπροσκυνοῦμεν καὶ συμβασίζομεν ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις καὶ τὴν ἂνθρωπινὴν καὶ τὴν ἑλεομορφὴν εἰς τὴν Εὐδοκίαν...
The third assertion is that which necessarily followeth from the former two, that the Spirit of God, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is properly and truly God. For if he be a person, as we have proved in the declaration of our first assertion; if he be a person not created, as we have demonstrated in the corroboration of the second assertion, then must he of necessity be acknowledged to be God, because there is no uncreated essence beside the essence of the one eternal God. And there is this great felicity in the laying of this third assertion, that it is not proved only by the two preceding assertions, but also by the adversaries of them both. He which denies the first, that is, the Socinian, affirms that the Spirit of God is in God, and is the eternal and omnipotent power of God; he which denies the second, that is, the Macedonian, asserts that he is a person of an intellectual nature subsisting: but whatsoever is a person subsisting of eternal and omnipotent power, must be acknowledged to be God. Whether, therefore, we look upon the truth of our assertions, or whether we consider the happiness of their negations, the conclusion is, that the Holy Ghost is God.

But were there nothing, which is already said, demonstrated, there is enough written in the Word of God to assure us of the deity of the Holy Ghost, to make us undoubtedly believe that the Spirit of God is God. It is written by Moses, that when he went in before the Lord to speak with him, he took the veil off, until he came out. And that Lord with whom Moses spake was the one Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth. But we are assured that the Spirit was and is that Lord to which Moses spake; for the apostle hath taught us so much by his own interpretation, saying, Even unto this day when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit. The Spirit is here so plainly said to be the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the one eternal God, that the adversaries of this truth must either deny that the Lord is here to be taken for God, or that the Spirit is to be taken for the Spirit of God: either of which denials must seem very strange to any person which considereth the force and plainness of the apostle's discourse.

But indeed they are so ready to deny anything, that they will by no means acknowledge either the one or the other; but the
Lord must be something which is not God, and the Spirit must be something which is not the Spirit of God: and then they conclude the argument is of no force, and may as well conclude the apostle's interpretation hath no sense. The Lord, they say, is Christ, and not God; for Christ, they say, is not God: the Spirit, they say, is the mystery of the law, or the hidden sense of it, and that every one knows is not the Spirit of God. But we are assured that the apostle did mean by the Spirit the Spirit of God, not the sense of the law; for he addeth immediately, Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty, and the sense of the law is never called the Spirit of the Lord. Nay, were it not that the coherence of the discourse did satisfy us, yet the objection ought not at all to move us; for the name of Spirit in those places mentioned by them to signify the sense of the law hath no affinity with this, according to their own way of argumentation: for it is never so taken with the emphasis of an article, and put in the place either of an entire subject or a predicate in a proposition except by way of opposition; and one of those it must of necessity be, in those words of the apostle, Now the Lord is the Spirit, and that without the least intimation of any opposition.

Again, we are assured that by the Lord the apostle did understand the eternal God, for he speaketh of the same Lord which he mentioned in the verse before, and that is the Lord God spoken of in the Book of Exodus; of which, except the apostle speaks, his argument hath neither inference nor coherence. In vain, therefore, is this pretended for an answer, that the apostle by the Lord doth always, unless he cite some place out of the old covenant, understand Christ; for in this particular he citeth a certain place out of the book of Exodus, and useth the name of the Lord in the same notion in which there it is used, framing an argument and urging it from thence; and if he did not, that rule is not so uni-

---

1 The places alleged by them are these: Περιτομή καρδίας, εν πνεύματι, ού γραάματι. (Rom. ii. 29.) Αυτε δουλεύειν ἦμας ἐν καινóτητι πνεύματος, και οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος. (Rom. vii. 6.) Αυτός καλείται πνεύματος Ξόδοιου καὶ Λησυστος. (Rev. vi. 8.)

One of these places speaks only adverbially; the other two have πνεύμα in oblique; and one of those two has it cum adjecto, both of them cum opposito, none of them cum articulo, none of them are in loco subjecti or predicati; and therefore how any of these can show, that τὸ Πνεύμα in this place by us urged, invested with an article, standing in the place either of a complete subject, or a complete predicate, with nothing opposed unto it, must be taken in the same sense with them, I cannot imagine. In the sixth verse of this chapter indeed (2 Cor. iii.) It is the subject of a proposition, and invested with an article; but that is an article of opposition, Τὸ γάρ γράμμα ἀποκταίνει, τὸ δὲ πνεύμα ἑσοπλωί, and this not. However, in that sense objected, it neither agrees with the words before it, nor with those which follow it.

2 The words in Exodus were these, chap. xxxiv. 34: Ηνίκα δ' ἄν εἰσεπτευέτο Μωυσῆς εναντίον Κυρίου λαλείν αὐτῷ, περιορίστω τὸ κάλυμμα, which are thus made use of by the apostle: Ηνίκα δ' ἄν εἰσπράξῃ πρὸς Κυρίου, πεποίηται τὸ κάλυμμα. (2 Cor. iii. 16.) Κύριος then is here used by St. Paul citing some place out of the old covenant; and the words which follow, Ο δὲ Κύριος, signify the same Κύριος, as appeareth by the conjunction δὲ: and if so, then according to the doctrine of our adversaries, it cannot

---
versal and infallible, but that the Lord in the language of the same apostle may not signify the second, but the first or third person of the Trinity. If then the Lord be the eternal God, as the apostle without any question understood him in Moses; if the Spirit be the Spirit of the Lord, as the apostle expounds himself in the words immediately following, then the Spirit of the Lord is the eternal God, and so termed in the scriptures.

Again, the same scriptures do clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term him plainly and expressly so. For when Peter said, Ananias, why hast Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? he repeateth the same question in reference to the same offence, Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God. To lie unto the Holy Ghost, is to lie unto God: to lie unto the Holy Ghost, is not to lie unto men, because the Holy Ghost is not man, and consequently not to lie unto any angel, because the Holy Ghost is not an angel, not to lie unto any creature, because the Holy Ghost is no creature, but to lie unto God, because the Holy Ghost is God.

To this plain and evident argument there are so many answers, that the very multitude discovers the weakness of them all; for if any one of them were sufficient to bear down the force of our reason, the rest would be superfluous. First, they answer that it cannot be collected from hence that the Spirit is God, because the Holy Ghost in the original is put in one case, and God in another, and the apostle speaking in one manner of the Spirit, and in

signify Christ. For that Lord, of whom Moses spake, was then when Moses wrote: But that Christ of which they interpret it, was not then, as they teach: Therefore that Lord cannot be Christ, in their interpretation, without a contradiction.

For though Christ be most frequently called “our Lord,” yet being [seeing] God the Father of Christ is our Lord, being [seeing] ος Κυριος is often used by St. Paul without any restriction or Intimation of appropriating that act unto the Son which is attributed to “the Lord” by him, the rule cannot be certain and universal. For I desire to know by what means they can be assured, that the apostle doth by the title ος Κυριος Intend Christ, and not the most high God the Father, in these following places: 1 Cor. iii. 5; iv. 19; vii. 10, 12; xvi. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 6; v. 27; 2 Thess. iii. 1, 5, 16; 2 Tim. i. 16, 18; ii. 7. And beside, I ask how the preface of this general rule can be properly objected by those who know that they, to whom they do object this rule, have contended that this title is elsewhere attributed to the Holy Ghost. As St. Basil, upon that place, (2 Thess. iii. 5.) ος δε Κυριος κατευθυναι ουν τας καρδιας εις την αγαθην του Θεου και εις την ουσιαν του Χριστου, thus disputes: Της δη κατευθυνων Κυριος εις την του Θεου αγαθην, και εις την ουσιαν των θελημων του Χριστου υπομονην: Αποκρινασθαι ημιν οι το Πνευμα καταδυνασθανωσθαι. Ειτε γαρ περι του [Θεου και Πατρος, ο Δος, παντως άν ερημος, ο δε Κυριος υμαι κατευθυναι εις την αγαθην ημαιν: ειτε περι του Υιου, προσεκείτο αν, Εις την έαυτου υπομοιωνην ξητεισθαι συν το εστω άλλο πρασπομων, τη προσαραγη του Κυριου την μαθαιναι έχων. And upon the like place, 1 Thess. iii. 12, 13; Ποιον Κυριον ευχεται ημιν πετασθαι του Θεου και Πατρος ημων, εν τη παρουσια του Κυριου ημων αμετοκυμην τας καρδιας ημων επηρεασθαι εν αγαθω συνε των εν Θεολογεια εις παντοτητας διεθεσις: Αποκρινασθαι ημιν οι μετα των λειτουργικων πνευματων των προς διακονιαν αποστελλωμενων (the newly-revised opinion clearly) το 'Αγιον Πνευμα τεθειτε: άλλ ουν εγουσ.—De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 21.

2 Actis v. 3. 3 Verse 4. 4 "Ex his facile apparent hauudquamam ex eo loco conclusi posse Spiritum Sanctum esse Deum: cum alio modo de Spiritu Sancto loquitur Petrus, allo de Deo. Ilice dicit mentiri non fallere, ac iidificari Spiritum Sanctum, hic mentiri Deo." — ChelUw De uno Deo Patre, lib. I. § 3, argum. 1.
another of God, cannot show that the Spirit is God. 'To which is easily answered, that the case or manner of the apostle's speech can make no difference, if the sense and substance be the same, as here it is; for to deceive the Holy Ghost is nothing else but to lie unto him, or by a lie to endeavour to deceive him. The act objected to Ananias was but one, which act of his the apostles looked upon as injurious not to themselves but to the Holy Ghost, and therefore St. Peter showed the sin to be not against men, but against God: as certainly then as the apostles were men, so certainly was the Holy Ghost, in the esteem of St. Peter, God.

As for that sense which they put upon the words, different from that of lying to God, as if Ananias were accused for counterfeiting the Holy Ghost, it is most certain that the words can in this place bear no such sense; for the sin of Ananias is again expressed in the case of his wife Sapphira, to whom St. Peter said, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? but to tempt the Spirit, and to counterfeit the Spirit, are two several things. And it is evident that in this place the tempting of the Spirit was nothing else but lying to him. For St. Peter said to Sapphira, Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much; and she said Yea, for so much. In which answer she lied. Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? viz., in saying that ye sold the land for so much. Here is no colour then for that new pretence, that Ananias did bear the apostles in hand that what was done he did by the motion of the Holy Spirit, and so did pretend, counterfeit, and belie the Holy Ghost. This is not to expound St. Peter, but to belie Ananias, and make him guilty of that sin which he was never yet accused of. It is most certain that he lied, it is also certain that he to whom he lied was the Holy Ghost, and therefore it might be well translated that he lied to the Holy Ghost.

1 Acts v. 9. 2 Verse 8. 3 Our translation is here accused without reason. For though the original be ψευδοσθαι σε το Πνεύμα το Αγιον, yet some copies have it, εις το Πνεύμα, and the Syriac did so read and interpret it, as translated in the Vulgar Latin to the same purpose, mentiri te Spiritui Sancto. And the author of the tractate De Temp. Barbarico, under the name of St. Austin, mentiri te orip Spiritum Sanctum.—Cap. 3. Now ψευδεσθαι εις το Πνεύμα is the same with το Πνεύμα: as, Μη ψευδεσθε εις αλληλους, "Lie not one to another." (Col. iii. 9.) If we read it εις Πνεύμα, then it is rightly translated. Again: If we read it το Πνεύμα, it has in this case the sense of το Πνεύμα. As Psalm lxvi. 2: יִשְׁתַּחֵץ יִשְׁתַּחֵץ: Και ψευσθαι σε οи έξηθοι σου το LXX: ψευσθαι σε οι έξηθοι σου of the same sense with that, Psalm. lxxxi. 16: מִלְיָה הַלְּיָה וֹנָה מְלָכָה וֹנָה. So Deut. xxxiii. 29: מִלְיָה בֵּית אֵיבָר מִלְיָה. LXX. Καὶ ψευσθαι; se oi εξηθοι σου. And Isai. lvii. 11: כִּי εֵין בִּי בִּי מֵאֹה. Kαι εἶναν με. 2 Kings iv. 16: כִּי מִלְיָה בֵּית אֵיבָר. Μη διαψευστη την δοιλην σου. If therefore we read it, ψευσθαι το Πνευμα, it is rightly translated "to lie unto the Holy Ghost;" and so agreeth with that which followeth, "to tempt the Holy Ghost," as Psalm lxxviii. 36: γνῶσθεν αυτον ενευσαται αυτω κατακεκλωσαν τον Θεον. Therefore whatsoever shifts are laid upon the phrase, or difference of expressions are either false or frivolous.
Next, because they may very well be conscious that this verbal or phraseological answer may not seem sufficient, they tell us though both the phrases were synonymous, yet they did no way prove that the Spirit is God; and the reason which they render to justify this negation is, because there are several places of the scripture in which the messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation unto God as here the Spirit is. To which the answer is most plain and clear, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they allege those words of the apostle, He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man but God, who hath also given us his Holy Spirit: I cannot see what similitude can be made unto the scripture now in question; for if the Spirit be not understood in the first words, he therefore that despiseth, it hath no relation to the present question; and if it be, it were so far from being a confutation, that it would be another confirmation. As for the other, He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me; it is so far from justifying their interpretation, that it hath nothing in it like that which sounds our reason, that is, no opposition. For there are three particulars in that scripture which we produce for our assertion: first, that they lied to the Holy Ghost; secondly, that in doing so they lied not unto men; and thirdly, that by the same act they lied unto God. In which the opposition is our foundation. For if the Spirit of God were not God, as we are sure it is not man, it might as well have been said you lied not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God. And indeed if the apostle would have aggravated the sin of Ananias with the full propriety and iniquity, in their sense, he must have said, thou hast not lied unto men, nor unto the Spirit of God, but unto God. But being he first told him plainly his sin, lying to the Holy Ghost, and then let him know the sinfulness of it, thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God: it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lied is God.

Thirdly, that person whose inhabitation maketh a temple is God; for if the notion of a temple be nothing else but to be the house of God; if to be the house of any creature is not to be a temple, as it is not; then no inhabitation of any created person can make a temple. But the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost maketh a temple, as we are informed by the apostle, What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you? Therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

To this is replied indifferently according to the diversity of

1 Thess. iv. 3. 3 Matt. x. 40; Luke x. 16. 4 Cor. vi. 19.
On the Creed. [Art VIII.

adversaries, as it is not probable that the deniers of so great a truth should agree. The first tell us that if we would inforce by this reason that the Holy Ghost is God, we must prove that he is a person, and that he doth possess our bodies by a divine right.¹ But we have already proved that he is a person, and certainly there can be no other right but that which belongs to God, by which the Holy Ghost inhabiteth and possesseth us. Nor have they any pretence to evince the contrary but that which more confirmeth our assertion, for they urge only those words of the apostle, *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?*² We do certainly know that we are the temple of God, and we also know that the Spirit of God therefore dwelleth in us; and we therefore know that we are the temple of God, because we know that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; and we know no other reason why we are the temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but only because we know the Spirit of God is God; for if the Spirit were any other person not divine, or anything but a person though divine, we could not by any means be assured that he did properly inhabit in us, or if he did, that by his inhabitation he could make a temple of us. The second hath very little to say, but only this, that being the Holy Ghost who possesseth us is a person, we must show that our bodies are his by the highest interest, and primarily dedicated to his honour; which he therefore conceives we cannot show, because he thinks our body is not at all his by interest, or dedicated to his honour. But it were very strange, if we should be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost should have no interest in us, but that he should be ours by interest, and not we his; that the Spirit of God should call for men to be separated to himself, and that they which are so separated should be no way dedicated to his honour. If the Holy Ghost had no interest in us, because he is given unto us, then Christ can have no interest in us, for he is also given unto us. Indeed if the apostle had said,³ as our adversary doth, that *we ought with our body to glorify, not the Spirit but God,* I should have concluded that the Spirit is not God; but being that blessed Spirit which dwelleth in us, and spake by the apostles, never taught us not to glorify him, I should rather take leave to suspect that of blasphemy than the assertion of his deity to be false divinity. And whereas it is said that the apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, to

¹ "Si quis ex eo, quod corpus nostrum Spiritus Sancti templum sit, concludere velit, eum esse Deum; illi demonstrandum est, ita corpus nostrum Spiritus Sancti templum dixit, ut intelligatur, cum esse personam, cujus honoris corpus nostrum sit dedicatum, a qua corpus nostrum eo jure, quod Drizinuminis proprium est, possideatur, ac principaliter incolatur." — Chelides, De uno Deo Patre, lib. i. § 3, argum. 1.
² 1 Cor. iii. 16.
³ 1 Cor. vi. 20.
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wit, by inhabitation, that is so far from breeding in me the least thought of diminution, that by this only notion I am fully confirmed in the belief of my assertion. For I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabiteth in us but by the inhabitation of the Spirit; and I understand no other way by which we can be the temple of God but by the inhabitation of God, as it is written, Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people: and therefore I conclude that the Holy Ghost who by his inhabitation maketh our bodies temples, is that God which dwelleth in us.

Fourthly, he, to whom the divine attributes do belong, as certainly as they belong unto God the Father, is truly and properly God; because those are divine attributes which are proprieties of the divine nature, and consequently none can be indued with them to whom the nature of God belongeth not. But the divine attributes, such as are omniscience, omnipotency, omnipresence, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost as they do unto God the Father. Therefore we are as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known, that I shall not need to mention them, and they are so many that to manage them against the exceptions of the adversaries would take up too much room in this discourse; especially considering they question some of them in the Father as well as in the Spirit, and so I should be forced to a double proof.

Fifthly, he, to whom are attributed those works which are proper unto God, by and for which God doth require of us to acknowledge and worship him as God, is properly and truly God; because the operations of all things flow from that essence by which they are, and therefore if the operations be truly divine, that is, such as can be produced by no other but God, then must the essence of that person which produceth them be truly such. But such works as are proper unto God, by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge him and worship him as God, are attributed often in the scriptures to the Spirit of God, as the acts of creation and conservation of all things, the miracles wrought upon and by our blessed Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of true believers, and the like. Therefore without any further disputation, which cannot be both long and proper for an exposition, I conclude my third assertion, that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is a person truly and properly divine, the true and living God.

Now being we do firmly believe that the true and living God can

1 2 Cor. vi. 16
be but one, that the infinity of the divine essence is incapable of multiplicity; being we have already shown that the Father is originally that one God, which is denied by none, and have also proved that the only Son is the same God, receiving by an eternal generation the same divine nature from the Father; it will also be necessary, for the understanding of the nature of the Spirit of God, to show how that blessed Spirit is God: to which purpose, that I may proceed methodically, my fourth assertion is, that the Spirit of God, which is the true and living God, is neither God the Father, nor the Son of God.

First, though the Father be undoubtedly God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods) the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Father. For the scriptures do as certainly distinguish them in their persons as they do unite them in their nature. He which proceedeth from the Father is not the Father, because it is impossible any person should proceed from himself; but the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Father,* therefore he is not the Father. He which is sent by the Father and from the Father, is not the Father by whom and from whom he is sent; for no person can be sent by himself, and by another from himself. But the Holy Ghost is sent by God the Father, and by the Son *from the Father;* therefore he is not the Father.

Secondly, though we have formerly proved that the Son of God is properly and truly God; though we now have proved that the Spirit of God is God, and in reference to both we understand the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Son. For he which receiveth of that which is the Son’s, and by receiving of it glorifieth the Son, cannot be the Son, because no person can be said to receive from himself that which is his own, and to glorify himself by so receiving. But the Comforter, *who is the Holy Ghost,* received of that which is the Son’s, and by receiving of it glorified the Son; for so our Saviour expressly said, *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine.* Therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son. Again, he whose coming depended upon the Son’s departing, and his sending after his departure, cannot be the Son who therefore departed that he might send him. But the coming of the Holy Ghost depended upon the Son’s departing, and his sending after his departure; as he told the apostles before he departed, I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you: therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son.

Thirdly, though the Father be God, and the Son be God, and the Holy Ghost be also the same God; yet we are assured that

the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son, because the Scriptures frequently represent him as distinguished both from the Father and the Son. As, when the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,1 he was manifestly distinguished from the person of the Son, upon whom he lighted, and from the person of the Father, who spake from heaven of his Son. The apostle teacheth us that through the Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father;2 and consequently assureth us that the Spirit by whom, is not the Father to whom, nor the Son through whom, we have that access. So God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father.3 Where the Son is distinguished from the Father as first sent by him, and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after he had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us several times in a word, as, The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name; 4 the Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father;5 and when that Comforter is come, Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.6 I conclude, therefore, against the old Sabellian heresy,7 that the Holy Ghost, although he be truly and properly God, is neither God the Father, nor God the Son; which is my fourth assertion.

Our fifth assertion is, that the Holy Ghost is the third person in the blessed Trinity. For being he is a person, by our first assertion; a person not created, by the second; but a divine person, properly and truly God, by the third; being though he is thus truly God, he is neither the Father nor the Son, by the fourth assertion, it followeth that he is one of the three, and of the three

---

1 Matt. iii. 16, 17. 2 Eph. ii. 18. 3 Gal. iv. 4-6. 4 John xiv. 26. 5 xv. 25. 6 Matt. xxviii. 19. 7 This heresy indeed was very ancient, even before Sabellius, though those which held it were afterwards all so denominated from Sabellius. For we find it was the opinion of Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote; who, being urged with that place, (Luke i. 35,) where the three persons were distinguished, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore that which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God," answered thus, "Filius Dei Deus est, et virtus Altissimi Altissimus est."—Ad Fac. Prov. cap. 26. After Praxeas followed Noetius, monostiptus ton auton Patéra, kai Yión, kai Ἀγίου Πνεύμα—ἐγγάμανος.—S. EPIPH. Hares. liv. § 2. "Noetiani a quo-dam Noeto, qui docebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum."—S. Aquin. Hares. 36. Suddenly after Noetius arose Sabellius: Δομιστίζει οὖν καὶ οἱ ἰν' αὐτοῦ Σαβελλιανοὶ, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Patéra, τὴν αὐτὴν Yión, τοῦ αὐτὸν ἂν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Αγίου Πνεύμα: ὥς εἶναι ἐν μία ὑποστάσει τριῶν οὐσιώνια.—S. EPIPH. Hares. 120. § 1. From him afterwards were all which held the same opinion called Sabellians: "Sabelliani ab illo Noeto, quem supra memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur; nam et discipulorum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed quâ causa duas haereses Epiphanius computat, nesecio; cum fieri potuisse videamur, ut fuerit Sabellius isto famosior etideo ex illo celebris haec haeresis nomen accepit. Noetically enim difficillime ab aliquo scintur; Sabelliani autem sunt in cor multicorum."—S. Aquin. Hares. 41.
is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the persons are neither more nor less than three, so there is also an order by which of these persons the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though, therefore, this was done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of order, by which the Father not the Son is first, and the Son not the Father second. Again, the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son: though, therefore, this was also done from all eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time, yet that of order must be here observed; so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father who is the first person, cannot be the first, receiving the same from the Son who is the second, cannot be the second, but being from the first and second must be of the three the third. And thus both the number and the order of the persons are signified together by the apostle, saying, There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared and the same order is expressly mentioned in the baptismal institution made in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. As, therefore, we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have but briefly spoken prove that the Holy Ghost is the third; which is our fifth assertion.

Our sixth and last assertion (sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God) teacheth that Spirit to be a person proceeding from the Father and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature, attributes, and operations with the Father, and the Son, as receiving the same essence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both. Now this procession of the Spirit in reference to the Father is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son is contained virtually, in the scriptures. First, it is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our

1 1 John v. 7. 2 Matt. xxviii. 19. 3 Jude p. 107. 4 So Epiphanius several times calls the Holy Spirit τὴν ὑπομασκα.
Saviour testifieth, *When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted; for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other, and because the Father hath been already shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.

Secondly, though it be not expressly spoken in the scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there, because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Father. *It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* For by the language of the apostle the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, *The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.* And we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God. Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son; for because we are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts: the Spirit of Christ, Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his; even the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets; the Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the apostle speaks, *I know that this shall turn to my salvation through my prayer and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.* If, then, the Holy Spirit be called the Spirit of God and the Father, because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son.

Again, because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath by the original communication a right of mission: as the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send. But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father is also sent by the Son, as he saith, *when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you.* Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son because he received

---

1 John xv. 26.  2 Matt. x. 20.  3 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12.  4 Gal. iv. 6.  5 Rom. viii. 9
6 1 Peter i. 11.  7 Phil. i. 19.  8 John xiv. 26.  9 John xv. 26.
not the Godhead from him, but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit, because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit; but both the Father and the Son sendeth the Holy Ghost, because the divine nature common to both the Father and the Son was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As, therefore, the scriptures declare expressly that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so do they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son.

From whence it came to pass in the primitive times, that the Latin fathers ¹ taught expressly the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, because by good consequence they did collect so much from those passages of the scripture which we have used to prove that truth. And the Greek fathers, though they stuck more closely to the phrase and language of the scripture, saying that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, and not saying that he proceedeth from the Son; ² yet they acknowledged under another scripture-expression the same thing which the Latins understand by procession, viz., that the Spirit is of or from the Son, as he is of and from the Father, and therefore usually when they said he proceedeth from the Father, they also added, he

¹ This is not the late, but ancient, opinion of the Latin church, as will appear by these testimonies: "Loquitur de eo [Spiritu Sancto] non necesse est, quia de Patre et Filio autotropi confidunt est." — S. Hilari. De Trin. lib. II. cap. 29. "Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separat ur a Patre, non separat ur a Filio." — S. Ambros. De Spiritu Sancto, lib. I. cap. 11. "Sanctus autem Sanctus vero Spiritus est, procedens quidem a Patre et Filio; sed non est Ipsus, quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroque." — Idem, De Symb. cap. 3.

"Et in servos coelestia dona profudit, Spiritum ab Unigenâ Sanctum et Patre procedente." — Paulin. De S. Filico, Nat. 9.


"Tanquam idem Deus nunc Pater, nunc Filius, nunc Spiritus Sanctus nomineatur; nec alius est qui genuit, alius qui genitum est, alius qui de utroque processit." — Leo speaking of the Sabellian heresy, Epist. xciii, cap. 1. "Audì manifestìus, proprium Patris esse genuisse, et proprium Filii naturamuisse; proprium vero Spiritus Sancti procedere de Patre Filioque." — Vigil. Contr. Eutych. lib. I. by which testimonies, and the like, of the Latin fathers we may well guess in which church the Creed commonly attributed to Athanasius first was framed; for as it is confessed to be written first in Latin, so it is most probable that it was composed by some member of the Latin church, by that expression in it, Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens.

² The ancient Greek fathers, speaking of this procession, mention the Father only, and never, I think, the Son, as sticking constantly in this to the language of the scriptures. Thus Gregory Nazianzen distinguiseth the three persons: Ἐν τοῖς ἱματεῖσι ὅραι ιστάμενοι, τὸ ἀγεννηστον εἰσάγομεν, καὶ τὸ γενετον καὶ τὸ εκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀπορροφομενον. — Orat. I De Filio. And the three properties attributed to the three persons are these, ἀγεννησία to the Father, γεννησία to the Son, and ἀπορροφοσία to the Holy Ghost. But this word ἀπορροφοσία, or the verb ἀπορροφέωςαν, was not used by the Greeks in reference to the Son, but only, as the scriptures speak, in relation to the Father.
received of the Son. 1 The interpretation of which words, according to the Latins, inferred a procession, 2 and that which the Greeks did understand thereby was the same which the Latins meant by the procession from the Son, that is, the receiving of his essence from him. That as the Son is God of God by being of the Father, so the Holy Ghost is God of God by being of the Father and the Son, as receiving that infinite and eternal essence from them both. 3

This being thus the general doctrine of the eastern and the western church, differing only in the manner of expression, and that without any opposition; Theodoret gave the first occasion of a difference, making use of the Greeks' expression against the doctrine both of Greeks and Latins, 4 denying that the Holy Ghost

1 As Epiphanius: "Quod si nihil differre credatur inter accipere a Filio, et a Patre procedere; quod si nihilo differre credatur inter accipere a Filio, et a Patre procedere; certe id ipsum atque unum esse existimabatur, a Filio accipere, quod sit accipere a Patre. Ipsae enim Dominius sit, quoniam de meo accipiet, et annuntiabit volit St. PERI. De Trin. lib. viii. cap. 20. So St. Cyril: "Epist. [ad Pneuma] "Oµoµ½ων τε εστι του του, και προϊαντες θεοπατρος δι' αυτου πάντων αυτου την ευχα ταυτατην ευγευςευς τε και δυναμεις δια τουτο φησιν ότι εκ του εμου λιθηται." —Com. in Joan. lib. xi. "De Filo ergo accepto, et omnia que habet Pater Filii sunt, quae Spiritus Sanctus accepta; quia non [sic solo Patre, nec] de solo Filio, sed simul de utroque procedit." —Praelectiones lib. vii. Contra Paul. —DIPTHEA. De Spiritu Sancto. 4 That this was the sense of the Greek fathers anciently, who used those two scriptures of the Holy Ghost, appeareth by Epiphanius, who frequently declares so much; as in Isocrata: Pneuma γαρ Θεου, και Pneuma Patris; και Pneuma Υου, εκ του Patros και του Υου, τριτον την ουσια. —Sect. 9. Syncletic Αριστοτεμος νοεσιως — Sect. 8. And speaking of Apanas who lied unto the Spirit: "Αριστες εκ Πατρος και Υου το Πνευμα, ΐ. εφευσαντο εκ απα του τωματος νοσιασιων." —Sect. 9. Εκ Πατρος και Υου, αλλα εκ της αυτης ουσιας, εκ της αυτης Θεοτητος, εκ Πατρος και Υου, σιν Πατρι και Υου, ενυστο στατον ἀει Πνευμα Αγιον. —Idem. Pne. lxii. 4. In these words is plainly contained that truth, that the Spirit is God of the Father, and of God the Son: and that they did conclude this truth from those two scriptures, "He procedeth from the Father," and "receiveth of the Son,"[John. xv. 21; xvi. 15.] is also evident by these and the like passages: Ei δε Χριστος εκ του Πατρος πορευεται Θεος εκ Θεου, και το Πνευμα εκ του Χριστου; η σοι Αμφιφερον; ὡς φησιν ο Χριστος, "ο παρα του Πατρος εκποιευται, και Ουσις εκ του ημου λιθηται." —S. PERI. Isocr. 67. Ei τοινυν πα του Πατρος εκποιευται, και εκ του εμου, φησιν εκ Κυριου, λιθηται. "Ον γαρ τραπον ουδες εγων του Πατερα ει μη ο Υου, ουδε του Υου ει μη ο Πατερα, ειτε του ζων ει παρα του Πατρος, ει του Υου. —Ibid. 73. "Λαον λοιπον του λαστηριον; hoc est, non sime me, et [sine meo et] Patris arbitrio; quia inseparabili a mea et a patri est voluntate; quia non ex se est, sed ex Patre et me est; hoc enim ipsum quod subsidi est loquitur, a Patre et me illi est." —DIPTHEA. De Spiritu Sancto, lib. ii. Et paulo post: "Iste me clarificabit, id est, Paracletus, quia de meo accipiet.urusum hoc accipere ut Divina natura convertat intelligendam. —Spiritus Sanctus a Filio accipere id quod sua natura fuerat, cognoscedendum est. Neque enim quid aliud est Filius, exceptis his quae et dantur a Patre; neque alià substantia est Spiritus Sancti prater id quod datur e a Filio." 4 St. Cyril, having set forth arithematisms against the heresy of Nestorius, in the ninth arithematisms condemned all who did not speak of the Holy Ghost as διαν του Χριστου του Πνευμα. To which Theodoret returned this answer: "Αησε δε το Πνευμα του Υου, ει μεν άμφιφερον και εκ Πατρος εκποιευμαι εφη, ουκομολογήσωμεν, κα
receiveth his essence from the Son, because the scripture saith he proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit which is of God. But St. Cyril, against whom he wrote, taking small notice of this objection, and the writings of Theodoret in which this was contained being condemned, there was no sensible difference in the church, for many years, concerning this particular. Afterwards divers of the Greeks expressly denied the procession from the Son, and several disputations did arise in the western church, till at last the Latins put it into the Constantinopolitan Creed, and

church of God, and it being added also by the next general council at Ephesus, that it should not be lawful to make any addition to it; notwithstanding, the question being agitated in the West, "Utrum Spiritus Sanctus, sicut procedit a Patre, ita et procedit a Filio," and it being concluded in the affirmative, they did not only declare the doctrine to be true, but also added the same to the Constantinopolitan Creed, and sung it publicly in their Liturgy: "Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et Vivificantem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem." This being first done in the Spanish and French churches, and the matter being referred to Leo III., bishop of Rome, he absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated: for in the acts of the synod held at Aquasgranum, we find it so determined by the pope, upon the conference with the legates. "Exgo, ut video, lilud a vestra paternitate decenitur, ut primo lilud de quo questio agitur, de sace-fato Symbolo tollatur, et tun demum a quilibet licite ac libere sive cantando sive tradendo discatur et doceatur," so one of the legates. To which Leo answered thus: "Ita procedubio a nostrâ parte decenitur: ita quoque ut a vestra assentiatur, a nobis omnibus modis suadereetur." Beside, lest the Roman church might be accused to join with the Spanish and French churches in this addition, the same pope caused the creed publicly to be set forth in the church, graven in silver plates, one in Latin, and another in Greek, in the same words in which the council of Constantinople had first penned it. "Hic pro amore et cautelâ orthodoxae fideli fecit [in B. Petri basilica] scuta argentea duo scripta utraque symbolo, unum quidem literis Graecis, et alium Latinis, sedentia dextra levâque super ingressum corporis."—Ana stasius in Vita Leonis III. "Leo tertius [symbol] transcriptionem in tabula argenteâ, post altare B. Pauli posita, posteris reliquit, pro amore ut ipsae alt, et cautelâ fideli orthodoxae. In quo quidem symbolo in processione Spiritus Sancti solus commemoratur Pater his verbis: Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum Vivificantem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre et Filio co-adorandum et glorificandum."—P. Lombardus. These were taken out of the archives at Rome, saith Flavios, and so placed by Leo, that they

with Cyril words in 

was addressed by Cyril to Taurus, etc. Cyril in his reply takes no great notice of this high charge of impiety and blasphemy, and only answers the argument so far as it concerned his expression, namely, that the Spirit is idem of the Son Pneuma, but in this answer makes use of that scripture by which he and others used to prove that the Spirit had his essence from the Son: "Externean meâs, quod èc to Theou kai Patrho to Pneu- ma to Ágeom, kata tîn tov Sotymos fowon, alla oik allorion onst à tov Yio: pâinta ghar ékei metà tôv Patrô: kai touto autòs édidate, eipan peri tôv 'Yio Pneumatos. Pânta òsta ékei ò Patrî, èmà ìstì: dia toûto ékai yîmî, óti èc tôv èkouv lîphêtaî, kai ìgânageî yîmîn. Although therefore St. Cyril doth not go to maintain that which Theodoret denied, and St. Cyril elsewhere teacheth, namely, that the Holy Ghost is from the Son, yet he justified his own position by that scripture which by himself and the rest of the fathers is thought to teach as much.

The second general council, held at Constantinople, finding it necessary to make an addition to the Nicene Creed in the Article concerning the Holy Ghost, of which that council had said no more than this, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," framed this accession against Macedonius, Eic to Pneuma to Ágeom, to Kupírion, to Zoostoi, to èc tôv Patrôs ékpropoumenon, in which they speak most warily, using the words of the scripture, and the language of the church, which was so known and public, that it is recorded even by Lukan in his Dialogue called Philo pa triâs, § 12:—

Krî. Kâi tâvâ ëpomíreada ge; Têp. Ùfyméovnà Θeôn, ùgevà ëmbrotov, òuránwv, òvòv Pântov Òaì Pneuma ëc Patrôs ëkpro poumenon.

"Evn èk triow, kai èc èrpos triâ; Tavta râmîa Zôma, tòvò ògouv Òaìv."

This Creed being received by the whole
being admonished by the Greeks of that, as of an unlawful addition, and refusing to raise it out of the Creed again, it became an occasion of the vast schism between the eastern and the western churches.

Now although the addition of words to the formal Creed, without the consent and against the protestation of the oriental church, be not justifiable; yet that which was added is nevertheless a certain truth, and may be so used in that Creed by them who believe the same to be a truth, so long as they pretend it not to might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true copies of that Creed not to be altered. 'O θεοτόκου Λέων και τάς εν τοῖς θησαυροφυλακίοις τῶν κοινωφαίων Πέτρου και Παύλου εκ παλαιστάτων χρόνων ἀποτεθήκας σωματικώς τοις ιεροῖς κενμανήδιον κατέγραψα καὶ ἀφίησαν Ἑλληνικῶς ἑλένην τὴν ἱερὰ τῆς ἱμίων πίστεως ἐκθέαν, ταύτας καταραγωγήθη τεκατενως τοῦ Ῥωμαίων πλῆθους καὶ εἰς ὅλων ἀπαντῶν ἔλθειν εἰδικαίως, καὶ πολλοί τῶν θεατά-μενον τηρικάτα καὶ ἀνεγκυκλοντὸν εἴτε τῷ βίῳ παραμένουσι. — Photius apud Nicet. Theor. 3ntol. Fil. it. 21, ut exscript. Archip. Armach. Ὑστός ο Λέων καὶ τὸ θησαυροφυλάκιον τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ῥωμαίων αἰείων ἀπάντησαν δύο τοῖς ιεροῖς κεκμήλιοις ἀποτεθησματικῶς εἴκονικως Ἑλληνικῶς καὶ γράμματει καὶ ἀρμασίον ἔχουσας τὴν εἰσερθα τῆς πίστεως ἐκθέαν.— Idem, apud Euthym. Panorph. Dogm. it. 12, ab eodem Archip. exscript. This was the great and prudent care of Leo IIII, that there should be no addition made to the ancient Creed authorised by a general council, and received by the whole church; and by this means he quieted all dissenters for his time. But not long after, the following popes, more in love with th is own authority, than desirous of the peace and utility of the church, neglected the tables of Leo, and admitted the addition Filioque. This was first done in the time and by the power of pope Nicholas I, who by the activity of Photius was condemned for it. "Time inter alias accensiones hoc principaliter posuit Photins ipsum [Nicolaum] fore excommunicatum, quod apposuerat ad symbolum Spiritum Sanctum a Filio procedere. Similiter et de positum, quod ipse Nicolas popa incisissim in sententiam tertii concilii."—Antonius, part. fil. it. 22, c. 13. This was it which Photius complained of so highly in his encyc- clical epistle to the archepiscopal sees of the eastern church: "Αλλὰ γαρ αὐξή μόνον εἰς ταύτα παραγωγεῖν ἐξηγερίαις, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰ τις κακῶν ἐκτίς κορώνης, εἰς ταύτην ἀνέγρα- μον πρὸς γάρ τοίς εἰρήμενοι ἀποτυ- μασι, καὶ τοῦ εἰρημένος καὶ αἰγον συμβολον, ὁ πάσας τοις συνοδοῖς καὶ υἱοκαινομοις ψευδο- μοις ἀμαχοι καὶ τις τοις ὑστης, υννους λαγνη- μοις, καὶ παρεγγυητοὺς λόγοις, καὶ θρα- σοὺς ἐνεβαλαί, καθιδέιειν ἐπεξείρησαν (ὁ τῶν τοῦ πονηροῦ μηχανη ἔτος) τον Πινέαμα τος Ἀγίου οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ γε καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐκπορευθείς, καὶ πονηρεύο- σας. — Phot. Epist. ii. § 8. "Hugo Etherianus legit κεφαλογράφοις, ὅμων υρτίν ἱμάρτανον προφήτου." Thus far Photius against Nicholas before he was pope. After the creed was restored again, in the time of pope John VIII. in the eighth general council, as the Greeks call it, it was declared that the addition of Filioque, made in the Creed, should be taken away. Εξηγερήσεν δὲ ἡ Σύνοδος αὐτή καὶ περὶ τῆς προσοφημης τοῦ συμβολοῦ, καὶ ἐκεῖνων ἄξιον ἢν ξανάρθηκε παντελώς, τοῦ Marcus bishop of Ephesus, in the council of Florence. After this the same complaint was continued by Michael Cerularius, and Theophylact, in as high a manner as by Photius. "Εκκλησίας ὁ τὸ μέγατον εἰκὼν σφάλμα ταῦτα, καὶ τοῦτο δὲ τὸ τοῦ Σαλομωντας ἄδον πεταλίων ποιούν συνάντητα, ἢ ἐν τῷ τῆς πίστεως συμβολάδι κανονικά, ἢν ἀπο- σαντὸν ἀνακρίσαντοι τὸ Πινέαμα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευθείς.— Theor. ad Joan. itii. Καὶ τῶς Δικτυκῶς τούτης εἰτὰ περὶ τὸ δόγμα διαμαρτητάτη παρὰ τὴν πατρίκην πίστιν σαλέουν, οὖν δὴ τὸ εἶν τὸ συμβολάδι περὶ τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος προστείθεσθαι, ἐνδέχεται ὁ κἐνδούς μέγιστος, τοῦτο μὴ διαβρώσθως ἀξιοῦμεν τὸ σαλαβωρὸν συμφωνητα.—Ibid. Thus did the oriental church accuse the occidental for adding Filio- que to the Creed, contrary to a general council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the authority of another council; and so the schism between the Latin and the Greek church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, or Filioque, are taken out of the Creed: the one relying upon the truth of the doctrine contained in those words, and the authority of the pope to alter anything; the other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for the authority of the ancient councils. This therefore is to be much lamented, that the Greeks should not acknowledge the truth which was acknowledged by their ancestors, in the substance of it; and that the Latins should force the Greeks to make an addition to the Creed without as great an authority as hath prohibited it, and to use that language in the expression of this doctrine which never was used by any of the Greek fathers.
be a definition of that council, but an addition or explication inserted, and condemn not those who, out of a greater respect to such synodical determinations, will admit of no such insertions, nor speak any other language than the scriptures and their fathers spake.

Howsoever we have sufficiently in our assertions declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, distinguishing him from all qualities, energies, or operations, in that he is truly and properly a person; differencing him from all creatures and finite things, as he is not a created person; showing him to be of an infinite and eternal essence, as he is truly and properly God; distinguishing him from the Father and the Son, as being not the Father, though the same God with the Father, not the Son, though the same God with him; demonstrating his order in the blessed Trinity, as being not the first or second, but the third person; and therefore the third, because as the Son receiveth his essence communicated to him by the Father, and is therefore second to the Father, so the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence communicated to him by the Father and the Son, and so proceedeth from them both, and is truly and properly the Spirit of the Father, and as truly and properly the Spirit of the Son.

Thus far have we declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, what he is in himself, as the Spirit of God; it remaineth that we declare what is the office of the same, what he is unto us, as the Holy Spirit. For although the Spirit of God be of infinite, essential, and original holiness, as God, and so may be called Holy in himself; though other spirits which were created be either actually now unholy, or of defective sanctity at the first, and so having the name of Spirit common unto them, he may be termed Holy, that he may be distinguished from them; yet I conceive he is rather called the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of Holiness,¹ because, of the three persons in the blessed Trinity, it is his particular office to sanctify, or make us holy.

Now when I speak of the office of the Holy Ghost, I do not understand any ministerial office or function, such as that of the created angels is, who are all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;² for I have already proved this Spirit to be a person properly divine, and consequently above all ministration. But I intend thereby whatsoever is attributed unto him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by him, for which he is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the persons in the Godhead are represented unto us as concurring unto our salvation: God so loved the world that he gave his only

¹ Rom. 1. 4. ² Heb. 1. 14.
begotten Son,¹ and through that Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father.² As, therefore, what our Saviour did and suffered for us belonged to that office of a Redeemer which he took upon him, so whatsoever the Holy Ghost worketh in order to the same salvation, we look upon as belonging to his office. And because without holiness it is impossible to please God, because we are all impure and unholy, and the purity and holiness which is required in us to appear in the presence of God, whose eyes are pure, must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God, who is called holy because he is the cause of this holiness in us, therefore we acknowledge the office of the Spirit of God to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God, and the declaration of this office, added to the description of his nature, to be a sufficient explication of the object of faith contained in this article, I believe in the Holy Ghost.

Now this sanctification being opposed to our impurity and corruption, and answering fully to the latitude of it, whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holiness and perfection must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore being by nature we are totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God; being as no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him, even so none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God; this Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God,³ and revealeth them unto the sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of their God. This work of the Spirit is double, either external and general, or internal and particular. The external and general work of the Spirit, as to the whole church of God, is the revelation of the will of God, by which so much in all ages hath been propounded as was sufficient to instruct men unto eternal life. For there have been holy prophets ever since the world began;⁴ and prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.⁵ When it pleased God in the last days to speak unto us by his Son,⁶ even that Son sent his Spirit into the apostles, the Spirit of truth, that he might guide them into all truth,⁷ teaching them all things, and bringing all things to their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them.⁸ By this means it came to pass that all scripture was given by inspiration of God,⁹ that is, by the motion and operation of the Spirit of God: and so whatsoever is necessary for us to know and believe, was delivered by revelation. Again, the same Spirit which revealeth the object

¹ John iii. 16. ² ¹ Cor. xii. 3. ³ ⁶ Heb. i. 2. ⁴ John xvi. 13. ⁵ ⁲ Peter. ii. 21. ⁶ Tim. iii. 16.
of faith generally to the universal church of God, which object is proposed externally by the church to every particular believer, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe that they may receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God not only in the object but also in the act; Christ is not only given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is also given us in the behalf of Christ to believe on him; and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent unto that which by the word is propounded to us: by this the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul; by this the word preached profiteth, being mixed with faith in them that hear it. Thus by grace are we saved through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God. As the increase and perfection, so the original, or initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God, not only by an external proposal in the word, but by an internal illumination in the soul; by which we are inclined to the obedience of faith, in assenting to those truths, which unto a natural and carnal man are foolishness. And thus we affirm not only the revelation of the will of God, but also the illumination of the soul of man, to be part of the office of the Spirit of God, against the old and new Pelagians.

The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversion of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God. For according to his mercy he saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. So that except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of

---

1 Phil. i. 29. 2 Acts xvi. 14. 3 Heb. iv. 2. 4 Eph. ii. 8. 5 This is the ancient determination of the second Arausian council: "Si quis sicut augmentum, ita eum inimam fidel, ipsunque credulitatis affectum, quo in eum credimus, qui justicat impium, et ad regenerationem [sacri] baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratiam donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritus Sancti corrigentis voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, et naturaliter nobis inesse dicit, apostolicae dogmatibus adversarius approbatur, beato Paulo dicens, Confidimus, quia quicapit in vobis bonum opus perfectum usque in diem Domini nostri Jesu Christi; et illud, Vobis datum est pro Christo, non solum ut in eum credatis, sed etiam ut pro illo patiamini; Et, Gratia salvi facti estis per fidem, non ex vobis; Dei enim donum est."—Can. 5, Concil. Araus.; et Gennad. Eccles. Dogma, cap. 42. 6 It was the known opinion of the Pelagians, that it is in the power of man to believe the gospel without any internal operation of the grace of God; and St. Austin was once of that opinion: "Neque enim fidem putabam," says he, "Dei gratia praeveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur quod posceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non praecedent praecomnium veritatis: ut autem predicato non evangelio consentiendum nostrum esse proprimum, et nobis ex nobis esse, arbitrarum. Quem meum errorem nonnulla opuscula mea satis indicant, ante episcopatum meum scripta."—De Prad. Sanct. lib. i, cap. 3. But whatsoever he had so written before he was made a bishop, he recalled and reversed in his Retractions, lib. i, cap. 23, and disputed earnestly against it as a part of the Pelagian heresy. This, as the rest of Pelagianism, is renewed by the Socinians, who in the Racovian Catechism deliver it in this manner: "Nonne ad credendum evangelio Spiritus Sancti interiori doneo opus est? Nullo modo: neque enim in scripturis legimus cuiquam id conferri donum, nisi credenti evangelice."—Titus iii. 5
I believe in the Holy Ghost.

1 John iii. 5. 2 1 Cor. vi. 11. 3 Gal. v. 25. 4 Verse 16. 5 Phil. ii. 13. 6 Rom. viii. 14. 7 Zech. xii. 10. 8 1 John v. 14. 9 Rom. viii. 26, 27. 10 John xiv. 16. 11 1 John ii. 1. 12 Rom. viii. 34.

13 Παρακλητος is five times used in the scriptures, and that by St. John alone: four times in his gospel, attributed to the Holy Ghost, once in his first epistle, spoken of Christ. When it relates to the Holy Ghost, we translate it always, “Comforter;” when to Christ, we render it “Advocate;” of which diversity there can be no reason; whereas Christ, who is a Paraclete, said that he would send another Paraclete; and therefore the notion must be the same in both: 'Ἀλλον Παρακλητον δωσει ὕπνω τον ἐμαυτόν, ἀλλον ως ἐμε. — S. Chrysost. ad locum. If therefore in the language of St. John Παρακλητος be a “Comforter,” then Christ is the Comforter; if Παρακλητος be an “Advocate,” the Holy Ghost is the Advocate. The Vulgar Latin keeps the Greek word in the gospels, Paracletus, but in the epistle renders it Advocatus. The Syriac keepeth the original altogether נַפְלָע as being or ordinary use in the writers of that and the Chaldee language; and there
Fourthly, the office of the same Spirit is to join us unto Christ, and make us members of that one body of which our Saviour is the

fore (it) was not well translated Paracletus in the gospels, and Advocatus in the epistle, by Tremellius. That the Latins did use generally the word Paracletus for the Holy Ghost, as it is now in the Vulgar Latin, appeared by the description of the heresy of Montanus, which Tertullian calls "novam prophetam de Paraclete inauditum."—De Resur. Carn. cap. 63; and, "spiritalem radionem, Paraclete autore."—Contra Marcin. lib. i. cap. 29. And yet the ancientest Latin translations rendered it Advocatus even in the gospels, in reference to the Spirit: as we read it in Tertullian: "Bene quod et Dominus usus hoc verbo in persona Paracleti, non divisionem significavit, sed dispositionem; Bogabo enim, inquit, Patrem, et aliquum Advocatum mittel vobis, Spiritum veritatis."—Advers. Prax. cap. 9. So Novatianus: "Ego rogabo Patrem, et aliquum Advocatum dabit vobis.—Necnon eum subdidit illud quoque, Advocatum autem, Spiritus Sanctus quod missurus est Pater, ille vos docebit."—De Trin. cap. 28. "Cum venerit Advocatus ille, quem ego mittam."—Apud S. Hilari. De Trin. lib. viii. § 19. Notwithstanding Consolator also is of good antiquity: as we read in the same St. Hilary: "Sumus nunc quidem consolati, quia Dominus ait, Mitte vobis Pater et aliquam Consolatorem."—Enarr. in Psal. cxviii. And it is possible that some which used Advocatus might understand it so much; for in the ancient Christian Latin, advocare signifies "to comfort," and advocatio "consolation;" as being the bare interpretations of parakaletin and parakletos. As Tertullian translites parakalestai petenntos, (lsai. lxi. 2) "advocare languentes."—Adv. Marcion. lib. iv. cap. 14. So when we read, Vvobis dimitivus, quia habebis consolatam vestram; Tertullian read it, "Vvobis dimitivus, quoniam recepistis adventonem vestram."—Advers. Marcion. lib. iv. cap. 14. And speaking in his own language: "Esti, inequit, flentes atque lugentes. Quis tali sine patientia tolerat? Itaque talibus et advocato et ruis promittitur."—De Patien. cap. 11. And as St. Hilary read it, so did St. Augustin expound it: "Consolabuntur Spiritu Sancto, qui maxime propitiera Paracletos nominatur, id est, Consolator."—De Sacram. Dom. in Monte, lib. i. cap. 2. "Cum Christus promisit suis missuram se Paracletum, id est, Consolatorem vel Advocatum."—Contra Faust. Lib. xii. cap. 17. "Consolator ergo ille, vel Advocatus, utrumque enim interpretatur quod est Græce Paracletos. Ec. Tract. 94 in Joan. And as they read or expounded it, so did the Arabic translator render it by two several words, one in the gospel, another in the epistle, both signifying Consolator. Now what they meant by Advocatus is evident, that is, "one which should plead the cause" of Christians against their adversaries which accused and persecuted them; that, as there is an accuser which is a spirit, even Satan, so there should be an Advocate to plead against that accuser, even the Holy Spirit. "Necessarius nobis est Deus, ut non comburamur, neque infractutnus efficiamur; et ubi accusatorem habemus, illic habeamus et Paracletum."—Iren. Adv. Haeres. lib. iii. cap. 19. "Hic ipse [Spiritus] et in prophetis populum accusavit, et in apocalypsis adeptionem gentis praebuit. Nam illi ut accuserentur mercabuntur, quia temperamentis legem; et qui ex gentibus credunt ut patrocinio Spiritus adjuvatur merentur, quia ad evangelenm perveniens gestium legem."—Novatian. De Trin. cap. 28. And again: "Quomiam Dominus in coelos esset abitus, Paracletum discipulis necessario dabat, ne illos quodammodo pupillos, quod minime debeat, relinquereet, et sive Advocato et quodam Tantre desereret."—Ibid. In this sense it was, that when Vettius pleaded for the Galatian martyrs before their persecutors, "Hic etiam accipit et acclamatur "et in" temporibus, endeavouing to clear them from all impiety objected to them, he was called the parakletos of the Christians, "Angelus et auius et quosque et alia ilium et mittere et alia parakletos,"—Clem. Mart. Gal. apud Eusner, Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. 1. In the same notion did the ancient rabbins use the same word retained in their language, מַשְׁמֵל as appear by that in the Pirke Avoth, cap. 4: "העושה走出来, ato jı̂ ṣım ı̂ ṣım, i.e. him who goes before them, says: "He which keepeth one commandment gaineth one advocate, and he which transgresseth one getteth one accuser." As therefore פַּרְאַכְּלֶט is catηγορος, so פַּרְאַכְּלֶט is suagnýgos, or παρακόλουθος who accuse us, as they are called parakletos. As we read in Isa.: "Thou shalt plead, and the plea to which thou shalt be called; and thou shalt plead, the plea to which thou shalt be called." And so advocatus is ordinarily understood for him which pleadeth and maintaineth the cause of any one. But I conceive there were other advocati, and especially parakletos among the Greeks, who did not plead or maintain the cause, but did only assist with their presence, entreaty, and interceding by way of petition to the judges; such as we are the friends of the τέως, called by him to his assistance, and interceding for him; in both which respects they were called parakletos. As we read in Isaiah, "Thou shalt plead, and the plea to which thou shalt be called." And so this action was called parakletos, and by the ancient grammarians parakletos is interpreted δήμες: as Harpocratis. Τίθειται "ξηνοτ/zv απαντησιων Ka. air tis δήμηζων. Λυκούργος.
head. For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body. And as the being one and have many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. Hereby we know that God abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us. As we become spiritual men by the Spirit which is in us, as that union with the body and unto the head is a spiritual conjunction, so it proceedeth from the Spirit; and he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit.

Fifthly, it is the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba Father. For we have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father. The Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God. As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our adoption; and because being sons we are also heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. For he which establisheth us in Christ and hath anointed us is God, who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts; so that we are sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession. The Spirit of God as given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a pledge, as in the gifts received here being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of anything already due; yet is to be looked upon as

by St. Paul is attributed to both, and is thus expressed of the Spirit by Novatianus: "Qui interpellat divinas aures pro nobis geminibus inequacius, adorationis implens officia et defensionis exhibens munera."—De Trinitate, c. 29.

1 "Dominus pollicitus est mittere se Paracletum, qui nos aptaret Deo. Sicut enim de arido tritico massa una ferci non potest sine homuro, neque unum panis; ita nec nos multi unum fieri in Christo Jesus poteramus, sine aqua quae de caelo est."—IRENÆUS Adv. Heres. lib. iii. cap. 19.
On the Creed.

| Act. VIII.

an earnest,¹ being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon the condition of performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.

Sixthly, for the effecting of all these and the like particulars, it is the office of the same Spirit to sanctify and set apart persons for the duty of the ministry, ordaining them to intercede between God and his people, to send up prayers to God for them, to bless them in the name of God, to teach the doctrine of the gospel, to administer the sacraments instituted by Christ, to perform all things necessary for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the

¹ The word ἀρραβών, which the apostle only useth in this particular, is of an Hebrew extraction, הַרְבָּוָן, a word of promise and engagement in commerce, bargains, and agreements; and, being but in one particular affair used in the Old Testament, is taken for "a pledge." (Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20.) and translated ἀρραβῶν by the LXX., as well as אֶשֶׁת by the Chaldee; yet the Greek word otherwise, consonantly enough to the origination, signifies rather an "earnest" than a "pledge," as the Greeks and Latins generally agree. Hesychius: ἀρραβῶν, πρόδομα. Εὐκμολόγος: ἀρραβῶν, ἡ ἐπὶ τοῖς θανάσι παρὰ τῶν φωνημένων διδαχὴ πρὸ καταβαλῆς ἕπερ ἁσφαλείας. Which words are also extant in Suidas, but corruptly. To this purpose is cited that of Menander:

—Μικρῷ
Μὴν ἀρραβῶν εἴεις μ’ ἑπετε καταβαλέωι.
—Εὐμολ. MAG. ἐν Ἀρραβῶν.


'Th. — — — —Fas quanti destinat?
Tr. Talensis magnus totidem, quot ego et tu sumas. Sed arrhaboni has dedit quadrarginta minas."—Mostell. act. iii. sc. i. 113.

The sum was £120, of which he gave £40 in part of payment, and this was the arrhabo. So the Greek fathers interpret St. Paul: Δια μέντοι τοῦ ἀρραβῶνος ήνίης ὀλοκλήρως τῶν δοθησομένων τὸ μέγεθος o γάρ ἀρραβῶν μικρὸν τι μέρος εστὶ του παντος. — Τίτους, in 2 Cor. iv. 22. Δια τούτο γάρ και ἀρραβῶν τον νῦν δοθὲν ορθομάζεται, ὅπως πολλαπλασιάσης εκεί δοθησομένης τῆς γάρμαν. — Ies. in 1 Cor. v. 24. Οὐδὲ Πνεύμα εἰπέν ἄπλος, ἀλλ’ ἀρραβόνα οὐνόμαζεν, ἵνα αὐτὸν καὶ περὶ του πνεύματος θαρσῆ — S. Chrysost. Ad 2 Cor. iv. 22. In this manner speaks Eusebius: Τὰ πρωτολεία τῶν ἐπάθερον ἐνδείξει προαρραβωινιζέται. — De Vida Constantini, lib. i. cap. 3. Οὕτω γὰρ πάνιν κεκομίσθαι, οὕτω παντὸς ὑπεραμφησομένων ἄλλ’ ἀπό ἀρραβῶν τῶν οἰκίων ἄγνωσκότων τοῦ πατρίσιος πλησίου πάλιν τοῦ πατρίσιος πλησίου. — THEODOR, in CLEM. ALEX. 302. So Terentian: "Hic sequester Dei atque hominum appetitus appellatus, ex utrisque partis desposito commissio sibi, carnis quoque depositum servat in semetips, arrhabonem summam totius, Quemadmodum enim nobis arrhabonem Spiritus reliquit, ita et a nobis arrhabone carnis acceptit, et vexit in eadem pignus totius summam illuc quandoque redigendae." — De Reurr. Carn. cap. 51. "Plane acceptit et hic Spiritum caro, sed arrhabone; anima autem non arrhabone, sed plenitudinem." — Ibid. cap. 53. So though the translator of Irenæus render ἀρραβῶν pignus, yet it is evident that Irenæus did understand by ἀρραβῶν an "earnest." "Quod et pignus dixit apostolus, hoc est, partem ejus honoris qui a Deo nobis promissus est, in epistola que ad Ephesos est." — Adv. Heres. lib. v. cap. 11. And a little after: "Si enim pignus complactens hominem in semedpsmus jam facti diece, Abba, Pater, quiet factum universa Spiritus gratia que hominibus ordinant ab exitu a Dei, cum similes nos efficit, et perlicit voluntate Patris?"
I believe in the Holy Ghost. The same Spirit which illuminated the apostles and endued them with power from above to perform personally their apostolical functions, fitted them also for the ordination of others, and the committing of a standing power to a successive ministry unto the end of the world; who are thereby obliged to take heed unto themselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, to feed the church of God.

By these and the like means doth the Spirit of God sanctify the sons of men, and by virtue of this sanctification, proceeding immediately from his office, he is properly called the Holy Spirit. And thus have I sufficiently described the object of our faith contained in this article, what is the Holy Ghost in whom we believe, both in relation to his nature, as he is the Spirit of God, and in reference to his office, as he is the Holy Spirit.

The necessity of the belief of this article appeareth first from the nature and condition of the Creed whereof it is an essential part, as without which it could not be looked upon as a creed. For being the Creed is a profession of that faith into which we are baptized, being the first rule of faith was derived from the sacred form of baptism, being we are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, we are obliged to profess faith in them three; that as they are distinguished in the institution, so they may be distinguished in our profession. And therefore the briefest comprehensions of faith have always included the Holy Ghost, and some concluded with it.

---

1 Eph. iv. 12. 2 Acts xx. 23. 3 In respect of the nature of the Holy Ghost, I have endeavoured the same which Faustus Rheiensis did, of whom Genadinus relates thus much: "Faustus, ex abbate Lirienensis monasterii apud regnum Galilae episcopus factus, vir in divinis scripturis satis intentus, ex traditione symboli occassione accepta, composuit librum de Spiritu Sancto, in quo ostendit eum justa fidei patrum et consubstantalem et coeorinalem esse Patri et Filio, ac plenitudinem Trinitatis obtinendum."—Catal. Hist. Vir. 87.

4 Matt. xxviii. 19. 5 I have formerly shown at large how the Creed did first arise from the baptismal institution, pp. 49, 50. And therefore as the name of the Holy Ghost is an essential part of that form, so must the belief in him be as essential to the Creed, which was at first nothing else but an explication of that form. The first enlargement and explication we find in Justin Martyr, thus expressed: [Ἐπεξεργάζεται]—τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσποτῶν Θεοῦ ὄνομα—καὶ ἐπὶ ὅνυματος ὥστε τῶν Σωμάτων Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπὶ ὅνυματος Πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ, ὅ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκρήγχετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἱησοῦν πάντα, ὃ φωτείζομεν λαοῦται.——Apol. I. c. 61. And the rule of faith delivered soon after by Irenaeus is very consonant unto it: Eic ἐνα Θεον Πατέρα Παντοκράτορα, τὸν πατεροκόσμο τῶν ὁμοιών, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς βαλασσὰς, καὶ πάντα τὰ ὑπὸ αὐτῶν,—καὶ εἰς τὴν Χριστοῦ Ἱησοῦν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκικὰ θεότητα ὑπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας υἱότητος καὶ εἰς Πνεύμα. Αγίων τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυγμένος τῶν οἰκονομιῶν καὶ τῶν ἱερατευσ.—Adv. Epist. lib. 1. cap. 2. As that delivered soon after him by Tertullian: "Unicum quidem Deum credimus; sub hac tamen dispensatione (quam oikonomiam dicimus) ut Unici Dei sit et Filium Sermoipsis, qui ex his processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil Hung missionem Patre in virginitem, et ex eis natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et Filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum: hunc passum, hunc mortuos, et secundum secundum scripturas, resuscitatum a Patre, et in coelo resumptionem, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicium vivos et mortuos. Quod exinde miscri, secundum
Secondly, it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, not only for the acknowledgment of the eminency of his person, but also for a desire of the excellency of his graces and the abundance of his gifts. What the apostle wished to the Corinthians, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with us all. For if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his; if he have not that which maketh the union, he cannot be united to him; if he acknowledgeth him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant; and no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit; such is their felicity which have it: that which is born of the flesh is flesh, such is their infelicity which want it. What, then, is to be desired in comparison of the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, especially considering the encouragement we receive from Christ, who said, If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

Thirdly, it is necessary to profess faith in the Holy Ghost, that the will of God may be effectual in us, even our sanctification. For if God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification, a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, Sanctificatorem, fidelis corum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. — Ade. Prax. cap. 2. Indeed there is an objection made against this truth by the Socinians, who would have us believe that in the first creeds or rules of faith the Holy Ghost was not included. Thus Schlichtingius, writing against Meisner: "Porro observatum est quibusdam tertiam hanc symboli istius partem quae a Spiritu Sancto incipit, ab initio defause, seu in symbolo non fuisset additurum; hanc autem merito, cum non personae ullass in quas credendam sit, (quas solas, ut appareat, auctoribus symboli commorare propositum fuisset,) sed res tantum credendae complectitur, quae implicite fide in Deum et in Jesum Christum omnes continentur. Hoc si ita est, sanc defuit tertius persona, quae Deum illum unum nobis declararet. Tertullianus sane, author antiquissimus et temporibus apostolorum proximus, hanc tertiam symboli istius partem non tantum ita non apposuit ut cunctiter, sed ida ut excluderet, Lib. de Virginibus velit." But as he argues very warily with his Hoc si ita est, so he disputes most fallaciously: for first he makes Tertullian the most ancient and next to the apostles, and so would bring an example of the first Creed from him; whereas Justin Martyr and Irenæus were both before him, and they both mention expressly the Holy Ghost in their rules of faith. Secondly, he makes Tertullian exclude the Holy Ghost from the rule of faith, which he clearly expressed in the place fore-cited: and therefore that place by him mentioned cannot be an exclusion, but an omission only; and the cause of that omission in that place is evident, that he might bring in his opinion of the Paracletus with the better advantage. Thus when Eusebius Cæsariensis gave in a copy of the Creed (by which he was catechised, baptized, and consecrated) to the Council of Nice, it runs thus, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν Πατέρα, ὑπό τούτου Χριστόν, δός, πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἄγιον Πνεύμα ἀγίου, and there concludes. In conformity whereunto the Nicene council altering some things and adding others against the Arians, concluded in the same manner, Καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεύμα. And the Arian bishops in the synod at Antioch not long after: Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεύμα ἐδε ἐδε προσθέσει, πιστεύομεν καὶ περὶ σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ ζωῆς αἰώνιου. From whence it appeareth that the profession of faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was counted essential to the Creed; the rest which followeth was looked upon as a prosōphēagma. "Quid nunc de Spiritu Sancto dicamus, quem credere consequente symboli parte in Trinitate praepriorum?"—Alcius Avoi Fragmenta Serm. de Symbolo.
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fication of the Spirit; 1 if we be elected according to the fore-knowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience; 2 if the office of the Spirit doth consist in this, and he be therefore called holy, because he is to sanctify us, how should we follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord? 3 how should we endeavour to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God? 4 The temple of God is holy, which temple we are, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; 5 for the inhabitation of God is a consecration, and that place must be a temple where his honour dwelleth. Now if we know that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost within us which we have of God; if we know that we are not our own, for that we are bought with a price: we must also know that we ought therefore to glorify God in our body, and in our spirit, which are God's: 6 thus it is necessary to believe in the Spirit of sanctification, that our hearts may be established unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints. 7

Fourthly, it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, that in all our weaknesses we may be strengthened, in all our infirmities we may be supported, in all our discouragements we may be comforted, in the midst of miseries we may be filled with peace and inward joy. For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. 8 We read of the disciples at first, that they were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost; 9 and those which afterwards became followers of them and of the Lord, received the word in much affliction, but with joy of the Holy Ghost. 10 These are the rivers of living water flowing out of his belly that believeth; 11 this is the oil of gladness wherewith the Son of God was anointed above his fellows, 12 but yet with the same oil his fellows are anointed also: for we have an unction from the holy one, and the anointing which we receive of him abideth in us. 13

Lastly, the belief of the Holy Ghost is necessary for the continuation of a successive ministry, and a Christian submission to the acts of their function, unto the end of the world. For as God the Father sent the Son, and the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, because he had anointed him to preach the Gospel, 14 so the Son sent the apostles, saying, As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you; and when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost: 15 and as the Son sent the apostles, so did they send others by the virtue of the same Spirit, as St. Paul sent

1 2 Thess. ii. 13. 2 1 Peter i. 2. 3 Heb. xii. 14. 4 2 Cor. vii. 1. 5 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. 6 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. 7 Thess. iii. 13. 8 Rom. xiv. 17. 9 Acts xiii. 52. 10 1 Thess. i. 6. 11 John vii. 33. 12 Psalm xlv. 7; Heb. i. 9. 13 John ii. 20, 27. 14 Luke iv. 18. 15 John xx. 21, 22.
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Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to send others, saying to Timothy, Lay hands suddenly on no man,¹ and to Titus, For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.² Thus by virtue of an apostolical ordination there is for ever to be continued a ministerial succession. Those which are thus separated by ordination to the work of the Lord, are to feed the flock of God which is among them, taking the oversight thereof;³ and those which are committed to their care are to remember and obey them that have the rule over them, and submit themselves, for that they watch for their souls as they must give account.⁴

Having thus at large asserted the verity contained in this article, and declared the necessity of believing it, we may easily give a brief exposition, by which every Christian may know what he ought to profess, and how he is to be understood, when he saith, I believe in the Holy Ghost. For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I freely and resolvedly assent unto this as unto a certain and infallible truth, that beside all other whatsoever, to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, who is truly and properly a person, of a true, real, and personal subsistence, not a created but uncreated person, and so the true and one eternal God; that though he be that God, yet he is not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the third person in the blessed Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son: I believe this infinite and eternal Spirit to be not only of perfect and indefectible holiness in himself, but also to be the immediate cause of all holiness in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed apostles, and enabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetual succession to continue the edification of the church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions, by all ways and means purifying and sanctifying their souls and bodies, to a full and eternal acceptation in the sight of God. This is the eternal Spirit of God: in this manner is that Spirit holy; and thus I believe in the Holy Ghost.

¹ 1 Tim. v. 22. ² Titus i. 5. ³ 1 Peter v. 2. ⁴ Heb. Lii. 7, 11.
ARTICLE IX.

The Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints.

CHAPTER I.

The Holy Catholic Church.

1. In this ninth article we meet with some variety of position, and with much addition, for whereas it is here the ninth, in some creeds we find it the last, and whereas it consisteth of two distinct parts, the latter is wholly added, and the former partly augmented; the most ancient professing no more than to believe the Holy Church, and the Greeks having added, by way of expli-

1 Although generally the Article of "the holy church" did immediately follow the Article of "the Holy Ghost," as Tertullian well observeth: "Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignorentur, necessario adjectior ecclesia mentio; quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi ecclesia, qua trium corpus est." De Bapt. cap. 6: and St. Augustine: "Spiritus Sanctus sicut creatura, non Creator, est; propter, profecto creatura rationalis est; ipsa enim esset summa creatura. Et ideo in regula fidei non ponetur ante ecclesiam, quia et ipsa ad ecclesiam pertinet." Enchir. cap. 56: and the author of the first book De Symb. ad Catechum.: "Sequitur post S. Trinitatis commendationem, sanctam ecclesiam." Cap. 6: and St. Jerome, cited in the next note; yet notwithstanding, this order was not always observed, but sometimes this Article was reserved to the end of the Creed. As first appeareth in that remarkable place of St. Cyprian: "Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat eadem Nova- tianum legem tenere, quam catholica ecclesia tenet, eodem symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propter hoc usu parecum eum potestatem baptizandai posit. quod videatur in interrogacione baptismi a nobis non discrepare: scit quisquis et hoc opponendum putat, primum, non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symbol legem, neque eandem interrogacionem. Nam cum dicunt, Credas remissionem peccatorum, et vitam aeternam per sanctam ecclesiam? mentitur in interrogacione, cum non habeam ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce sula ipsi confutetur remissione peccatorum non dari, nisi per sanctam ecclesiam, [posse]." Epist. ad Magn. Thus Arius and Eunouius, in the words hereafter cited, place the church.

In the conclusion of their Creed. And the author of the second book De Symb. ad Catechum, placeth "the remission of sins" after "the Holy Ghost." "Noli injuriam facere illi qui fecit te, ut consecuaris ab illo, quod in isto sancto symbolo sequitur, remissionem omnium peccatorum." Cap. 10: and after he hath spoken of the resurrection and life everlasting, proceeds thus to speak of the church: "Sancta ecclesia, in quam omnis sacramenti terminatur, auctoritas," &c. Cap. 13. The author of the third: "Ideo sacramenti hujus conclusio per ecclesiam terminatur, quia ipsa est mater secunda." Cap. 12. And the author of the fourth: "Per sanctam ecclesiam. Propretia hujus conclusio sacramentorum et sanctorum ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absque ea inventus fuerit, absens erit a numero fiatorum; nec hab. Deum Patrem qui ecclesiam noluerit habere matrem." Cap. 13. Thus therefore they disposed the last part of the Creed: "Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, peccatorum remissionem, carnis resurrectionem, et vitam aeternam per sanctam ecclesiam." And the design of this transposition was to signify that remission of sins and resurrection to eternal life are to be obtained in and by the church: as the Creed in the first homily under the name of St. Chrysostom: "Credo in Spiritum Sanctum. Iste Spiritus percutit ad sanctam ecclesiam; ipsa est quum dimitit peccata, promittit carnis resurrectionem, promittit vitam aeternam." 2 "Quae est mater nostra, in quam re- promissimus sanctam ecclesiam." Terrul. Adv. Marcion. lib. v. cap. 4. So Ruffinus: Sanctam ecclesiam. For catholican is added by Pamphilus So St. Jerome: "Preterea cum solena sit in haecus post Trinitatis confessionem interrogare, Credas sanctam
cation or determination, the word catholic, it was at last received into the Latin Creed.

2.—To begin then with the first part of the article, I shall endeavour so to expound it as to show what is the meaning of the church, which Christ hath propounded to us, how that church is holy, as the apostle hath assured us, how that holy church is catholic, as the fathers have taught us. For when I say I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, I mean that there is a church which is holy, and

ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum? quam ecclesiam credidissi eum dicis? Arianorum? sed non habent: nostram? sed extra hanc baptizatus non potuit eam credere quam nescivit.—Adv. Lucif. And St. Augustine: “Credimus et sanctam ecclesiam,” with this declaration, “utique catholicam.” — De Fide et Symb. cap. 10. So Maximus Taurinensis, Chrysolonus, and Venantius Fortunatus. The author of the first book De Symb. ad Catechum. — “Sequitur post Sancte Trinitatis commendationem, Sanctam ecclesiam.”—Cap. 6. The author of the other three, who place this Article last of all: “Sancta ecclesia, in qua omnis baptismatis determination auctoritas.” —Lib. ii. cap. 13; and lib. iv. cap. 13, expressly, Per sanctam ecclesiam, as the words of the Creed, with the explication before mentioned. As also the interrogation of the Novilians, ending with Per sanctam ecclesiam, cited before out of St. Cyprian. So likewise, of those two homilies on the Creed which are falsely attributed to St. Chrysostom, the first hath sanctam ecclesiam after the belief in the Holy Ghost, the second conclude the Creed with Per sanctam ecclesiam. “In carnis resurrectione, id est, in vita aterna specis, in sancta ecclesia charitatis.” Thus the ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus:—

The halgan gelædinge,
that is, “The holy Church;” the Greek Creed in Saxon letters in Sir Robert Cotton’s library, and the old Latin Creed in the Oxford library. “Deus qui in coeli habitat, et condidit ex nihilo ea quae sunt, et multiplicavit proper sanctam ecclesiam suam, firmavit taibi.” —Hebra. lib. i. Vs. 1. “Virtute sua potuit condidit sanctam ecclesiam suam.” — Ibid. “Regalum Dominum, ut revelationes ejus, quas mihi ostendit per sanctam ecclesiam suam, confirmaret.” — Ibid. “Nunc autem una eademque in Trinitate Divinitus docetur, sicut dicitum est in Deo Patre credi, adjecta propositione in, ita et in Christo Filio ejus, ita et in Spiritu Sancto memoratur. Sed ut manifestus fiat quod dictum, ex consequentibus approbabilitur. Sequitur post humum sermonem, Sanctam ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem. Non dixit, in sanctam ecclesiam, nec in remissionem peccatorum, nec in carnis resurrectionem; sed enim addidisset in propositionem, una eademque vis fuisse cum superioribus. Nec autem (f. Nunc autem) in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi de Divinitate fides ordinatur, in Deo Patre dicitur, et in Jesu Christo Filio ejus; et in Spiritu Sancto; in ceteris vero ubi non de Divinitate, sed de creaturis ac mysteriis, sermo est, in propositione non additur, ut dictur in sanctam ecclesiam, sed sanctam ecclesiam credendam esse, nec in Deum, sed ut ecclesiam Deo congregastis; et remissionem peccatorum credendam esse, non in remissionem peccatorum; et resurrectionem carnis, non in resurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque propositionis syllaba Creator a creaturis secernetur, et Divina separatur ab humanis.” — Ruffinus In Symb. Though, I say, this expression be thus pressed, yet we are sure that the fathers did use eis and in for the rest of the Creed as well as for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We have already produced (p. 26, note 2) the authorities of St. Cyril, Arius and Euzoius, and that of St. Epiphanius in Ancyral. Thus also the Latins, as St

Μιαν και μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. — ΤΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΣ Ιστορ. Εκκλ. lib. i. cap. 4. And Arius and Euzoius, in their Confession of faith given in to Constantine, thus conclude, Και εἰς [μίαν] καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἀπὸ περατῶν ἑως περατῶν. — ΣΟΚΡΑΤ. ΗΙΣΤ. ΕΚΚΛ. lib. i. cap. 26. The same is also expressed in both the Creeds, the lesser and the greater, delivered by Epiphanius in Ancyral; the words are repeated in the next observation.

1 Credo sanctam ecclesiam, “I believe there is a holy church,” or, Credo in sanctam ecclesiam, is the same; nor does the particle in added or subtracted make any difference. For although some of the Latin and Greek fathers press the force of that preposition, as it is before observed; though Ruffinus urge it far in this particular: “Ut autem una eademque in Trinitate Divinitus docetur, sicut dicitum est in Deo Patre credi, adjecta propositione in, ita et in Christo Filio ejus, ita et in Spiritu Sancto memoratur. Sed ut manifestus fiat quod dictum, ex consequentibus approbabilitur. Sequitur post humum sermonem, Sanctam ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem. Non dixit, in sanctam ecclesiam, nec in remissionem peccatorum, nec in carnis resurrectionem; sed enim addidisset in propositionem, una eademque vis fuisse cum superioribus. Nec autem (f. Nunc autem) in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi de Divinitate fides ordinatur, in Deo Patre dicitur, et in Jesu Christo Filio ejus, et in Spiritu Sancto; in ceteris vero ubi non de Divinitate, sed de creaturis ac mysteriis, sermo est, in propositione non additur, ut dictur in sanctam ecclesiam, sed sanctam ecclesiam credendam esse, nec in Deum, sed ut ecclesiam Deo congregastis; et remissionem peccatorum credendam esse, non in remissionem peccatorum; et resurrectionem carnis, non in resurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque propositionis syllaba Creator a creaturis secernetur, et Divina separatur ab humanis.” — RUFFINUS IN SYMB. Though, I say, this expression be thus pressed, yet we are sure that the fathers did use eis and in for the rest of the Creed as well as for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We have already produced (p. 26, note 2) the authorities of St. Cyril, Arius and Euzoius, and that of St. Epiphanius in Ancyral. Thus also the Latins, as St
which is catholic, and I understand that church alone which is both catholic and holy; and being this holiness and catholicism are but affections of this church which I believe, I must first declare what is the nature and notion of the church, how am I assured of the existence of that church, and then how it is the subject of those two affections.

3. For the understanding of the true notion of the church, first we must observe that the nominal definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If we look upon the old English word now in use, church or kirk, it is derived from the Greek, and first signified the house of the Lord, that is, of Christ, and from thence was taken to signify the people of God, meeting in the house of God. The Greek word used by the apostles to express the church signifieth a calling forth, if we look upon the origination; a congregation of men, or a company assembled, if we consider the use of it. But neither of these doth fully express

Cyprin: "In aeternam penam sero credent, qui in vitam aeternam credere noluerunt."—

Ad Demetrianum. So interpres Irenaei:"Quotquot autem timent Deum, et credunt in adventum Filii ejus," &c. So Chrysologus: "In sanctam ecclesiam. Quia ecclesia in Christo, et in ecclesia Christus est; qui ergo ecclesiam fatetur, in ecclesiam se confessus est credidisse."—Serm. 82. And in the ancient edition of St. Jerome in the place before cited it was read, Current in sanctam ecclesiam, and the word in was left out by Victorinus.

1 Κύριος, "the Lord," and that properly Christ: from whence Κύριον, "belonging to the Lord Christ;" ὅσος Κυρίακος, "the Lord's house;" from thence κυρίανκο, "kyrk," and "church." 2 The word used by the apostles is εκκλησία, from εκκλείω, ενοχή. From εκκλησια, εκκλησίας, from εκκλήσια, εκκλησία of the same notation with the Hebrew, קְרֵיָה. "Ecclesia quippe ex vocations appellata est."—S. August. Expos. ad Rom. And though they ordinarily take it primarily to signify congregatio, as St. Augustine: "Inter congregacionem, unde synagoa, et congregationem, unde ecclesia nomen habet, distinct aliquid."—Enarr. in Psalmum LVIII., yet the origination speaks only of "evocation," without any intimation of "congregation or meeting together," as there is in εὐκλήσιον. From whence arose that definition of Methodius, "Οτι εκκλησίαν παρά το εκκλησιάν τὰς ἱδονὰς λέγεσθαι φησίν.—Phot. Biblioth. § 235. Whereas εκκλαίου is here no more than καλεῖν, ἐκκλήσια no more than κλάσις, as κλήρους and εκκλησίουs with the Attics were the same: from whence it came to pass that the same proposition hath been twice added in the composition of the same word; from εκκαλεῖν, εκκλησία, from thence εκκλησιάζειν, and because the proposition had no significance in the use of that word, from thence εξεκκλησιάζειν, to convocare, or "call together." But yet εκκλησία is not the same with εκκλησίας, not the "evocation or the action of calling," but the κλητοι or the "company called," and that (according to the use) gathered together; from whence εκκλησιάζειν is "to gather together," or "to be gathered." Hence St. Cyril: Έκκλησία δε καλεῖται φερούμενος, διά το πάντας εκκαλεσθαι και ὁμοί συνάγεται.—Cachet. 18. So Ammonites: "Εκκλησίαν εἴλεγον οἱ Αθηναῖοι τῷ σύνῳ τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν. To this purpose do the LXX. use εκκλησίαζειν actively, "to convocare or call together an assembly," as εκκλησιάζειν λάβε, and εκκλησιάζειν συναγωγῆς, and εκκλησιάζεσθαι passively, as 'Εξεκκλησιάζον τή συναγωγή, (Joshua xvii. 1,) which the Attic writers would have expressed by εκκλησιάζειν, as Aristophanes:—'

'Εδώθε τοι περὶ πρωτὸν ὕπνοιν ὑν τῇ Ποικίλῃ· Εκκλησιάζειν πρόβατα συναγώνειαν.'—Iesp. 31. Where though the scholiast hath rendered it, 'Eκκλησιάζειν, εἰς εκκλησίαν συνάγειν, whereby the lexicographers have been deceived, yet the word is even there taken as a neuter, in the passive sense, as generally the Attics use it. Howsoever from the notion of the word we cannot conclude that it signifies a number of men called together into one assembly out of the mass or generality of mankind; first, because the preparation of any such force in the use of the word; secondly, because the collection of coming together is not specified in the original.
the nature of the church, what it is in itself, and as it is pro-
pounded in our Belief.

4.—Our second observation is, that the church hath been taken
for the whole complex of men and angels worshipping the same
God; and again, the angels being not considered, it hath been
taken as comprehending all the sons of men believing in God ever
since the foundation of the world.1 But being Christ took not
upon him the nature of angels, and consequently did not properly
purchase them with his blood, or call them by his word; being
they are not in the scriptures mentioned as parts or members of
the church, nor can be imagined to be built upon the prophets or
apostles; being we are at this time to speak of the proper notion
of the church, therefore I shall not look upon it as comprehending
any more than the sons of men. Again, being though Christ was
the lamb slain before the foundation of the world, and whosoever
from the beginning pleased God were saved by his blood; yet
because there was a vast difference between the several dispensa-
tions of the law and gospel; because our Saviour spake expressly
of building himself a church when the Jewish synagogue was about
to fail; because catholicism, which is here attributed unto the
church, must be understood in opposition to the legal singularity
of the Jewish nation; because the ancient fathers were generally
wont to distinguish between the synagogue and the church; there-
fore I think it necessary to restrain this notion to Christianity.2

5.—Thirdly, therefore I observe that the only way to attain
unto the knowledge of the true notion of the church is to search
into the New Testament, and, from the places there which mention
it, to conclude what is the nature of it. To which purpose it will
be necessary to take notice that our Saviour first speaking of it,
mentions it as that which then was not, but afterwards was to be;3
as when he spake unto the great apostle, Thou art Peter, and upon

2 Thus St. Ignatius speaking of Christ: Αὐτὸς ὑμῖν θύρα τοῦ Πατρός ἤ γε εισερχόμενος ἃ 
τις Μάρα, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία:"—Epist. ad Philad. § 9. Where ἡ ἐκκλησία is plainly taken for the multitude of Christians who were converted to the faith by the apostles, and those who were after-
wards joined to them in the profession of the same faith. "Sacrificia in populo, sacrificia 
it in ecclesia."—IBEX. Adv. Haeres. lib. iv. cap. 34. "Disseminaverunt sermone de Christo patriarchae et prophetae; demessa est autem ecclesia, hoc est, fructus perce-
pit."—Idem, lib. iv. cap. 42. "Quid? Judaeus populus circa beneficia divina perdi-
dus et ingratus? nonne quod a Deo primum recessit, impatienltiae crimen fuit? — Impa-
tientia etiam in ecclesia haereticos facit."—S. CYPRIAN. De Bono Patient. "Quis non 
agnoscat Christum——reliquisse matrem synagogam Judeorum, Veteri Testamento carnali-
er adhaerentem, et adhaesse uxor sui, sanctae ecclesie?" — S. AUGUSTINUS 
Contra Faust. lib. xii. cap. 8. "Mater sponsi Domini nostri Jesus Christi, synagoga est; profunde nunc ejus ecclesie." — Idem, 
Fiar. in Psalmum alio.
3 "In quem tingeret? — in ecclesiam? quam nondum apostoli siruerant." — TER-
TULLIANUS De Baptismate, cap. 11.
this rock I will build my church; but when he ascended into heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down, when Peter had converted three thousand souls which were added to the hundred and twenty disciples, then was there a church (and that built upon Peter, according to our Saviour's promise), for after that we read, The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved. A church, then, our Saviour promised should be built, and by a promise made before his death; after his ascension, and upon the preaching of St. Peter, we find a church built or constituted, and that of a nature capable of a daily increase. We cannot, then, take a better occasion to search into the true notion of the church of Christ, than by looking into the origination and increase thereof; without which it is impossible to have a right conception of it.

6. Now what we are infallibly assured of the first actual existence of a church of Christ is only this: There were twelve apostles with the disciples before the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the number of the names together were an hundred and twenty. When the Holy Ghost came after a powerful and miraculous manner upon the blessed apostles, and St. Peter preached unto the Jews that they should repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. These being thus added to the rest, continuing steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers: and all these persons so continuing are called the church. What this church was is easily determined, for it was a certain number of men, of which some were apostles, some the former disciples, others were persons which repented, and believed, and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the sacraments administered, joining in the public prayers presented

1 Matt. xvi. 18. 2 Acts ii. 41. 3 Acts i. 15. 4 "Quam est oevente atque commutans manifesta Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem, super te, inquit, edificato ecclesiam mean; et dabo tibi clares, non ecclesias. Sic enim et exitus docet: in ipsa ecclesia extraest, id est, per ipsum, ipse clarem imbuist; vide quam: Viri Israelei, auribus mandate quae dico: Jesus Nazarenum vitum a Deo vobis destinatum, et reliqua."—Tertull. De Pudicit. cap. 21. 5 Acts ii. 47. 6 Tertullian, mentioning the Acts of the Apostles, addeth these words: "Quam scripturam qui non recipit, nec Spiritus Sancti esse possunt, qui necdum Spiritum possint agnosce discernibis missum; sed nec ecclesiam defendere, qui, quando et quis in omnia instituit est hoc corpus, probare non habent."—De Praescr. Haeret. cap. 22. 7 Acts i. 15. 8 Acts ii. 38, 41, 42. 9 "Cum remississesummi sacerdotes Petrum et Joannem, et reversi essent ad reliquos co-apostolos et discipulos Domini, id est, in ecclesiis."—S. Ireneeus Adversus Haereses: seu De Refutatione falsae Scientia lib. ii. cap. 12.
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into God. This was then the church, which was daily increased by the addition of other persons received into it upon the same conditions, making up the multitude of them that believed, who were of one heart and one soul, believers added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.

But though the church was thus begun, and represented unto us as one in the beginning; though that church which we profess to believe in the Creed be also propounded unto us as one, and so the notion of the church in the Acts of the Apostles might seem sufficient to express the nature of that church which we believe; yet because that church was one by way of origination, and was afterwards divided into many, the actual members of that one becoming the members of several churches; and that church which we believe, is otherwise one by way of complexion, receiving the members of all churches into it; it will be necessary to consider how at the first those several churches were constituted, that we may understand how in this one church they were all united. To which purpose it will be farther fit to examine the several acceptions of this word as it is diversely used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament; that, if it be possible, nothing may escape our search, but that all things may be weighed, before we collect and conclude the full notion of the church from thence.

7.—First, then, that word which signifies the church in the original Greek, is sometimes used in the vulgar sense, according as the native Greeks did use the same to express their conventions, without any relation to the worship of God or Christ, and therefore is translated by the word assembly, of as great a latitude. Secondly, it is sometimes used in the same notion in which the Greek translators of the Old Testament made use of it, for the assembly of the people of God under the law, and therefore might be most fitly translated the congregation, as it is in the Old Testament. Thirdly, it hath been conceived that even in the scriptures it is sometimes taken for the place in which the members of the church did meet to perform their solemn and public services unto God; and some passages there are which seem to speak no less, but yet are not so certainly to be understood of the place, but that they may as well be spoken of the people congregated in a certain place. Beside these few different acceptions, the church in the

1 Acts iv. 32. 2 Acts v. 14. 3 Hanc voces ecclesia, ex qua habuit omnis ecclesia initium. —Idem, ibid. 4 Acts vii. 38; 39-41. 5 Heb. ii. 12. 6 From these places St. Augustin did collect that ecclesia was taken in the scriptures for the place of meeting, or the house of God, and came so to be frequently used in the language of Christians in his time: "Sicut ecclesia dicitur locus, quo ecclesia congregatur. Nam ecclesia homines sunt, de quibus dicitur, Ut exhiberet sibi gloriosam ecclesiam. Hanc tamen vocari etiam lipsau- domum orationum, idem apostolus testis est, uti alt. Nunquid domos non habetis ad mun-
language of the New Testament doth always signify a company of persons professing the Christian faith, but not always in the same latitude. Sometimes it admitted of distinction and plurality; sometimes it reduceth all into conjunction and unity. Sometimes the churches of God are diversified as many; sometimes, as many as they are, they are all comprehended in one.

For first in general there are often mentioned the churches by way of plurality; the churches of God, the churches of the Gentiles, the churches of the saints. In particular we find a few believers gathered together in the house of one single person, called a church, as the church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila; the church in the house of Nymphas; the church in the house of Philemon; which churches were nothing else but the believing and baptized persons of each family, with such as they admitted and received into their house to join in the worship of the same God.

8.—Again, when the scripture speaketh of any country where the gospel had been preached, it nameth always by way of plurality the churches of that country, as the churches of Judea, of Samaria and Galilee, the churches of Syria and of Cilicia, the churches of Galatia, the churches of Asia, the churches of Macedonia. But notwithstanding there were several such churches or congregations of believers in great and populous cities, yet the scriptures always

ducandum et bibendum? an ecclesiam Dei contemplavit? Et hoc quotidianis loquendi usus obnuit, ut in ecclesiis prodiere, aut ad ecclesiastum congregate, non dicatur, nisi qui ad locum ipsum parietesque prodicerit, vel confugerit, quibus ecclesiis congregatio continentur?—Quast. in Levit. lib. iii. cap. 57. By these words it is certain that in St. Augustin’s time they used the word ecclesia, as we do now “the church,” for a place set apart for the worship of God; and it is also certain that those of the Greek church did use ἐκκλησία in the same sense; as Eusebius, speaking of the flourishing times of the church, before the persecution under Diocletian, says, the Christians, μηδεις ἐτί τοις παλαιοῖς ὁικοδομήμασιν ἀφφεύγονες, εὑρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνά πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμέλιων ἀνάστασις ἐκκλησιῶν—Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. 1. And St. Chrysostom: Ἐ γάρ ἐκκλησίας κατασκαίη χαλεπτὸν καὶ ἀνάστασιν, πολυ- μαλὸν ναόν πνευματικῶν καὶ γάρ ἀνθρώπων ἐκκλήσιας σεμνότερον.—Homil. 26 in Epist. ad Rom. But it is not so certain that the apostle used ἐκκλησία in that sense, nor is it certain that there were any houses set apart for the worship of God in the apostles’ times, which then could be called by that name. For Isidorus Pelusiota expressly denies it, and distinguishes between ἐκκλησία and ἐκκλησιαστήριον, after this manner: Ἄλλο ἐστίν ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλο ἐκκλησιαστήριον. ἦ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἀμώμων φυκῶν συνεστήκε, τὸ δ’ ἀπὸ λίθων καὶ ἑξων ὁικοδομεῖται. And thus he proved this distinction: Ὀσπερ γὰρ ἄλλο ἐστι θυσιαστήριον, καὶ ἄλλο θυσία, καὶ ἄλλο θυμίατον, καὶ ἄλλο θυμία, καὶ ἄλλο βουλευτήριον, καὶ ἄλλο βουλή τοῦ μέν γὰρ τοῦ τόπου ἐν ὑ πνευματουσίᾳ μηνεύει, ἡ δὲ τῶν βουλευτερέων ἀνθρώπων, εἰς καὶ ὁ κύδωνος καὶ ἡ ὑστημα ἀνήκε, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστή- ριον καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Then he concludes, that in the apostles’ times there were no ἐκκλησιαστήρια. Εὔπερ μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὅτε ἡ ἐκκλησία ἑκάμα μὲν χριστιανὴ πνευματικὸς ἐβρευ ἐς πολιτεία λαμπρᾷ, ἐκκλησιαστήριον οὐκ ἤν.—Lib. ii. Epist. 246. Acts xi. 26; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22.

1 Acts xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xiv. 34; 2 Cor. vii. 19, 23, 24; xi. 5, 28, xii. 13; Rev. xxii. 16.
2 1 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 16.
3 Rom. xvi. 4.
4 Thus Origen for the most part speaks of the church in the plural number, Λῃ ἐκκλησιαστήριον. 1 Cor. xiv. 33.
5 St. Chrysostom observe of Priscilla and Aquila, Οὕτω γὰρ ἦσαν εὐδοκίμοι, ὡς καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκκλησιαστήριον ποιοῦσι, διὰ τοῦ πάντας ποιοῦσι πιστούς, καὶ διὰ τοῦ τῶν ἔχουσιν αὐτῶν αὐνοίας παραβιάσιν.—Homil. 39 in Epist. ad Rom. Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19.
6 Col. iv. 15.
7 Phil. 2.
8 Gal. i. 22; Acts ix. 31; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 19; Rev. i. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Gal. i. 2.
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speak of such congregations in the notion of one church. As when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, Let your women keep silence in the church; ¹ yet the dedication of his epistle is, Unto the church of God which is at Corinth.² So we read not of the churches, but the church at Jerusalem, the church at Antioch, the church at Cæsarea, the church at Ephesus, the church of the Thessalonians, the church of Laodicea, the church of Smyrna, the church of Pergamus, the church of Thyatira, the church of Sardis, the church of Philadelphia.³ From whence it appeareth that a collection of several congregations, every one of which is in some sense a church, and may be called so, is properly one church by virtue of the subordination of them all in one government under one ruler. For thus in those great and populous cities where Christians were very numerous, not only all the several churches within the cities, but those also in the adjacent parts, were united under the care and inspection of one bishop, and therefore was accounted one church; the number of the churches following the number of the angels, that is, the rulers of them, as is evident in the Revelation.

Now as several churches are reduced to the denomination of one church, in relation to the single governor of those many churches, so all the churches of all cities and all nations in the world may be reduced to the same single denomination in relation to one supreme governor of them all, and that one governor is Christ, the bishop of our souls. Wherefore the apostle speaking of that in which all churches do agree, comprehendeth them all under the same appellation of one church; and therefore often by the name of church ⁴ are understood all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the churches dispersed through the distant and divided parts of the world.⁵ For the single persons professing faith in Christ are members of the particular churches in which they live, and all those particular churches are members of the general and universal church, which is one by unity of aggregation; and this is the church in the CREED which we believe, and which is in other creeds expressly termed one: ⁶ I believe in one Holy Catholic Church.

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 31.
² 1 Cor. i. 2.
³ And thus after they grew yet far more numerous in the time of Clemens bishop of Rome: Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παρουκοίασιν ἡ ἔμπνευσα, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ παρουκούσην Κορινθιόν.—Epist. 1. So after him Ignatius: Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἀσυμμετρόπῳ τῇ ὑστερῷ εἰς Ἐφέσου τῆς Ἀσίας.—Επιστ. ad Ephes. And, Ἐκκλησία ἀγία τῇ ὑστερῇ εἰς Τρακκίσου.—Επιστ. ad Tral. And so the rest. Acts viii. 1; ix. 22; xiii. 1; xv. 3; xviii. 22; xx. 17; 2 Thess. i. 1; Col. iv. 16; Rev. ii. 8, 12, 18; iii. 1, 7, 14.
⁴ Of this, as of one church, Celsus calls the Christians, τοὺς ἀπὸ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας—Αρμα Οργεν. lib. ν.
⁵ Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28; xv. 9; Gal. i. 13; Eph. i. 22; iii. 10, 21; v. 23, 25, 27, 29, 32; Phil. iii. 6; Col. i. 18, 24; Heb. xii. 23.
⁶ So the Creeds of Epiphanius in Apo-

vato, Ποιεῖσθαι εἰς μίαν ἀγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. So the Jerusalem Creed In St. Cyril. Thus the Nicene, with the additions of the council of Constantinople, Μιᾶν ἀγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Thus also the Alexandrian, as appeareth by those already quoted of Alexander, Arius and Eusebius.
9.—It will, therefore, be farther necessary for the understanding of the nature of the church, which is thus one, to consider in what that unity doth consist. And, being it is an aggregation not only of many persons, but also of many congregations, the unity thereof must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If, then, we reflect upon the first church again, which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all other since have been in a manner added and conjoined, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other churches are united and agree. Now they were described to be believing and baptized persons, converted to the faith by St. Peter, continuing stedfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and prayers. These, then, were all built upon the same rock, all professed the same faith, all received the same sacraments, all performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same church. To this church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same church by being built upon the same foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, by receiving the same sacraments, by performing the same devotions.¹

From whence it appeareth that the first unity of the church considered in itself, beside that of the head, which is one Christ, and the life communicated from that head, which is one Spirit, relieth upon the original of it, which is one; even as a house built upon one foundation, though consisting of many rooms, and every room of many stones, is not yet many, but one house. Now there is but one foundation upon which the church is built, and that is Christ: for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.² And though the apostles and the prophets be also termed the foundation, yet even then the unity is preserved, because as they are stones in the foundation, so are they united by one corner-stone; whereby it comes to pass that such persons as are of the church, being fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, growth unto a holy temple in the Lord.³ This stone was laid in Zion for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation;⁴ there was the first church built, and whosoever have been, or ever shall be converted to the true Christian faith, are and shall be added to that church, and laid upon the same foundation, which is the unity of origination.⁵ Our Saviour gave the same power to all the

Acts ii. 41, 42, 44, 47. ¹ ¹ Cor. iii. 11. ² Eph. ii. 19-21. ³ Tertullian, speaking of the apostles. ⁴ Isai. xxviii. 16. ⁵ Louter.
10.—Secondly, the church is therefore one, though the members be many, because they all agree in one faith. There is one Lord, and one faith, and that faith once delivered to the saints, which whosoever shall receive, embrace, and profess, must necessarily be accounted one in reference to that profession. For if a company of believers become a church by believing, they must also become one church by believing one truth. If they be one in respect of the foundation, which is ultimately one; if we look upon Christ, which is mediately one; if we look upon the apostles united in one corner-stone; if those which believe be therefore said to be built upon the foundation of the apostles, because they believe the doctrine which the apostles preached, and the apostles be therefore said to be of the same foundation, and united to the corner-stone, because they all taught the same doctrine which they received from Christ, then which believe the same doctrine delivered by Christ to all the apostles, delivered by all the apostles to believers, being all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same church. And this is the unity of faith."
11.—Thirdly, many persons and churches, howsoever distinguished by time or place, are considered as one church, because they acknowledge and receive the same sacraments, the signs and badges of the people of God. When the apostles were sent to found and build the church, they received this commission, Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.\(^1\) Now as there is but one Lord, and one faith, so also is there but one baptism;\(^2\) and consequently they which are admitted to it in receiving it are one. Again, at the institution of the Lord’s Supper, Christ commanded, saying, Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this, and all by communicating of one become as to that communication one. For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.\(^3\) As, therefore, the Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink;\(^4\) and thereby appeared to be the one people of God; so all believing persons, and all churches congregated in the name of Christ, washed in the same laver of regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the same cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to be the same church. And this is the unity of the sacraments.

12.—Fourthly, howsoever belongeth to any church is some way called, and all which are so, are called in one hope of their calling:\(^5\) the same reward of eternal life is promised unto every person, and we all through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.\(^6\) They, therefore, which depend upon the same God, and worship him all for the same end, the hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began,\(^7\) having all the same expectation, may well be reputed the same church. And this is the unity of hope.

13.—Fifthly, they which are all of one mind, whatsoever the number of their persons be, they are in reference to that mind but one; as all the members howsoever different, yet being animated

\(^{1}\) Matt. xxviii. 19. \(^{2}\) Eph. iv. 5. \(^{3}\) 1 Cor. x. 17. \(^{4}\) 1 Cor. x. 2-4. \(^{5}\) Eph. iv. 4. \(^{6}\) Gal. v. 5. \(^{7}\) Titus i. 2.
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by one soul, become one body. Charity is a fastening and uniting nature, nor can we call those many who endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. By this, said our Saviour, shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. And this is the unity of charity.

14.—Lastly, all the churches of God are united into one by the unity of discipline and government, by virtue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastors, guides appointed, authorized, sanctified, and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternal salvation: as, therefore, there is no church where there is no order, no ministry; so where the same order and ministry is, there is the same church. And this is the unity of regimen and discipline.

15.—By these means and for these reasons, millions of persons and multitudes of congregations are united into one body, and become one church. And thus under the name of church expressed in this article, I understand a body or collection of human persons professing faith in Christ, gathered together in several places of the world for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforesaid. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the true notion of the church as such, which is here the object of our faith: it remaineth, therefore, that we next consider the existence of the church, which is acknowledged in the act of faith applied to this object. For when I profess and say I believe a church, it is not only an acknowledgment of a church which hath been, or of a church which shall be, but also of that which is. When I say I believe in Christ dead, I acknowledge that death which once was, and now is not; for Christ once died, but now is not dead. When I say I believe the resurrection of the body,

1 Eph. iv. 3.
2 John xiii. 35.
3 "Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia ejus, et fides una, et plebs in solidum corporis unitatem concordiae glutine copulata."—S. CYPRIAN. De Unitate Eccles.
4 "Ecclesia non est, qua non habet eam doctrinam."—S. HIERONYM. Adv. Lucifer. Pántes éuerpešóswsan τοὺς διακόνους ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ τὸν ἑπίσκοπον ὡς πα- τέρα, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνάδον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς συνάδον ἀποστόλων. Χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται.—S. IGNAT. Epist. ad Traul. § 3. Τὸ γε τέλ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλη- σίᾳ ὄνομα τῷ τῶν εἰς Χριστὸν πιστε- 

\[\text{Interpres ἡπαίνει male transitūt declarat, quod est ὑποφαίνει: cum reddere oportuerit, connectit, aut context.}^{3}\]

3 "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singu- līs in solidum pars tenetur: ecclesia quo- que una est, quae in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur."—S. CYPRIAN. De Unitate Eccles. So he joins these two together: "Cum sit a Chrismo una ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum concordii numerositatem diffusus."—Epist. ad Antonianum.

6 These are all expressed by Tertullian: " Una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus; idem Christus, eadem spe, eadem lavacri sacra-

\[\text{De Virg. relat. cap. 2. "Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis, et disciplina unitate, et spolo unico."—Apolog. cap. 39.}^{6}\]
I acknowledge that which never yet was, and is not now, but shall hereafter be. Thus the act of faith is applicated to the object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, as past; to what is to come, as still to come; to that which is present, as it is still present. Now that which was then past, when the CREED was made, must necessarily be always past, and so believed for ever; that which shall never come to pass until the end of the world, when this public profession of faith shall cease, that must for ever be believed as still to come. But that which was when the CREED began, and was to continue till that CREED shall end, is proposed to our belief in every age as being; and thus ever since the first church was constituted, the church itself, as being, was the object of the faith of the church believing.

The existence, therefore, of the church of Christ (as that church before is understood by us), is the continuation of it in an actual being, from the first collection in the apostles' times unto the consummation of all things. And therefore to make good this explication of the article, it will be necessary to prove that the church which our Saviour founded and the apostles gathered was to receive a constant and perpetual accession, and by a successive augmentation be uninterruptedly continued in an actual existence of believing persons and congregations in all ages unto the end of the world.

16.—Now this, indeed, is a proper object of faith, because it is grounded only upon the promise of God: there can be no other assurance of the perpetuity of this church but what we have from him that built it. The church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve itself for ever. Many thousand persons have fallen totally and finally from the faith professed, and so apostatized from the church. Many particular churches have been wholly lost, many candlesticks have been removed; neither is there any particular church which hath any power to continue itself more or longer than others; and consequently, if all particulars be defectible, the universal church must also be subject of itself unto the same defectibility.

But though the providence of God doth suffer many particular churches to cease, yet the promise of the same God will never permit that all of them at once shall perish. When Christ spake first particularly to St. Peter, he sealed his speech with a powerful promise of perpetuity, saying, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. When he spake generally to all the rest of the apostles to the

1 Matt. xvi. 18,
same purpose, Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he added a promise to the same effect, and lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world.\(^1\) The first of these promises assureth us of the continuance of the church, because it is built upon a rock; for our Saviour had expressed this before: Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.\(^2\) The church of Christ is the house of Christ, for he hath builded the house, and is as a Son over his own house, whose house are we: \(^3\) and as a wise man, he hath built his house upon a rock, and what is so built shall not fall. The latter of these promises giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ.\(^4\) Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ, there he is in the midst of them,\(^5\) and thereby they become a church, for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house. Wherefore being Christ doth promise his presence unto the church, even to the end of the world, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the church, until that time, of which his presence is the cause. Indeed, this is the city of the Lord of Hosts, the city of our God, God will establish it for ever,\(^6\) as the great prophet of the church hath said.

Upon the certainty of this truth, the existence of the church hath been propounded as an object of our faith in every age of Christianity; and so it shall be still unto the end of the world. For those which are believers are the church, and therefore if they do believe, they must believe there is a church. And thus having showed in what the nature of a church consisteth, and proved that a church of that nature is of perpetual and indefectible existence

\(^1\) Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.
\(^2\) Matt. vii. 24, 25.  \(^3\) Heb. iii. 3, 6.  \(^4\) "Non desirit ecclesiam suam Divina protectio, dicente Domino, Ecce, ego vobiscum omnibus diibus:" dc.—Leo, Epist. 31, St. Augustin upon these words of Psalm ci., Exiguatatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi, maketh the church to speak these words: "Quid est, quod nescio qui recedentes a me murmurant contra me? Quid est, quod perdidi me perisse contendunt? Certe enim hoc dicunt, Qula fui et non sum. Annuncia mihi exiguatatem dierum meorum. Non a te quero illos dies aeternos: illi sine fine sunt, ubi ero; non ipso quo: temporales quero, temporales dies mihi annuncia: Exiguatatem dierum meorum, non aeternitatem dierum meorum, annuncia mihi." Quamdiu ero in isto seculo, annuncia mihi, propter illos qui dicunt, Fuit, et jam non est: propter illos qui dicunt, Impa
\(^5\) Matt. xviii. 20.
\(^6\) "Forle ista civitas, quae mundum te

ult, aliquando evetetur. — Abst.: Deus fundavit eam in aeternum. Si ergo eam Deus fundavit in aeternum, quid times ne sedat firmamentum?"—S. August. Serm. in Psalmum xlvii. Psalm xlviii, 8,
by virtue of the promises of Christ, I have done all which can be necessary for the explication of this part of the article, I believe the church.

17.—After the consideration of that which is the subject in this article, followeth the explication of the affections thereof, which are two, sanctity and universality; the one attributed unto it by the apostles, the other by the fathers of the church: by the first the church is denominated holy, by the second catholic. Now the church which we have described may be called holy in several respects, and for several reasons: First, in reference to the vocation by which all the members thereof are called and separated from the rest of the world to God; which separation in the language of the scriptures is a sanctification: and so the calling being holy (for God hath called us with an holy calling), the body which is separated and congregated thereby may well be termed holy. Secondly, in relation to the offices appointed and the powers exercised in the church, which by their institution and operation are holy, that church for which they were appointed and in which they are exercised, may be called holy. Thirdly, because whosoever is called to profess faith in Christ, is thereby engaged to holiness of life, according to the words of the apostle, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity: for those namers of the name, or named by the name of Christ, are such as called on his name, and that was the description of the church; as when Saul did persecute the church, it is said he had authority from the chief priests to bind all that called upon the name of Christ, and when he preached Christ in the synagogues, all that heard him said, Is not this he who destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem? Being then all within the church are by their profession obliged to such holiness of life, in respect of this obligation the whole church may be termed holy. Fourthly, in regard the end of constituting a church in God, was for the purchasing an holy and a precious people; and the great design thereof was for the begetting and increasing holiness, that as God is originally holy in himself, so he might communicate his sanctity to the sons of men, whom he intended to bring unto the fruition of himself, unto which without a previous sanctification they can never approach, because without holiness no man shall ever see God.

For these four reasons the whole church of God, as it containeth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the.

1 2 Tim. i. 9. 2 2 Tim. ii. 19. Vide 1 Cor. i. 2; Acts ix. 14, 20, 21. 3 Or, γάρ τὸ ἄρθρον τῶν ἄγιων τὸ ἄλθος πίστεως καὶ πολτείας ἁριστῆς συν- κεκρατημένων ἐκκλησία ἵσι ἐδώ κατε τοίς σοφιας γενεαμενοις. — Ἐνοκές ΠΕΛΕΙΩΣΑ Ινθ. ii. Επιθ. 246. 4 Hebr. xii. 14.
faith of Christ, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed holy. But the apostle hath delivered another kind of holiness which cannot belong unto the church taken in so great a latitude. For, saith he, Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. Now though it may be conceived that Christ did love the whole church as it did any way contain all such as ever called upon his name, and did give himself for all of them; yet we cannot imagine that the whole body of all men could ever be so holy as to be without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing. It will be therefore necessary, within the great complex body of the universal church, to find that church to which this absolute holiness doth belong: and to this purpose it will be fit to consider both the difference of the persons contained in the church, as it hath been hitherto described, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death; whereby we shall at last discover in what persons this holiness is inherent really, in what condition it is inherent perfectly, and consequently in what other sense it may be truly and properly affirmed that the church is holy.

18.—Where first we must observe that the church, as it embraceth all the professors of the true faith of Christ, containeth in it not only such as do truly believe and are obedient to the word, but those also which are hypocrites, and profane. Many profess the faith, which have no true belief; many have some kind of faith, which live with no correspondence to the gospel preached. Within, therefore, the notion of the church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both professing the same faith. For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a field in which wheat and tares grow together unto the harvest; like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; like unto a floor in which is laid up wheat and chaff; like unto a marriage feast, in which some have on the wedding garment, and some not. This is that ark of Noah in which were preserved beasts clean and unclean. This is that great house in which there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood, and of earth, and some to honour and some to dishonour. There are many called, of all which the church

---

1 Eph. v. 25-27. 2 Matt. xiii. 24, 30, 47. 3 "Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites, Dei esse ecclesiam catholicam, et intra eam usque in finem seculit frumentum mixtas paleas contineri: hoc est, bonis mala sacramento communione miscere."—Fulgent, Ad Petrum, cap. 43. Matt. iii. 12. 4 Matt. xxii. 16. 5 Gen. vii. 2. 6 St. Jerome joins these two together: "Arca Noæ ecclesiae typus:—ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita et in hac universarum et gentium morum hominum sunt: ut ibi pardus et leo, lupus et agnus; ita et hic justi et peccatores, id est, vamp
consisteth, but there are few chosen, of those which are called, and thereby within the church.\(^1\) I conclude, therefore, as the ancient Catholics did against the Donatists,\(^2\) that within the church, in the public profession and external communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved; and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned: and that church containing these of both kinds may well be called holy, as St. Matthew called Jerusalem the holy city,\(^3\) even at that time when our Saviour did but begin to preach, when we know there was in that city a general corruption in manners and worship.

Of these promiscuously contained in the church, such as are void of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the church, and when they pass out of this life die in their sins, and remain under the eternal wrath of God; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto which they were called, and being by death separated from the external communion of the church, and having no true internal communion with the members and the head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they die are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the church, but remain united still by virtue of that internal union by which they were before conjoined both to the members and the head. As, therefore, the church is truly holy, not only by an holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy in relation to the same saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from

\(^{1}\) Matt. xxii. 14.
\(^{2}\) The opinion of the Donatists confined by the Catholics is to be seen in St. Augustin's book entitled Breviculi Collationum. Upon which reflecting in his book Post Collationem, he observes how they were forced, by the testimony of those scriptures which we have produced, to acknowledge that there were mingled with the good such as were occultly bad: "Ecce, etiam ipsi veritatem evangelicam non alium coacti sunt confiteri, qui malos occultos nunc el permixtos esse [dixerunt];" as the good and bad fish are taken in the same net, because it could not discern the bad from the good. And thence he enforceth from their acknowledgment, that those which are apparently evil, are contained in the same church: "Si enim [Dominus] propere rebus bonos et malos [pisces pariter] congregatus ecclesiam comparavit, quia malos in ecclesia non manifester, sed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita nescient sacerdotes, quemadmodum sub fluitibus quid accoperint reta nescerunt piscatores; propertea ergo et area comparata est, ut etiam manifesti mali cum bonis in ea [permixtia] praemunientur futuri. Neque enim palaque quae in area est permixta frumentis, etiam ipsa sub fluitibus latet, quae sic omnium occultis est conspicua, ut potius occulta sint in ea area manifesta."—Ether post Collat. cap. 2, 10.

\(^{3}\) Matt. iv. 5; xxvii. 53.
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19.—Then shall that be completely fulfilled that Christ shall present unto himself a glorious church, which shall be holy and without blemish.\(^1\) Not that there are two churches of Christ, one in which good and bad are mingled together, another in which there are good alone; one in which the saints are imperfectly holy, another in which they are perfectly such; but one and the same church in relation to different times,\(^2\) admitteth or not admitteth the permission of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly. To conclude, the church of God is universally holy in respect of all, by institutions and administrations of sanctity; the same church is really holy in this world, in relation to all godly persons contained in it, by a real infused sanctity; the same is farther yet at the same time perfectly holy in reference to the saints departed and admitted to the presence of God; and the same church shall hereafter be most completely holy in the world to come, when all the members actually belonging to it shall be at once perfected in holiness and completed in happiness. And thus I conceive the affection of sanctity sufficiently explicated.

20.—The next affection of the church is that of universality, \textit{I believe the Holy Catholic Church.} Now the word catholic, as it is not read in the scriptures, so was it not anciently in the Creed (as we have already shown), but being inserted by the church, must necessarily be interpreted by the sense which the most ancient fathers had of it, and that sense must be confirmed, so far as it is consonant with the scriptures.

21.—To grant, then, that the word was not used by the apostles,\(^3\) we must also acknowledge that it was most anciently in use among the primitive fathers, and that as to several intents. For first, they called the epistles of \textit{St. James}, \textit{St. Peter}, \textit{St. John}, \textit{St. Jude}, the catholic epistles,\(^4\) because when the epistles written by St.

\(^1\) Eph. v. 27.
\(^2\) This was it which the catholics answered to the Donatists objecting that they made two distinct churches: “De duabus etiam ecclesias calumniat eorum catholicus refutatur, identidem expressius ostendentes quid dixerint, id est, non eam ecclesiam quae nunc habet permixtos malos alienam se dixisse a regno Dei, ubi non erunt mali commixti; sed eandem ipsam unam et sanctam ecclesiam nunc esse aliter, tunc antem aliter futuram; nunc habere malos mixtos, tunc non habiurum; sicut nunc mortalem, quod ex mortalibus constaret hominibus, tunc another immortal, quod in ea nullus esset vel aequore moriturus: sicet non idem duos Christi, quia prior moriturus postea non moriturus.” —S. August. Collat. tertii Diei, cap. 10.
\(^3\) It was the ordinary objection of the schismatical Novatians, that the very name of “catholics” was never used by the apostles; and the answer to it by the catholics was by way of concession: “vel sub apostolis, inquit, nemo catholicus vocatur. Esto, sic fuerit, vel illud indulget,” &c.—Pacian, Ad Symponianum, Epist. 1.
Paul were directed to particular churches congregated in particular cities, these were either sent to the churches dispersed through a great part of the world, or directed to the whole church of God upon the face of the whole earth. Again, we observe the fathers to use the word catholic for nothing else but general or universal, in the ordinary or vulgar sense; as the catholic resurrection is the resurrection of all men, the catholic opinion the opinion of all men. Sometimes it was used as a word of state signifying an officer which collected the emperor's revenue in several provinces, united into one diocese, who, because there were particular officers belonging to the particular provinces, and all under him, was therefore called the catholicus, as general procurator of them all, from whence that title was by some transferred upon the Christian patriarchs.

lam reliquit." This therefore was the common title of these epistles in St. Jerome's time among the Latins, and before among the Greeks, as appeareth by Eusebius: Τοιαύτα κατὰ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, οὐ η πρῶτοι τῶν ὄνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται: ἦσσον δὲ ὡς νοθεύτηκαν μὲν οὐ πολλοὶ γονᾶ τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐνεργήσαντα, ὡς οὖν τῆς λεγόμενης Ιουδαίων, καὶ αὐτὴς ὀρθῆς τῶν ἐπτα λεγόμενων καθολικῶν.

—Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. 23. The same was in use before the time of Eusebius, as appeareth by Dionysius bishop of Alexandria: ὁ δὲ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὗτος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προερχόμεν ἐκατον τὸ ὄνομα.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 25. And before him, as appeareth by Origen: δευτέρω δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκου, ὡς Πέτρος ὑψηλόντα αὐτὸ ποιήσαντα, ὡν καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ διὰ τῶν τῶν ὁμολογήσεων.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. 25. Thus anciently epistolae catholicae was used for the "general epistle;" καθολικαί δὲ ἐκλήσισαν, ἐπίειδαι οὖς πρὸς ἐνόντα ἐγγράφασιν, ὡς αὐτοῦ Παῦλου, ἀλλὰ καθόλου πρὸς πάντα.—Leont. De Sectis, act. 2. And so continued, not only in relation to the scriptures, but to the epistles of others; as Eusebius, of Dionysius bishop of Corinth: Χρησιμοτάτον ἀπαντήν εκκλησίας ἐν αὐτοῖς εὐπρόστευτο καθολικαῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστολάς.—Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. 23.


2 We read in the old Glossary, καθολικος, rationalis, that is, the receiver of the imperial revenue; not that it signifies so much of itself, but because he was the general receiver; and so not for receiving or accounting, but for the generality of his accounts in respect of others who were inferior, and whose receipts and accounts were more particular, therefore he was called catholicus, who by the Latins was properly stilled, procurator summi ret; or rationalis summum. Thus Constantine signified to Cezilianus bishop of Carthage, that he had written to his procurator-general to deliver him monies: ἦδονα γραμματα πρὸς ὄσσον τὸν διεσταμω- τον καθολικὸς τῆς Ἀθρικῆς, καὶ ἐξόλοσα αὐτὸ, ὡς προεγράφων φασί τῇ τῇ στερ- βότητι ἀπαντημένην φροντίστω.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. x. cap. 6. And in the same manner to Eusebius: Ἀπεστάλη δὲ γράμματα παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἡμέρας πρὸς τὸν τῆς διοικήσεως καθολικὸν, ὥς αὐτὸς ἐς τὰς ἐπισκέψεις ἐμπρός ἑπισκόπων καὶ παρασκευασίας φρον- τίστερις.—Idem, De Vida Constanti. Lib. iv. cap. 36; et Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 9. So Suidas: Ἔπιστολὴ Τιμίλεως τοῦ παραβατοῦ πρὸς Πορφύριον καθολικὸν, which is the 36th of his epistles excur.
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When this title is attributed to the church it hath not always the same notion or signification; for when by the church is understood the house of God, or place in which the worship of God is performed, then by the catholic church is meant no more than the common church, into which all such persons as belonged to that parish in which it was built were wont to congregate. For where monasteries were in use, as there were separate habitations for men, and distinct for women, so there were also churches for each distinct; and in the parishes, where there was no distinction of sexes as to habitation, there was a common church which received them both, and therefore called catholic. 1

Again, when the church is taken for the persons making profession of the Christian faith, the catholic is often added in opposition to heretics and schismatics, expressing a particular church continuing in the true faith with the rest of the church of God, as the catholic church in Smyrna, the catholic church in Alexandria. 2

This rationalis summation was by the Greeks expressed thus, either by one word, καθολικός, or by more to the same purpose. So Dio Caeceleianus, speaking of Aurelius Eubalus: Τούς γὰρ δὴ καθόλου λόγους ἐπιτετραμικότεράν, οὐδὲν ἔτι οὐκ ἐγέμισεν. — Euseb. hist. lib. 19. So Porphyrius: Ὅστε καὶ θαυμασίου τινος οὐδόμα τεπεσεθάντος τούς καθόλου λόγους πράττοντος.—In Vitae Plotin. So Dionysius of Alexandria speakoth of Macrianus, who was procurator eunuchus rei to the emperor Valerianus: Ὅσοι πρότερον μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων λεγόμενοι εἶναι βασιλείως, οὐδὲν εὐλογοῦ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων οὐδὲ καθολικῶς (alluding to the Logos) ἐφοροῦντο, ἀλλὰ ὑποτειχίσκων ἄριστα προσφηντή τῇ ἰερασίᾳ, Οὐδὲ τούτοις προφητεύοντο ἀπὸ κἂν ἄνω τούτων, καί τὸ καθόλου μὴ θέλοντος ὑπὸ τῆς καθολικῆς πιστεύσεως, οὐδὲ τῇ κατά τὸ θείον ἤπατε τοῦ πρὸ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι διὸ καὶ τῆς μὲν καθολικῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἄγγειον πολέμας.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 10.

Thus ἐκκλησία καθολικὴ is often to be understood, especially in the latter Greeks, for the common or parochial church. As we read in Codin us: Ὁ Ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐνοχῆς ἑγὼν τῶν καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.—De officiis Constant. cap. 1. And again: ὁ ἄριστος τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἑγὼν τῆς ἐνοχῆς τῶν καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν μετὰ προτεραθεῖ τοῦ Ἐκκλησίας.—Ibid. So likewise Ialsammon: Λέγεται Ἐκκλησίας ὁ τῶν μοναστηρίων διοικητῆς, ὡς ἡ Ἐκκλησίαι ὑποκριτικῶς ὁ τῶν καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν φροντιστὴς.—Lib. vii. Juris Grecorum. Where appeareth a manifest distinction of the monastic and the catholic churches. Hence Alexius, patriarch of Constantinople, complained of such as frequented the private chapels, and avoided the common churches, describing those persons in this manner: Πατριαρχικὸς σταυροφορικὸς ή καὶ ἐπισκοπικος θαρροῦσαι, τὸς καθολικὰς παραιτούμεναι, καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ πάντων συναξῶν καταφθονοῦσαι.—Lib. iv. Juris Gratuum.

2 As the Smyrnecans spake in Eusebius of Polycarpus: Τενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.—Ibid. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. 13. So, Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρει, in Epiphanius. Thus Gregory Nazianzen begins his own last will, Γρηγόριος έπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντίνῳ πόλει, in which he bequeaths his estate to the αγία καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία τῆς ἐν Ναζαρέω, and subscribes it after the same manner of words in which he began it; and so the rest of the bishops which subscribed as witnesses: Αμφιλοχίους ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ισιον.—Οἰκείων ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Αλεξάνδρει.—Θεόδοσίου ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Χαλκεί.—Θεόδωρου ἐπίσκοπος τῆς άγιας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς κατὰ Άπατείαν. — Θεομιστίου ἐπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς κατὰ Ἀδριανούπολιν.—In the same manner the Latins: "Eodem itaque tempore in ecclesia Hippornensi catholica Vale ricus sanctus episcopatum gerebat."—Possinus De Vita August. cap. 4. Thus any particular true church is called "the catholic church" of the place in which it is; and all churches which retain the catholic faith, are called "catholic churches." As when the synod of Antioch concluded their sentence against the Samosateneans thus, Καὶ πάντα αἱ καθολικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι συμφωνοῦσιν ὡμίου. According to which notion we read in Leo the Great, "Ad venerationem Pentecostes unanimer inicetur, exultantes in honore sancti Spiritus, per quem omnis ecclesia catholica sanctificatur, omnis anima rationum imbutatur."—Serm. 1 de Pentecost. Where, where we read in the synod of Ariminum, Εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πάντες ἐπίσκοποι.
22.—Now being these particular churches could not be named catholic, as they were particular, in reference to this or that city, in which they were congregated, it followeth that they were called catholic by their coherence and conjunction with that church which was properly and originally called so;¹ which is the church taken in that acceptance which we have already delivered. That church which was built upon the apostles as upon the foundation, congregated by their preaching and by their baptizing, received continued accession, and disseminated in several parts of the earth, containing within it numerous congregations, all which were truly called churches, as members of the same church; that church, I say, was after some time called the catholic church, that is to say, the name catholic was used by the Greeks to signify the whole. For being every particular congregation professing the name of Christ, was from the beginning called a church; being likewise all such congregations considered together were originally comprehended under the name of the church; being these two notions of the word were different, it came to pass that for distinction sake at first they called the church, taken in the large and comprehensive sense, by as large and comprehensive a name, the catholic church.²


² I conceive at first there was no other meaning in the word καθολικὴ than what the Greek language did signify thereby, that is, toва or universa; as St. Austin: "Cum dixisset, "deeper contexta, addidit, per totum. Quod si referamus ad id quod significat, nemo ejus est express qui pertinere inuentur ad totum: a quolo loto, siue Graece indicat lingua, catholicos vocatur ecclesia." — Tract. 118 in Joan. The most ancient author which I find it in, (except Ignatius: "O Sophia av φανη ὅ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεὶ τὸ πλήθος ἑστω: ὡσπερ ὅπου ἂν ἡ Χριστοῦ ἵστου, ἐκεὶ ἡ καθολική ἐκκλησία." — Epist. ad Smyrnanos, § 8) is Clemens Alexandrinus: Μόνη εἶναι φομὲν τὴν ἄρχας καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. — Strom. lib. vii. But the Passion of Polycarbus, written in the name of the church of Smyrna, may be much ancien, in which the original notion seemeth most clear: "Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦντα Σμύρναν, τῇ παροικοῦντι ἐν Φιλολαύνῳ καὶ πᾶσας ταῖς κατά πάντα τόπος τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίας, ἵνα ἐστι omnibus toius ecclesiae urbea cruciata. —Evser. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. 15. It was otherwise called in the same notion.
Although this seem the first intention of those which gave the name catholic to the church, to signify thereby nothing else but the whole or universal church, yet those which followed did signify by the same that affection of the church which floweth from the nature of it, and may be expressed by that word. At first they called the whole church catholic, meaning no more than the universal church; but having used that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the church was to be universal, and in what that universality did consist.

As far, then, as the ancient fathers have expressed themselves, and as far as their expressions are agreeable with the descriptions of the church delivered in the scriptures, so far I conceive we may safely conclude that the church of Christ is truly catholic, and that the truly catholic church is the true church of Christ, which must necessarily be sufficient for the explication of this affection, which we acknowledge when we say we believe the catholic church.

23.—The most obvious and most general notion of this catholicism consisteth in the diffusiveness of the church, grounded upon the commission given to the builders of it, Go teach all nations, whereby they and their successors were authorised and empowered to gather congregations of believers, and so to extend the borders of the church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The synagogue of the Jews especially consisted of one nation, and the public worship of God was confined to one country: In Judah was God known, and his name was great in Israel; in Salem was his tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Sion. He showed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation. The temple was the only place in which the sacrifices could be offered, in which the priests could perform their office of ministration; and so under the law there was an enclosure divided from all the world besides. But God saith unto his Son, I will give the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. And Christ commanded the apostles, saying, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Thus the church of Christ, in its primary institution, was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend itself, from the city


1 Matt. xxviii. 19. 2 Psalm lxxvi. 1, 2. 3 Psalm cxvii. 19. 4 Psalm ii. 8. 5 Mark xvi. 15. 6 Luke xxiv. 47.
of Jerusalem, where it first began, to all the parts and corners of the earth. From whence we find them in the Revelation, crying to the Lamb, Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. 1 This reason did the ancient fathers render why the church was called catholic, 2 and the nature of the church is so described in the scriptures.

24.—Secondly, they called the church of Christ the catholic church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whether they be things in heaven or things in earth, whether they concern the condition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the Holy Ghost did lead the apostles into all truth, 3 so did the apostles leave all truth unto the church, which teaching all the same, may well be called catholic, from the universality of necessary and saving truths retained in it. 4

25.—Thirdly, the church hath been thought fit to be called catholic in reference to the universal obedience which it prescribeth; both in respect of the persons, obliging men of all conditions, 5 and in relation to the precepts, requiring the performance of all the evangelical commands. 6

1 Rev. v. 9.
2 We have before observed of Aruis and Euolios, that, naming the catholic church in their Creed, they gave withal the interpretation of it: Eise miain katholikou ekklhesia ton Theou, tìn apò perasvous evous perasvot. — Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 26.
4 This is the second interpretation delivered by St. Cyril: Kaic dì to didaixen katholikoj kai anelleivoj apanta tìn ej peri ton anbropov evain ejdeonontta ejgymata, peri te drastov kai deon petram ejgymata, etpovrianov tòn eki ejgeovion. — Catech. 18. "Ecclesia Gracem nomen est, quod in Latinum vertitur convocatio, propere qua omnes ad se vocet. Catholica (id est, universalis) ideo dicitur, quia per universum mundum est constitutae, vel quoniam catholica, hoc est, generalis in eadem doctrina est ad instructionem." — Ivo, Decret. p. iii. cap. 2.
5 This is the third interpretation of St. Cyril: Kai dìa to pav geinous anbropov eji eivtheia ejpetovon, ejpovion tòn ea eij ejgeovion, ejgynov te kai ejgynov, ejlynov te kai ejlynov. — Catech. 18.
6 "Si reedenda catholicj vocabuli ratio est, et exprimenda de Graco interprettatione Romana, catholicus ubique unum, vel (ut doctores putant) obedientia omnium nuncupatur, mandatarum silicet Dei. Unde apostolus, Si in omnibus obedientes estis: et iterum, Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius peccatoris constituisti sunt multi, sic per dictandum unius justi consuetudinem etiam multi, ergo qui catholicus, idem justi obedientis." — Pauianus, Ad Symp. Epist. I. "Acutum aliquid tibi videris dicere, cum catholica nomen non ex totus orbis communione interpretari, sed ex observatione praecipserum omnium Divinorum, atque omnium sacramentorum: quasi nos, etiam forte hinc sit appellata catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat, cujus veritatis nonnullae particula etiam in diversis involuntur heresibus, hujus nominis testimonio nitamur ad demonstrandam ecclesiam omnium gentibus, et non promulgete Dei et m.
26.—Fourthly, the church hath been yet further called or reputed catholic, by reason of all graces given in it, whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spiritual virtues are disseminated, all the works, and words, and thoughts of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in Christ Jesus.

In all these four exceptions did some of the ancient fathers understand the church of Christ to be catholic, and every one of them doth certainly belong unto it. Wherefore I conclude that this catholicism, or second affection of the church, consisted generally in universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kind of obedience, as curing all diseases, and planting all graces, in the souls of men.

27.—The necessity of believing the Holy Catholic Church, appeared first in this, that Christ hath appointed it as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first that the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved; and what was then daily done, hath been done since continually. Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a church to save some, and make another institution for other men’s salvation. There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus; and that name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the church. As none were saved from the deluge but such as were within the ark of Noah, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first-born of Egypt lived but such as were within those habitations whose door-posts were sprinkled with blood by the appointment of God for their preservation; as none of the inhabitants of Jericho could escape tam multis tantique manifestis oraculis ipsius veritatis. Sed unum hoc est tutum, quod nostis persanàere comaris, solos romanississe Bogatistas, qui catholicé recte appellandí sint, ex observatione praecipuorum omnia Divinorum atque omnia sacramentorum.”
—S. Augustinus, Epist. xliviii. cap. 7.

Indeed this notion of the catholic church was urged by the Donatists as the only notion of it, in opposition to the universality of place and communion. For when the catholics answered for themselves, “Quia ecclésiae totius orbis diffusa, cui testimonium prohibet scriptura Divina, ipsa, non Donatista, communickt, unde catholicó merito et sunt et vocantur: Donatistas autem responderunt, non catholicum nomen ex universitate gentium, sed ex plenitudine institutionum.”—Idem, Collatio tertii Diei, cap. 3.

This is the fourth and last explication given by St. Cyril: Αλλὰ τὸ καθολικὸς εὐαγγελιον μὲν καὶ θεραπευών ἀπάν τὸν ἄμαρτων εἰδος, τῶν διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος εἰπτελούμενων, κεκτηθαὶ δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ πάσαν ιδέαν οὗτομομενής ἀρέτης, εἰ ἐργοὶ τε καὶ λόγοι, καὶ πνευματικοὶ παντοτεχνοί χαρισματε.—Catech. 18.

2 Acts iv. 47.

3 Καθάπερ ἐν ταλάσσῃ νῦσσο εἰσὶ αἱ μὲν οἰκηται καὶ εὐνορὲς καὶ καρποφόροι, ἔχουσι δρόμους καὶ λιμενές, πρὸς τὸ τοὺς χειμαζομένους ἔχεις ἐν εὐαυτῷ καταφυγῆς; οὕτω δεδώκεν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ κόσμῳ κυμανισμόνε καὶ χειμαζομένω ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὰς συναγωγάς, λεγομένας ἐκκλησίας ἁγίας, εν αἷς καθάπερ λιμένα εὑρὸ οἱ νησίων αἱ διδασχαλίας τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσὶ, πρὸς αἱ καταθέτων οἱ θελοντες σωτηθοῦν. —S. Timothei episcopi. A.D. Apostolicon, liber ii. Μη δὲ προσέχετε ἐκκλησία τὴν σωτηρίαν τούτην εὐποτεῖμη, καὶ μετέννα τὴν καθολικήν ἔλευσθεν ἐκκλησίας καὶ πίστεως μετέχειν Χριστοῦ δυνάμεως, μὴ δὲ σώζεσθαι.
the fire or sword but such as were within the house of Rahab, for whose protection a covenant was made; so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God which belong not to the church of God. This is the congregation of those persons here on earth which shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the vessels of the tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into, and fixed in, the temple.

28.—Secondly, it is necessary to believe the church of Christ, which is but one, that being in it we may take care never to cast ourselves, or be ejected out of it. There is a power within the church to cast those out which do belong to it; for if any neglect to hear the church, saith our Saviour, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.  

By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanours, we may incur the censure of the church of God, and while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of heaven. For our Saviour said to his apostles, upon whom he built his church, Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.  

Again, a man may not only passively and involuntarily be rejected, but also may by an act of his own cast out or reject himself, not only by plain and complete apostasy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable heresy, or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the catholic church, and falling into an irrecoverable schism.

29.—Thirdly, it is necessary to believe the church of Christ to be holy, lest we should presume to obtain any happiness by being of it, without that holiness which is required in it. It is not enough that the end, institution, and administration of the church are holy; but, that there may be some real and permanent advantage received by it, it is necessary that the persons abiding in the communion of it should be really and effectually sanctified. Without which holiness the privileges of the church prove the greatest disadvantages, and the means of salvation neglected, tend to a punishment with aggravation. It is not only vain but pernicious to attend at the marriage-feast without a wedding garment, and it is our Saviour's description of folly to cry Lord, Lord, open unto us, while we are without oil in our lamps. We must acknowledge a necessity of holiness when we confess that church alone which is holy can make us happy.

30.—Fourthly, there is a necessity of believing the catholic church, because except a man be of that he can be of none. For

---

1 Matt. xviii. 17.  
2 John xx. 23.  
3 Matt. xxv. 11.  
2 M 2
being the church which is truly catholic containeth within it all which are truly churches, whosoever is not of the catholic church cannot be of the true church.\footnote{"Sola catholica ecclesia est, quae verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis; hoc est domicilium fidei; hoc templum Dei, quo si quis non intraverit, vel a quo si quis exierit, a spe vitae ac salutis aeternae alienus est." - \textit{LACTAN. De Vera Sup. Lib. iv. cap. 30.}} That church alone which first began at Jerusalem on earth, will bring us to the Jerusalem in heaven; and that alone began there which always embraceth the faith once delivered to the saints.\footnote{\textit{Jude 3.}} Whatsoever church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new churchdom, and whatsoever is so new is none. So necessary it is to believe the Holy Catholic Church.

31.—Having thus far explicated the first part of this article, I conceive every person sufficiently furnished with means of instruction what they ought to intend when they profess to believe the Holy Catholic Church. For thereby every one is understood to declare thus much: I am fully persuaded and make a free confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that Christ, by the preaching of the apostles, did gather unto himself a church, consisting of thousands of believing persons, and numerous congregations, to which he daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add unto the same unto the end of the world; so that by the virtue of his all-sufficient promise I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, and now is, and hereafter shall be, so long as the sun and moon endure, a church of Christ one and the same. This church I believe in general holy in respect of the author, end, institution, and administration of it; particularly in the members, here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly, holy. I look upon this church not like that of the Jews limited to one people, confined to one nation, but by the appointment and command of Christ, and by the efficacy of his assisting power, to be disseminated through all nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of Christ, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well-pleasing in the sight of God. And thus I believe the Holy Catholic Church.
CHAPTER II.

The Communion of Saints.

1. THIS part of the article beareth something a later date than any of the rest, but yet is no way inferior to the other in relation to the certainty of the truth thereof. And the late admission of it into the CREED will be thus far advantageous, that thereby we may be the better assured of the true intent of it, as it is placed in the CREED. For it will be no way fit to give any other explication of these words as the sense of the CREED than what was then understood by the church of God, when they were first inserted.

2. If we look upon the first institution of the church, and the original condition of those persons which received the gospel, how they were all together, and had all things common; how they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need; how St. Paul urged an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, as it was written, He that hath gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack: we might well conceive that the communion (which word might be taken for communication) of the saints, may signify the great charity, bounty, and community among the people of God.

3. But being that community precisely taken was not of eternal obligation, nor actually long continued in the church; being I conceive this article doth not wholly look upon that which is already past; and especially, being I think neither that custom, nor that notion was then generally received in the church, when

1 These words, communio sanctorum, were not in the Aquilian Creed expounded by Ruffinian: they were not mentioned by him, as being either in the Oriental or the Roman Creed. They were not in the African Creed expounded by St. Austin De Fide et Symbolo; nor in the Creed delivered by Maximus Taurinensis; nor in any of the Sermons of Chrysologus; nor in any of the four books De Symbolo et Catechumenos attributed to St. Austin; nor in the 118th Sermon, under his name, De Tempore: "Cum dixerimus sanctam ecclesiam, adjungimus remissionem peccatorum."—Cap. 8. They are not in the Greek Creed in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, not in the old Latin Creed in the Oxford Library, not in that produced by Elipandus. We find them not in the old Greek Creeds, not in that of Eusebius given in to the council of NICE, not in that of Marcellus delivered to the bishop of Rome, not in that of Arius and Eusolus presented to Constantine, not in either of the Creeds preserved in the Ancoratus of Epiphanius, not in the Jerusalem Creed expounded by St. Cyril, not in that of the council of Constantinople, not in that of Charisius given in to the Ephesine council, not in either of the Expositions under the name of St. Chrysostom. It was therefore of a later date, and is found in the Latin and Greek copy in Bene't College library, and is expressed and expounded in the 116th and 117th Sermons De Tempore, attributed to St. Austin. Vide Paschali Symbolum.

2 Acts ii. 44, 45. 3 Cor. vili. 14, 15.

3 Grotius upon that place of the Corinthians observes: "Spectat et hic ea quam in Symbolo profitemur sanctorum commun. in."
this communion of saints was first inserted, I shall therefore endeavour to show that communion which is attributed to the saints, both according to the fathers who have delivered it and according to the scriptures from whence they derived it.

4.—Now all communion being between such as are some way different and distinct, the communion of the saints may either be conceived between them and others, or between themselves; between them and others as differing from them either in their nature or their sanctity, between themselves, as distinct in person only, or condition also. Wherefore if we can first understand who or what kind of persons these are which are called saints, with whom beside themselves, and how among themselves, in this relation as they are the saints, they have communion, and lastly in what the nature of that communion in each respect consisteth; I know not what can be thought wanting to the perfect explication of the communion of saints.

That we may understand what communion the saints have with others, it would be necessary first to consider what it is to be a saint, in what the true nature of saintship doth consist, by what the saints are distinguished from others. Again, that we may understand what communion the saints have with or among themselves, it will be farther necessary to consider who are those persons to which that title doth belong, what are the various conditions of them, that we may be able to comprehend all such as are true saints, and thence conclude the communion between them all.

5.—I take it first for granted, that though the Greek word which we translate saints, be in itself as applicable to things, as persons; yet in this article it signifieth not holy things, but holy ones, that is, persons holy. Secondly, I take it also for granted that the singular holy one, the holy one of Israel, the fountain of all sanctity, the sanctifier of all saints, is not comprehended in the article, though the communion of the holy ones with that singular, eminent, and transcendent holy one be contained in it. Thirdly, I take it farther for granted that the word in this article, which we translate saints, is not taken in the original of the Creed, as it is often taken in the translation of the Old Testament, for the

---

1 Kουσφία ἄγιων may be as well understood in the neuter as the masculine; as Exod. xxviii. 33: Ἑξαρὰτ Ἄραβας τῷ ἀναστήματος τῶν ἄγίων; that “Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things.” So Lev. v. 15: Καὶ ἀμαρτή ἀκούσιος ἀπὸ τῶν ἄγίων. Kap. xxiii. 2: Καὶ προεξέτωσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄγίων τῶν Ισραήλ. I Chron. xxiv. 5: Ἀνερτες τῶν ἄγιων. “the governors of the sanctuary,” of which notion afterwards.

2 This is one of the common names of God in the Old Testament, Ἁγίος Ἰσραήλ, which is also sometimes translated, plurally by the LXX.; as Isai. xii. 16: Ἄγιοι Ισραήλ. Jer. li. 5: καὶ προεξέτωσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἄγίων Ισραήλ. and if it were so taken, then κοινοφία τῶν ἄγίων would be “the communion of God,” as τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.
sanctuary as if the communion were nothing else but a right of communicating or participating of the holy things of God. Lastly, I take it also for granted that although the blessed and holy angels are sometimes called in the scriptures by the name of saints, yet they are not those saints who are here said to have the communion, though the saints have communion with them.

For this part of the article hath a manifest relation to the former, in which we profess to believe the holy church; which church is therefore holy because those persons are such, or ought to be, which are within it, the church itself being nothing but a collection of such persons. To that confession is added this communion; but because though the church be holy, yet every person contained in it is not truly so, therefore is added this part of the article which concerneth those who are truly such. There is, therefore, no doubt but the saints mentioned here are members of the church of Christ, as we have described it, built upon the apostles, laid upon the foundation of their doctrine, who do not only profess the gospel, but are sanctified thereby.

The only question then remaining is, in what their sanctity or saintship doth consist, and (because though they which are believers since our Saviour’s death be truly and more highly sanctified, yet such as lived before and under the law, the patriarchs, the prophets, and the servants of God were so called, and were truly named the saints of God) who were the persons which are capable of that denomination.

Now being God himself hath given a rule unto his people, which is both in the nature of a precept and of a pattern (Be ye holy as I the Lord your God am holy: be ye holy, there is the command, as

1 καὶ ἡ ἁγία is frequently used in the scriptures for “the sanctuary;” and then κοσμικὰ τῶν ἁγίων might be taken for “the communion in all those things which belonged to the worship of God,” as ἀκούωντις was “a man excluded from all such communion.”

2 The angels are not only called “holy” in the scriptures by way of addition or epithet, as, Πάντες οἱ ἁγίοι ἄγγελοι. (Matt. xxv. 31.) Μετά τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἁγίων. (Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26.) Εὐχαριστήσθη ὑπὸ ἄγγελον ἁγίου. (Acts x. 22.) Ἐνμοινὸν τῶν ἁγίων ἄγγελων. (Rev. xiv. 10;) but also the ἁγία, “holy ones, or saints,” taken substantively or singly, signify sometimes the angels; as Deut. xxxiii. 2: Ἡ γῆ ἡ μακρὰς ἀπὸ μικρῶν ἐκ τῶν ἄγγιστων ἡ ἁγία. (Targum renders, ἡ ἡκίον ἡ μεγάλη ἡ ἁγία.) “And with him ten thousands of holy angels;” and Jonathan supplies, ἡ ἥλιος ἡ ἐν πίστει ἡ ἁγία. “And with him myriads of holy angels.” And although the LXX. keep the Hebrew שֵׁם, yet they understood “the angels” in that place: Σὺν μυριάσεως Κάθως, (Hesychius; Κάθως, ἄγγελόμυκα,) εἰ δεξιῶν αὐτῶν ἄγγελος μετ’ αὐτῶν. So Job v. 1: “To which of the saints wilt thou turn?” Εὐσεία ἄγγελων ἄγγιων ἐν τοῖς ἑξηκοσιούδος (Dan. viii. 13.) Thus in the vision of Daniel: He “heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake.” (Dan. viii. 13.) So Zech. xiv. 5: “And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee.” And thus it may very well be understood in the New Testament, 1 Thess. iii. 13: Εἰ τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετ’ ἄνω τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῶν. In correspondence to that, 2 Thess. i. 7: Εἰ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ’ ὑπομονῆς μετ’ ἄγγελων ἀκούοντων. These are the μυριάδες ἄγγιων in St. Jude 14, ἀκούοντας τοὺς ἁγίους, “the myriads of angels,” and thus κοινωνία ἁγίων should be “the communion of the angels.”
the Lord your God is holy, there is the rule); being it is impossible that we should have the same sanctity which is in God, it will be necessary to declare what is this holiness which maketh men to be accounted holy ones, and to be called saints.

6.—The true notion of saints is expressed by Moses both as to the subject and the affection or qualification of it; for they are called by him men of holiness:¹ such are the persons understood in this article, which is the communion of men of holiness. Now holiness in the first acception of it signifieth separation, and that with the relation of a double term, of one from which the separation is made, of the other to which that which is separated is applied. Those things which were counted holy under the law were separated from common use and applied to the service of God, and their sanctity was nothing else but that separation from and to those terms, from an use and exercise profane and common, to an use and exercise peculiar and divine. Thus all such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God, are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of saints. The penmen of the Old Testament do often speak of the people of Israel as of an holy nation, and God doth speak unto them as to people holy unto himself; because he had chosen them out of all the nations of the world and appropriated them to himself. Although, therefore, most of that nation were rebellious to him which called them, and void of all true inherent and actual sanctity, yet because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to the separation, called holy. In the like manner those of the New Testament writing to such as were called, and had received, and were baptized, in the faith, give unto them all the name of saints, as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For being baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect, therefore all such as have been received into the church may be in some sense called holy.

7.—But because there is more than an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption, necessary to make a man holy, therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not only by an extrinsical denomination, but by a

¹ Exod. xxii. 31.
real and internal affection. What this sanctity is, and who are capable of this title properly, we must learn out of the gospel of Christ, by which alone, ever since the church of Christ was founded, any man can become a saint. Now by the tenure of the gospel we shall find that those are truly and properly saints which are sanctified in Christ Jesus:¹ first, in respect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated; for whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God; ² by which they are purged, God himself purifying their hearts by faith; ³ whereby they are washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus,⁴ in whom also, after that they believe, they are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise; ⁵ secondly, in respect of their conversation: for as he which hath called them is holy, so are they holy in all manner of conversation; ⁶ adding to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity, that they may neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." Such persons, then, as are called by a holy calling, and not disobedient to it; such as are endued with a holy faith, and purified thereby; such as are sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God, and by virtue thereof do lead a holy life, perfecting holiness in the fear of God; ⁸ such persons, I say, are really and truly saints, and being of the church of Christ (as all such now must of necessity be) are the proper subject of this part of the article, the communion of saints, as it is added to the former, the Holy Catholic Church.

Now as these are the saints of the church of Christ, from whence they were called the churches of the saints; ⁹ so there was never any church of God but there were such persons in it as were saints: we read in the Psalms of the congregation and the assembly of the saints;¹⁰ and Moses assured the people of Israel that all the saints of God were in his hand; ¹¹ we read in the prophets of the saints of the most high,¹² and at our Saviour's death the bodies of such saints which slept arose.¹³ Where, again, we may observe that they were saints while their bodies were in the grave; as Aaron in the time of David kept the name of saint of the Lord.¹⁴ Such as are holy in their lives do not lose their sanctity but improve it at their deaths, nor can they lose the honour of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection.

¹ 1 Cor. i. 2.       ² 1 John v. 1.       ³ Acts xv. 9.       ⁴ 1 Cor. vi. 11.       ⁵ Eph. i. 13.       ⁶ 1 Peter i. 15.       ⁷ 2 Peter i. 5-8.       ⁸ 2 Cor. vii. 1.       ⁹ 1 Cor. xiv. 33.       ¹⁰ Psalm lxxxix. 5; cxlix. 1: ἡ ἡσυχία LXX., ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἄγιων. lxxxix. ¹¹ 2 Peter i. 9: τὸ ὑπὲρθεῖν ἐν βουλή ἄγιων. Latin Vulgate, in ecclesia et in concilio sanctorum. (Deut. xxxiii. 3; Dan. vii. 18, 21, 22, 25; Matt. xxvii. 52.) "Quis ignorant sub altera dispensatione Dei omnes retro sanctos ejusdem fuisse meriti cujus nunc Christiani sunt?" — S. Hieron. Adversus Jovin. lib. ii.       ¹² 1 Cor. xiv. 33.       ¹³ Dan. vii. 25.       ¹⁴ Matt. xxvii. 52.
Hence grows that necessary distinction of the saints on earth, and the saints in heaven; the first belonging to the militant, the second to the triumphant church. Of the first the prophet David speaketh expressly, Thou art my Lord, my goodness extendeth not to thee, but to the saints that are in the earth. Of these do we read in the Acts of the Apostles, to these did St. Paul direct his epistles. Of the second doth the apostle make that question, Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And all those which were spoken of as saints then in the earth, if truly such and departed so, are now, and shall for ever continue, saints in heaven.

Having thus declared what is the sanctity required to make a saint, that is, a man of holiness; having also distinguished the saints before and under the gospel (which difference is only observable as to this exposition of the Creed), and again distinguishing the same saints while they live here with men on earth, and when after death they live with God in heaven; having also showed that of all these, those saints are here particularly understood who in all ages lived in the church of Christ; we may now properly descend to the next consideration, which is, who are those persons with whom those saints have this communion, and in what the communion which they have consists.

8.—First, then, the saints of God living in the church of Christ have communion with God the Father; for the apostles did therefore write that they to whom they wrote might have communion with them (that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us, saith St. John), and did at the same time declare that their communion was with the Father. Wherefore being all the saints of God under the gospel receiving the doctrine of the apostles have communion with them; being the communion of the apostles was the communion with the Father; it followeth that all the saints of God under the gospel have a communion with God the Father. As we are the branches of the vine, so the Father is the husbandman: and thus the saints partake of his care and inspection. As Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God, so all which are heirs of the faith of Abraham are made partakers of the same relation. Nor are we only friends, but also sons; for behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. Thus must we acknowledge that the saints of God have communion with the Father, because by the great and precious promises given unto them they become partakers of the divine nature.
Secondly, the saints of God living in the church of God have communion with the Son of God; for, as the apostle said, our communion is with the Father and the Son:1 and this connexion is infallible, because he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son;2 and our Saviour prayed for all such as should believe on him through the word of the apostles, that they might be one, as the Father is one in him and he in the Father, that they also may be one in both. I x. them, saith Christ, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.3 This communion of the saints with the Son of God is, as most evident, so most remarkable. He hath taken unto him our nature and infirmities; he hath taken upon him our sins, and the curse due unto them; while we all have received of his fulness grace for grace,4 and are all called to the fellowship of his sufferings that we may be conformable to his death.5 What is the fellowship of brethren and co-heirs of the bridegroom and the spouse; what is the communion of members with the head, of branches with the vine; that is the communion of saints with Christ. For God hath called us unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.6

Thirdly, the saints of God in the church of Christ have communion with the Holy Ghost; and the apostle hath two ways assured us of the truth thereof: one rhetorically, by a seeming doubt, if there be any fellowship of the Spirit;7 the other devoutly, praying for it, The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.8 The saints are, therefore, such, because they partake of the Holy Ghost, for they are therefore holy because they are sanctified, and it is the Spirit alone which sanctifieth. Beside, the communion with the Father and the Son is wrought by the communication of the Spirit; for hereby do we become the sons of God, in that we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father;9 and thereby do we become co-heirs with Christ, in that, because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father: so that we are no more servants, but sons; and if sons, then heirs of God through Christ.10 This is the communion which the saints enjoy with the three persons of the blessed Trinity: this is the heavenly fellowship represented unto entertaining Abraham, when the Lord appeared unto him, and three men stood by him;11 for our Saviour hath made us this most precious promise, If any man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and

1 1 John i. 3. 2 John 9. 3 John xvii. 20, 21, 23. 4 John i. 16. 5 Phil. iii. 10
6 1 Cor. i. 9. εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ Υιοῦ. 7 Phil. ii. 1. κοινωνία Πνεύματος.
8 2 Cor. xiii. 14. 9 Rom. viii, 15 10 Gal. iv. 6, 7. 11 Gen. xviii. 1, 2.
make our abode with him.\(^1\) Here is the soul of man made the habitation of God the Father and of God the Son; and the presence of the Spirit cannot be wanting where those two are inhabiting: for if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.\(^2\) The Spirit, therefore, with the Father and the Son, inhabiteth in the saints; for know ye not, saith the apostle, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?\(^3\)

9.—Fourthly, the saints of God in the church of Christ have communion with the holy angels. They who did foretell the birth of John the forerunner of Christ; they who did announce unto the blessed Virgin the conception of the Saviour of the world; they who sung a glorious hymn at the nativity of the Son of God; they who carried the soul of Lazarus into Abraham’s bosom; they who appeared unto Christ from heaven in his agony to strengthen him; they who opened the prison doors and brought the apostles forth; they who at the end of the world shall sever the wicked from among the just, and gather together the elect of God, certainly they have a constant and perpetual relation to the children of God. Nay, Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?\(^4\) They have a particular sense of our condition, for Christ hath assured us that there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.\(^5\) And upon this relation the angels, who are all the angels, that is, the messengers of God, are yet called the angels of men, according to the admonition of Christ, Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.\(^6\)

Thus far have we considered the communion of saints with such as are distinguished from them by nature as they are men; the fellowship which they have in heaven with God and his holy angels while they are on earth. Our next consideration will be, what is the communion which they have with those who are of the same nature, but not partakers of the same holiness with them.

10.—Fifthly, therefore, the saints of God, while they are of the church of Christ on earth, have some kind of communion with those men which are truly saints. There were not hypocrites among the Jews alone, but in the church of Christ many cry Lord, Lord, whom he knoweth not. The tares have the privilege of the field, as well as the wheat, and the bad fish of the net, as well as the good. The saints have communion with hypocrites in all things with which the distinction of a saint and hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both externally

\(^{1}\) John xiv. 23. \(^{2}\) Rom. viii. 9. \(^{3}\) 1 Cor. iii. 16. \(^{4}\) Luke xv. 10. \(^{5}\) Matt. xvii. 10. \(^{6}\) Heb. i. 14.
baptized alike; they communicate in the same creed, both make the same open profession of faith, both agree in the acknowledgment of the same principles of religion; they communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine preached; they communicate at the same table, both eat the same bread and drink the wine which Christ hath appointed to be received: but the hypocrite doth not communicate with the saint in the same saving grace, in the same true faith working by love, and in the same renovation of mind and spirit, for then he were not an hypocrite but a saint: a saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sins, in the same lurking infidelity, in the same unfruitfulness under the means of grace, in the same false pretence and empty form of godliness, for then he were not a saint but an hypocrite. Thus the saints may communicate with the wicked, so they communicate not with their wickedness, and may have fellowship with sinners, so they have no fellowship with that which makes them such, that is, their sins. The apostle's command runneth thus, Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness; and again, Be not partakers of other men's sins; and a voice from heaven spake concerning Babylon, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins. To communicate with sin is sin, but to communicate with a sinner in that which is not sin, can be no sin; because the one defileth, and the other cannot, and that which defileth not is no sin.

Having thus considered those who differ from the saints of God; first in respect of their humanity, as they are men; secondly, in reference to their sanctity, as they are men of holiness: we are now to consider such as differ either only in person, as the saints alive, or in present condition also, as the saints departed.

11.—Sixthly, therefore, the saints of God living in the church of Christ have communion with all the saints living in the same church. If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another: we all have benefit of the same ordinances, all partake of the same promises; we are all endued with the graces of the same mutual love and affection, keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, all engrafted into the same stock, and so receiving life from the same root, all holding the same head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together,


2 1 Tim. v. 22. 3 Rev. xviii. 4.

4 1 John i. 7. κοινωνίαν μετ' ἄλληλων.

5 Eph. iv. 3. 6 Rom. xi. 17, 18.
Indeed, with the increase of God. For in the philosophy of the apostle the nerves are not only the instruments of motion and sensation, but of nutrition also, so that every member receiveth nourishment by their intervention from the head; and being the head of the body is Christ, and all the saints are members of that body, they all partake of the same nourishment, and so have all communion among themselves.

12.—Lastly, the saints of God living in the church of Christ are in communion with all the saints departed out of this life and admitted to the presence of God. Jerusalem sometimes is taken for the church on earth, sometimes for that part of the church which is in heaven, to show that as both are represented by one, so both are but one city of God. Wherefore thus doth the apostle speak to such as are called to the Christian faith, Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant. Indeed, the communion of saints in the church of Christ with those which are departed is demonstrated by their communion with the saints alive. For if I have communion with a saint of God, as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death. The mystical union between Christ and his church, the spiritual conjunction of the members to the head, is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and increasing by the same influence which they receive from him. But death, which is nothing else but the separation of the soul from the body, maketh no separation in the mystical union, no breach of the spiritual conjunction, and consequently there must continue the same communion, because there remaineth the same foundation. Indeed, the saint departed, before his death had some communion with the hypocrite, as hearing the word, professing the faith, receiving the sacraments together; which being in things only external, as they were common to them both, and all such external actions ceasing in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining loses all communion with the saint departing, and the saints surviving cease to have

1 Col. ii. 19. 2 Heb. xii. 22-24.

This is that part of the communion of saints which those of the ancients especially insisted upon, who first took notice of it in the Creed. Sanctum communionem, id est, cum illis sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt, societate et spei communionis teneantur. —Serm. de Temp. Deus. cap. 13. "Et qui nunc cognoscitis per annum communionem habeatis cum sanctis martyribus, et per illos cum Domino Jesu Christo" —Prof. Pass. S. Perpetua.
further fellowship with the hypocrite dying. But the true and unfeigned holiness of man wrought by the powerful influence of the Spirit of God not only remaineth, but also is improved after death; being the correspondence of the internal holiness was the communion between their persons in their life, they cannot be said to be divided by death, which had no power over that sanctity by which they were first conjoined.

13.—This communion of the saints in heaven and earth, upon the mystical union of Christ their head, being fundamental and internal, what acts or external operations it produceth is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happiness which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity is certain. But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly considered, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverential respect, and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity. They which first found this part of the article in the CREED, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this communion, as to the saints of heaven, than the society of hope, esteem, and imitation on our side,1 of desires and supplications on their side; and what is now taught by the church of Rome is, as unwarrantable, so a novitious interpretation.

14.—The necessity of the belief of this communion of saints appeareth, first, in that it is proper to excite and encourage us to holiness of life. If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another. But if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth.

1 We have already produced the words of the 81st sermon De Tempore concerning hope. In the same we find also that of imitation: “Si igitur cum sanctis in aeterna vita communione habere velumus, de imitatione corum cogitemus. Debet enim in nobis aliquid recognoscere de suis virtutibus, ut pra nobis digerunt Domino supplicare.”—Ibid, cap. 13. “Hac sunt vestigia quae nobis sancti quoque reverentes in patriam relinquunt, ut illorum semitis inherentes sequeremur ad gaudia.”—Ibid. Beside this imitation, he addeth their desires and care for us below: “Cur non properamus et currimus, ut patriam nostram videre possimus? Magnus ille charorum numerus expectat, parentum, fratum, librorum, frequentes nos et captuta turba desiderat, jam de sua Incolumitate secura, adhuc de nostra salute sollicita.”—Ibid. Of the venerable esteem we ought to have of them, speaks Eusebius Gallicanus: “Credamus et sanctorum communioem; sed sanctos non tam pro Dei parte, quam pro Dei honore, vaenremur.” And again: “Digne venerandi sunt, dum Dei nobis cultum et futurae vitae desideriis contemptu mortis insinuant.” —De Symb. Homil. 2. Thus far anciently they which expounded this Article; but the late exposition of the church of Rome runneth thus: “Non solum ecclesia quae est in terris communicat bona sua cum omnibus membribi sibi conjunctis, sed etiam communicat suffragia ecclesia quae est in purgatorio, et ecclesia quae est in caelis communica orationes et merita sua cum ecclesia quae est in terris.”—Bellarm. In Symb. Where the communication of the suffrages of the saints alive to the church in purgatory, and the communication of the merits of the saints in heaven to the saints on earth, are novel expositions of this Article, not so much as acknowledged by Thomas Aquinas in his Explanation of the Creed much less to be found in any of the ancient expositors of it.

1 1 John 1, 6, 7.
For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness; and what concord hath Christ with Belial? 1 When Christ sent St. Paul to the Gentiles, it was to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Christ. 2 Except we be turned from darkness, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of sin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them who are sanctified, we cannot be thought meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. 3 Indeed there can be no communion where there is no similitude, no fellowship with God without some sanctity; because his nature is infinitely holy, and his actions are not subject to the least iniquity.

15.—Secondly, the belief of the communion of saints is necessary to stir us up to a proportionate gratitude unto God, and an humble and cheerful acknowledgment of so great a benefit. We cannot but acknowledge that they are exceeding great and precious promises, by which we become partakers of the divine nature. 4 What am I? said David, and what is my life that I should be son-in-law to the king? 5 What are the sons of men, what are they which are called to be saints, that they should have fellowship with God the Father? St. Philip the apostle said unto our Saviour, Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth; 6 whereas he hath not only shown us, but come unto us with the Father, and dwelt within us by his Holy Spirit; he hath called us to the fellowship of the angels and archangels, of the cherubins and seraphins, to the glorious company of the apostles, to the goodly fellowship of the prophets, to the noble army of martyrs, to the holy church militant in earth, and triumphant in heaven.

16.—Thirdly, the belief of the communion of saints is necessary to inflame our hearts with an ardent affection towards those which live, and a reverent respect towards those which are departed and are now with God. Nearness of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnatural who loveth not those persons which nature hath more immediately conjoined to him. Now no conjunction natural can be compared with that which is spiritual, no temporal relation with that which is eternal. If similitude of shape and feature will create a kindness, if congruity of manners and disposition will conjoin affections, what should be the mutual love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them, of those who are endued with the gracious influences of the same
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spirit? And if all the saints of God living in communion of the church deserve the best of our affections here on earth; certainly when they are dissolved and with Christ, when they have been blessed with a sight of God and rewarded with a crown of glory, they may challenge some respect from us who are here to wait upon the will of God expecting when such a happy change shall come.

17.—Fourthly, this tendeth to the directing and enlarging our acts of charity. We are obliged to be charitable unto all men, because the love of our brother is the foundation of our duty towards man; and in the language of the scriptures whosoever is another is our brother; but we are particularly directed to them that are of the household of faith. And as there is a general reason calling for our mercy and kindness unto all men, so there is a more special reason urging those who are truly sanctified by the Spirit of God to do good unto such as appear to be led by the same Spirit: for if they communicate with them in the everlasting mercies of God, it is fit they should partake of the bowels of man’s compassion; if they communicate with them in things spiritual and eternal, can it be much that they should partake with them of such things as are temporal and carnal?

18.—To conclude, every one may learn from hence what he is to understand by this part of the article, in which he professeth to believe the communion of saints; for thereby he is conceived to express thus much, I am fully persuaded of this as of a necessary and infallible truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the church of Christ, while they live among the crooked generations of men, and struggle with all the miseries of this world, have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them; that they partake of the care and kindness of the blessed angels, who take delight in the ministration for their benefit: that beside the external fellowship which they have in the word and sacraments with all the members of the church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the saints on earth as the living members of Christ: nor is this union separated by the death of any, but as Christ in whom they live, is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so have they fellowship with all the saints which from the death of Abel have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. And thus I believe the communion of saints.
ARTICLE X.

The Forgiveness of Sins.

1. THIS article hath always been expressly contained and acknowledged in the CREED, as being a most necessary part of our Christian profession; and for some ages it immediately followed the belief of the holy church, and was therefore added immediately after it, to show that the remission of sins was to be obtained in the church of Christ. For being the CREED at first was made to be used as a confession of such as were to be baptized, declaring their faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose baptism they were to be admitted, and the forgiveness of sins, which by the same baptism was to be obtained; and therefore in some creeds it was particularly expressed, I believe one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.

Looking thus upon this article, with this relation, we find the sense of it must be this, that we believe forgiveness of sins is to be

1 Therefore Carolus Magnus in his CAPITULAR. lib. iii. cap. 6, inveighs against Basilii the Bishop of Ancyræ, because in his confession of faith which he delivered in the second council of Nice, (Act. i.) he omitted the remission of sins, which the apostles in so short a compendium as the Creed would not omit: "Hanc apostoli in collatione fidei, quam ab invicem discussi quasi quandam credulitatis et predicationis normam statuerunt, post confessionem Patris et Filiæ et Spiritus Sancti posuisse perhibentur; et in tanti verbi brevitate, de quo per propheticam dictum est, Verbum abbreviatum faciet dominus super terram, hanc ponere minime distulerunt, quia sine hac fidei sinceritatem integram esse minime perspexerunt. Nec coluit eos ab eis professione illius symboli brevitas, quam exposebat sacre fidelis integritas, tantique doni veneranda sublimitas."

2 "Concordant autem nobiscum angeli etiam nunc, cum remittuntur nostra pecata. Ideo post commemorationem sanctae ecclesiae in ordine confessionis ponitur remissio peccatorum: per hoc enim stat ecclesia que in terris est; per hanc non petit quod perlerat et inventum est." — S. AUGUSTIN. Enchir. cap. 64. And to this purpose it is that in his book De Agone Christiano, passing from one article to another with his general transition, after that of the church, he proceedeth with these words: "Nec eos audiamus, qui negant ecclesiam Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere." — Cap. 31. So it followeth also in Venantius Fortunatus, and in such other Creeds as want that part of the former Article of "the communion of saints."


obtained in the church of Christ. For the explication whereof it will be necessary: first, to declare what is the nature of remission of sins, in what that action doth consist; secondly, to show how so great a privilege is propounded in the church, and how it may be procured by the members of the church. That we may understand the notion of forgiveness of sins, three considerations are required: first, what is the nature of sin which is to be forgiven; secondly, what is the guilt or obligation of sin which wanteth forgiveness; thirdly, what is the remission itself, or the loosing of that obligation.

2. As the power of sin is revealed only in the scriptures, so the nature of it is best understood from thence. And though the writings of the apostles give us few definitions, yet we may find even in them a proper definition of sin. Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law, saith St. John, and then rendereth this reason of that universal assertion, for sin is the transgression of the law. Which is an argument drawn from the definition of sin; for he saith not, Every sin is the transgression of the law, which had been necessary, if he had spoken by way of proposition only, to have proved the universality of his assertion, but produceth it indefinitely, Sin is the transgression of the law, which is sufficient, speaking it by way of definition. And it is elsewhere most evident that every sin is something prohibited by some law, and deviating from the same. For the apostle affirming that the law worketh wrath, that is a punishment from God, giveth this as a reason or proof of his affirmation, for where no law is there is no transgression. The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is sin: the law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to that law is impure. Whatsoever, therefore, is done by man, or is in man having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought against the law, is a sin of commission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary to, the prohibition of the law, or a negative precept. Every omission of a duty required of us is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the law, or

1 1 John iii. 4. 2 The manner of the apostle's speech is also to be observed, having an article prefixed both to the subject and the predicate; as if thereby he would make the proposition convertible, as all definitions ought to be: Il ēμπρια εστιν η ανωθ. (1 John iii. 4.) 3 Rom. iv. 15. 4 "Quid est peccatum nisi praevaricatio legis Divinae, et coelestium inobedientia preceptorum?" — S. AMBROS. De Paradiso, cap. 8. "Pecatum est factum vel dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra eorum legem." — S. AUGUST. Contra Faust. lib. xxii. cap. 27. "Quid verum est, nisi et Domum dare præcepta, et animas liberae esse voluntatis, et malum naturam non esse, sc. esse aversionem a Dei præceptis?" — Idem, De Fide contra Manich. cap. x. "Neque negandum est hoc Deum jubere, ita nos in facienda justitia esse debere perfectos, ut nullum habeamus omnino peccatum: nam nec peccatum erit, si quid erit, si non divinitus jubet, ut non sit." — Idem, De Po Meritis et Rem. lib. ii. cap. 16.
an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by the actions committed against the law of God, is a sin constituting a man truly a sinner; even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul to do that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that soul, whether by an act of his own will, or by an act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the nature of sin.

3.—The second particular to be considered is the obligation of sin, which must be presupposed to the solution or remission of it. Now every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person; which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the sin. It is the nature of laws in general to be attended with these two, punishments, and rewards; the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatened upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penal denunciations accompanying the laws of God, yet the transgression of them would nevertheless make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed. Sins of commission pass away in the acting or performing of them, so that he which acteth against a negative precept, after the act is passed, cannot properly be said to sin. Sins of omission, when the time is passed in which the affirmative precept did oblige unto performance, pass away; so that he which did then omit his duty when it was required, and in omitting sinned, after that time cannot be truly said to sin. But though the sin itself do pass away together with the time in which it was committed, yet the guilt thereof doth never pass which by committing was contracted. He which but once committeth adultery, at that one time sinneth, and at no time after can be said to commit that sin; but the guilt of that sin remaineth on him still, and he may be for ever said to be guilty of adultery, because he is for ever subject to the wrath of God, and obliged to suffer the punishment due unto adultery.¹

¹ This obligat. unto punishment, remaining after the act of sin, is that peccati reatus of which the Schools, and before them the fathers, spake. The nature of this reatus is excellently declared by St. Austin, delivering the distinction between actual and original sin: "In eis qui regerantur in Christo, cum remissionem accipient prorsus omnium peccatorum, utiqueecessce est, ut reatus eorum. hujus licet adhuc maneat, concupiscientia remittatur, ut in peccatum, [sicut dixi,] non imputetur. Nam sicut eorum peccatorum quae materia non possunt, quoniam tum fiunt praecunctat, reatus tamen manet, et, nisi remittatur, in aeternum manebit; sic illius [concupiscientiae], quando remittitur, reatus auteretur. Hoc est enim non habere peccatum, reum non esse peccati. Nam si quisquam, verbi gratia, fecerit adulterium, etiamsi numquam
The Forgiveness of Sins.

This debt or obligation to punishment is not only necessarily resulting from the nature of sin, as it is a breach of the law, nor only generally delivered in the scriptures revealing the wrath of God unto all unrighteousness, but is yet more particularly represented in the Word, which teacheth us, if we do ill, how sin lieth at the door.1 Our blessed Saviour thus taught his disciples: Whoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Racha, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable (obnoxious, or bound over) to hell fire.2 So saith our Saviour again, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme. But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is liable (obnoxious, or bound


2. "Ενοχος ἔσται" is the word used here, which is translated, "shall be in danger," but is of a fuller and more pressing sense, as one which is a debtor, subject and obliged to endure it. "Ενοχος, κρεστήτης, ὑπεύθυνος, ὑποκείμενος.—Hesych. "Ενοχος, υπαίτιος.

Suidas. Where by the way is to be observed a great mistake in the Lexicon of Phavorinus, whose words are these: "Ενοχος, ὑπεύθυνος, κρεστήτης. "Ενοχος, υπαίτιος. Τίματος. The first taken out of Hesychius, the last out of Suidas, corruptly and absurdly; corruptly, ἔσται for ἔσται ab suardly, Τίματος is added either as an interpretation of ἔσται, or as an author which used it; whereas Τίματος in Suidas is only the first word of the sentence, provided by Suidas for the use of ἔσται in the signification of ὑπαίτιος. Agreeable unto Hesychius this is that in the Lexicon of St. Cyril, ἔσται, obnoxius, reus, obligatus. And so in this place of St. Matthew, the old Latin translation, Reus erit judicio. As in Virgil:

"Constituam ante aras voti reus."—Aeneid. v. 237.

Servius: "Vidi reus. Debitor: unde voto solventes dicimus absolutes. Inde est, Ecl. v. 80: Damnabis tu quoque voto; quasi, Reus facies." So the Syriac: ὅτι, from ὅτι, obligatum, debitorum, reum esse. For indeed the word ἔσται among the Greeks, as to this matter, hath a double significations; one in respect of the sin, another in respect of the punishment due unto the sin. In respect of a sin, as that in Antiphon: Μὴ ὁποια φαύνα, μηδέ ἔσται τῷ ἐργῷ.—Orat. 14, 15; and that in Aristotle: ἔσται ἐφήσεν ἑρωυνή λαίας ἔσται.—Ethic. lib. ii.; and that in Suidas, taken out of Polybius: Τίματος κατὰ τῶν ἐφήσεων ποιεῖται καταδρομή αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐπί δυνάμεως ἑρωυνής ἔσται τῷ μὲν, ὅτι πικρὸς κατηγορεῖ τῶν πέλας, ἐπὶ τοίοτοι, σὺν σώσει ἔσται τῷ. In respect of the punishment of a sin, he is ἔσται ἄρα, who is "obnoxious to the curse," and ἔσται ἐπιτιμίως, "obnoxious to the punishment." Ἑμποίησοι, ἐμποίησοι, τούτεστι, ἔσται ἐπιτιμίως, σὺν ἑρωυνή, σὺν ἑρωυνή, σὺν τω ποιήσεις, σὺν οὕτω. In the Intention of the Jews, "He is in danger of death," but, "He deserveth death," and, "He ought to die;" he is κατάδικος, by their sentence, as far as in them lay, "condemned to die." Τῇ ὅποι ἐκείνοι, "ἔσται κατάδικον τῷ ὅποι ὁ κατάδικος ἐσκεύασθαι, αὐτῷ τῷ Πλάτων λοιπῶν ἀποφήγασθαι παρακατεύθυνσθαι, δι' ὅτι κάκησε τινές συνείδησες φασίν, ἔσται κατάδικον εἶναι τοιούτως καταδίκασται, αὐτοῖς καταδίκασται, αὐτοῖς ἑπτάδες, πάντα αὐτοῖς γινόμενοι τότε. —S Chrysost. ad locum. Matt. v. 22.
over) to eternal damnation. Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of sin and obligation to eternal punishment, if there be no remission or forgiveness of it, and the taking off that liableness, obnoxiousness, or obligation unto death, if there be any such remission or forgiveness: all which is evident by the opposition, much to be observed, in our Saviour’s expression, He hath never forgiveness, but is liable to eternal death.

God, who hath the sovereign power and absolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetual and universal rule of human actions; which law whosoever doth violate or transgress, and thereby sin (for by sin we understand nothing else but the transgression of the law), is thereby obliged in all equity to suffer the punishment due to that obliquity. And after the act of sin is committed and passed over, this guilt resulting from that act remaineth; that is, the person who committed it continueth still a debtor to the vindictive justice of God, and is obliged to endure the punishment due unto it: which was the second particular to be considered.

4.—The third consideration now followeth: what is the forgiveness of sin, or in what remission doth consist. Which at first appeareth to be an act of God toward a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God, and therefore the punishment must be due from him, because the injury was done unto him. But what is the true notion and nature of this act, or how God doth forgive a sinner, is not easy to determine; nor can it be concluded out of the words themselves which do express it, the niceties of whose origins will never be able to yield a just interpretation.

1 Mark iii. 23, 29.
2 The word used in the Creed is ἀφέσις ἀμαρτίων, and that generally likewise in use in the New Testament. But from thence we cannot be assured of the nature of this act of God, because ἀφέσις and ἀφέσις are capable of several interpretations. For, [First,] sometimes ἀφέσις is emittere, and ἀφέσις emissio. As, Gen. xxxv. 18: 'Εγένετο δέ ἐν τῷ ἀφέσιν αὐτῆς τῷ ψυχῆν τοῖς, Cum dimitteret eam anima, as it is translated; but, Cum emitteret eam animam, I.e. effecerat: as, 'Αφήσε το πνεῦμα, Emittit spiritum. (Matt. xxvii. 50.) So Gen. xiv. 2: Καὶ ἀφήσε ψυχὴν μετὰ κλαυθμοὺς οὖν, destruxit, but, Emissit nunc cum fetu: as, 'Αφήσε ψυχὴν μεγάλην, Emissa voces magna. (Mark xv. 37.) In the like manner, ἀφέσεις θελαστῶς are emissiones maris; (2 Sam. xxii. 16;) as ἀφέσεις ὑδάτων (Joel i. 20;) to which sense may be referred that of Hesychius: 'Αφέσιν, ὑπόλεγγα. And this interpretation of ἀφέσις can have no relation to the remission of sins. Secondly, Ἀφέσις is often taken for permittere: as Gen. xx. 6: Οὐκ ἠφέσε σε ἀμαρτήσαι αὐτόν; Matt. iii. 15. "Ἀφέσε ἄρτοι, καὶ Τῶτε ἀφήσεις αὐτοῖς" which the Vulgar first translated well, Sine modo, and then ill, Tunc dimissit eum. Matt. vii. 4: "Ἀφέσε ἐκβάλοι, Sine efficacia, so Hesychius: 'Αφέσις, συγχώρησις. And this hath as little relation to the present subject. Thirdly, Ἀφέσις is sometimes relinquuere and deserere, as Gen. xiiii. 33: 'Αδέσποτον ἐνα ἀφέτε δω ἐνε ἐμοῖ. Matt. v. 24: 'Ἰδοὺ ἐκεί τὸ δόμον σου. Chap. viii. 15: Καὶ ἀφῆσεν αὐτον ἀπὸ πυρότος. Chap. xix. 27: Ἰδοὺ, ῥήματα ἀφήκασεν πάντα. Chap. xxi. 52: Τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πᾶντες ἀφῆκεν αὐτῶν ἐφιγν. And in this acception it cannot explicate unto us what is the true notion of ἀφέσις ἀμαρτίων. Fourthly. It is taken for permittere; as Matt. xxiii. 23: Καὶ ἠφέσε τα βαρύτατα τού νόμου καὶ Λουκ. xl. 42: Τούτα ἐδει ποιήσας, κακαία μὴ ἄφεσιν. And yet we have nothing to our
The Forgiveness of Sins.

For although the word signifying remission have one sense among many other which may seem proper for this particular concernment, yet because the same word hath been often used to signify the same act of God in forgiving sins, where it could have no such particular notion, but several times hath another signification tending to the same effect, and as proper to the remission of sins, therefore I conceive the nature of _forgiveness of sins_ is rather to be understood by the consideration of all such ways and means which were used by God in the working and performing of it than in this, or any other word which is made use of in expressing it.

Now that we may understand what was done toward the remission of sins, that from thence we may conclude what is done in it: it is first to be observed, that almost all things by the law were purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission. And what was then legally done, was but a type of that present purpose. But, Fifthly, It is often taken for _remittet_, and that particularly in relation to a debt; as _Matt._ xvii. 27: _To dāneioν ἄφθειν αὐτῷ_ and verse 32; _Πάσαν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἑκείνην ἄφθεικα_ σοι. Which acceptance is most remarkable in the year of release; _Deut._ xxv. 1, 2: _Δὴ ἐπὶ τὴν τούτης ἄφθειας_. Kαί αὖτω τῷ πρόσταγμα τῆς ἄφθειας: _ἄφθειας πάν χρόνος ἵδιον, ὃ ὄφειλεν σοι ὁ πληρῶν, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν σου οὐκ ἀπαιτήσῃς_ ἐπικέκπται γὰρ ἄφθειας. Now this remission or release of debts hath a great affinity with remission of sins; for Christ himself hath conjoined these two together, and called our sins by the name of "debts," and promised remission of sins to us by God, upon our remission of debts to man. And therefore he hath taught us thus to pray: "_Ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν ἄφθειάς τοῖς ἄδελφοις ἡμῶν._ (Matt. vi. 12:) Besides, he hath not only made use of the notion of debt, but any injury done unto a man he calls "a sin" against man, and exhorted to forgive those sins committed against us, that God may forgive the sins committed by us, which are injuries done to him. _Luke_ xvii. 3: _Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμάρτῃ εἰς σέ ὁ ἀδελ- φός σου, ἐπίτιμησον αὐτῷ_ καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήῃς, ἄφες αὐτῷ.

1 We must not only look upon the propriety of the words used in the New Testament, but we must also reflect upon their use in the Old, especially in such subjects as did belong unto the Old Testament, as well as the New. Now _ἀφέων_ _ἀμαρτίας_ is there used for the verb _pardon_ as _Isai._ xxvii. 14: _Μὴ ἀφέσῃ τὸν ἐαυτὸν Παύς τῷ ἀμαρτήσαντι_. Our _ἀφέσῃ_ has _pardon_ in it, or the same thing. Sometimes for the verb _pardon_, as _Gen._ i. 17: _יָשָׁעַת לְאַבֶּנֵי הַלַּאֲמַרְתֶּן_. "_Apes auitw tivn adikian kai thn amartian aitw_. Psalm. xxv. 18: _και αφες τας amartias mou_. and in that remarkable place which St. Paul made use of to declare the nature of remission of sins, _Psalm_ xxxii. 1: _τὸ νῦν ἐγὼ τιμῶν ἀμαρτίας_ τῶν. It is taken for _Robin_ as _Num._ xiv. 19: _ὁμοιοίως_ ἀφεῖς τήν ἀμαρτίαν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. _Lev._ iv. 20: _Καὶ ἀφέσῃ αὐτοῖς ἡ ἀμαρτία_. Now being [seeing] _ἀφέσῃ_, in relation to sins, is used for _punish_ signifying "expiation and reconciliation;" for _pardon_ signifying "elevation, portation, or ablation;" for _Robin_ signifying "pardon and indulgence;" we cannot argue from the word alone, that God in forgiving sins only and barely release the debt. There is therefore no force to be laid upon the words _ἀφείς_ _ἀμαρτίων_, _remissio peccatorum_, or, as the ancient fathers, _remissa peccatorum_.


2 _Heb._ ix. 22. _γίνεται αἰματεκχύσις οἷς γίνεται ἀφέσις._
which was to be performed by Christ; and therefore the blood of Christ must necessarily be involved in the remission of sins; for he once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. It must then be acknowledged, and can be denied by none, that Christ did suffer a painful and a shameful death, as we have formerly described it; that the death which he endured, he did then suffer for sin; for this man, saith the apostle, offered one sacrifice for sins; that the sins for which he suffered were not his own, for Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust; he was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and therefore had no sin to suffer for; that the sins for which he suffered were ours, for he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: He was delivered for our offences, he gave himself for our sins, he died for our sins according to the scriptures; that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a punishment taken upon himself to free us from the punishment due unto our sins; for God laid on him the iniquity of us all, and made him to be sin for us who knew no sin: he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes were we healed; that by the suffering of this punishment to free us from the punishment due unto our sins it cometh to pass that our sins are forgiven; for This is my blood, saith our Saviour, of the New Testament (or Covenant), which is shed for many for the remission of sins. In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.

5.—In which deduction or series of truths we may easily perceive that the forgiveness of sins, which is promised unto us, which we upon that promise do believe, containeth in it a reconciliation of an offended God, and a satisfaction unto a just God; it containeth a reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a satisfaction, as without which God was resolved not to be reconciled.

For the first of these, we may be assured of forgiveness of sins, because Christ by his death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that he hath done so, we are assured; because he which before was angry with us, upon the consideration of Christ's death becomes propitious unto us, and did ordain Christ's death to be a propitiation for us. For we are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his

1 It is not only ἀφέωσις, but ἅτέργησις, ἅμαρτίας. Heb. ix. 26.
2 Heb. x. 12.
3 1 Peter iii. 18.
6 Rom. iv. 25.
8 1 Cor. xv. 3.
10 2 Cor. v. 21.
13 Matt. xxvi. 28.
1 Gal. i. 4.
7 Isa. iii. 6.
11 Isa. li. 3, 4.
13 Eps. i. 7.
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We have an advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins. For God loved us and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins. It is evident, therefore, that Christ did render God propitious unto us by his blood (that is, his sufferings unto death), who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before he determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God, who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in him upon the lapse of man, is wrath and indignation. God, therefore, was most certainly offended before he gave a Redeemer, and though it be most true that he so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son; yet there is no incongruity in this, that a Father should be offended with that Son which he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding, therefore, that God loved men whom he created, yet he was offended with them when they sinned, and gave his Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them.

6.—This reconciliation is clearly delivered in the scriptures as wrought by Christ; for all are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ; and that by virtue of his death, for when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, making peace through the blood of his cross, and by him reconciling all things unto himself. In vain it is objected that the scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but nowhere teacheth that he reconciled God to man; for in the language of the scripture to reconcile a man to God is in our vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is to cause him who before was angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the princes of the Philistines spake of David, Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his master? should it not be with the heads of these men? wherewith shall he reconcile Saul, who is so highly offended with him? wherewith shall he render him gracious and favourable but by betraying these men unto him? As our Saviour adviseth, If thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, that is, reconcile thy brother to thyself, whom thou hast injured, render him by

---

1 Rom. iii. 24, 25. 2 1 John ii. 1, 2. 3 1 John iv. 10. 4 John iii. 16. 5 2 Cor. v. 18. 6 Rom. v. 10. 7 Col. i. 20. 8 Εν τίνι διαλαληγησεται οὕτως τῷ κυρίῳ ἀντίω; Ὄχι εὖ τοῖς κεφαλαίς τῶν ἀδρόνων εἰκεῖνων; ἦν τὰ ἄρτος Ἀρβέτου ἑτοιμαζόμενα γεροτελός τῷ οἴκῳ, τῷ συλλαβὸς τῷ αὐτοῦ. 9 Matt. v. 23, 24. Πρώτον διαλαλήστατε τῷ αὐτοῦ σοι.
thy submission favourable unto thee, who hath something against thee, and is offended with thee. As the apostle adviseth the wife
that departeth from her husband, to remain unmarried, or to be recon-
ciled to her husband,¹ that is, to appease and get the favour of her
husband. In the like manner we are said to be reconciled unto
God, when God is reconciled, appeased, and become gracious and
favourable unto us; and Christ is said to reconcile ̇us unto God,
when he hath moved and obtained of God to be reconciled unto
us, when he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favour.
Thus when we were enemies we were reconciled to God, that is, not
withstanding he was offended with us for our sins, we were restored
unto his favour by the death of his Son.²

Whence appeareth the weakness of the Socinian exception, that in
the scriptures we are said to be reconciled unto God,³ but God
is never said to be reconciled unto us. For by that very expres-
sion it is understood, that he which is reconciliation, in the language
of the scriptures, is restored unto the favour of him who was for-
merly offended with that person which is now said to be reconciled.
As when David was to be reconciled unto Saul, it was not that
David should lay down his enmity against Saul, but that Saul
should become propitious and favourable unto David; and there-
fore where the language is that David should be reconciled unto
Saul, the sense is, that Saul, who was exasperated and angry,
should be appeased and so reconciled unto David.

Nor is it any wonder God should be thus reconciled to sinners
by the death of Christ, who while we were yet sinners died for us,⁴
because the punishment which Christ, who was our surety, en-
dured, was a full satisfaction to the will and justice of God. The
Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to
give his life a ransom for many.⁵

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 11.
² Rom. v. 10.
³ "Ad hoc vero quod nos Deo reconciliariit quid affers? Primum, nusquam scripturant assercere Deum nobis a Christo re-
conciliatum, verum id tantum quod nos per Christum aut mortem ejus simus reconcili-
ati, vel Deo reconciliati; ut ex omnibus locis quae de reconciliacione agunt videre est."—Catech. Racov. cap. 8. To this may be added the observation of Socinus: "Ita communis consuetudo fioque fers: ut scil-
licet is reconciliatus fuisse dicatur, per quem stabat, ne amicitia aut denou existet aut conservaretur."—De Christo Servatore, p. 1.
⁴ cap. 5. Which observation is most false, as appeareth in the case of Saul and David, and in the person mentioned in the gospel,
who is commanded to be reconciled unto him whom he had offended, and who had
something against him.
⁵ Now a ransom is a price given to

δούναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρων ἀντὶ πολλῶν. What is the true notion of λύ-
τρων? What is the true notion of λύ-
tρων? Which observation is most false, as appeareth in the case of Saul and David, and in the person mentioned in the gospel, who is commanded to be reconciled unto him whom he had offended, and who had something against him.
⁴ Rom. v. 8.
redeem such as are any way in captivity; anything laid down by way of compensation, to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he which before was bound becometh free. All sinners were obliged to undergo such punishments as are proportionate to their sins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and Christ did give his life a ransom for them, and that a proper ransom, if that his life were of any price, and given as such. For a ransom is properly nothing else but something of price given by way of redemption,¹ to buy or purchase that which is detained, or given for the releasing of that which is enthralled. But it is most evident that the life of Christ was laid down as a price, neither is it more certain that he died, than that he bought us; Ye are bought with a price, saith the apostle,² and it is the Lord who bought us,³ and the price which he paid was his blood, for We are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.⁴ Now as it was the blood of Christ, so was it a price given by way of compensation; and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented, and increaseth, according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it, so the value, price, and dignity of that which is given by way of compensation is raised according to the dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite majesty, against whom we have sinned, and Christ is of the same divinity, who gave his life a ransom for sinners; for God hath purchased his church with χλησιν). So that whatsoever is given for such a purpose is άποτροπα, and whatsoever is not given for such an end deserveth not that name in Greek. As the city Antandrus was so called, because it was given in exchange for a man who was a captive: "Ος Ἀσκάνιος αἰχμαλωτὸς ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Πελασ- γών καὶ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ τῷ πόλιν δέδωκε λυτρά, καὶ ἀνελήθη,- ΕΤΥΜΟΙ. So that there can be nothing more proper in the Greek language than the words of our Saviour, Δῶσαι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρων ἀντί πολλῶν. Δόναι λύτρων for λύτρων is ὑπὸ διδόμενου καὶ ἀντί πολλῶν; for it is given ἀντὶ ἄνθρώπων, as that city was called "Antandros, ἀγοράν ἀντί ἄνθρωπος. And therefore, 1 Tim. ii, 6, it is said, Ο οὖν ἐαυτοῦ ἀντίλυτρων ὑπὲρ πάντων. Matt. xx, 23.

¹ Hesychius: Λύτρων, τίμια. ² 1 Cor. vi, 20; vii, 23. ³ 2 Peter ii, 1. ⁴ This is sufficiently expressed by two words, each of them fully significative of a price: the first simple, which is ἀγοράζειν; the second in composition, which is ἐξαγοράζειν. That the word ἀγοράζειν in the New Testament signifieth properly "to buy," appeared generally in the evangelists, and particularly in that place of the Revelations, Chap. xii, 17: "Ινα μυτίς δύναται ἀγοράζειν." In the same signification it is attributed undoubtedly unto Christ in respect of us, whom he is often said to have bought; as, 2 Pet. ii, 1: Τὸν ἀγοράζαντα αὐτοῖς Δεσπότην ἀφοίμενον and this buying is expressed to be by a price: 1 Cor. vi, 19, 20: Οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐαυτῶν, ἐγοράσθη γὰρ τιμῆς: Vulgate: Non estis vestri, empti enim estis mentio magno; and 1 Cor. vii, 23: Τιμῆς ἐγοράσθητε; μὴ γίνεσθε δούλοι ἄνθρωπος. What this price was is also evident; for the term ἐγοράσθη is ὑπὸ τιμῆς also ἐγοράσθη, καὶ ἐγοράσθη τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὰ αὐτᾶς σου. Which will appear more fully by the compound word ἐξαγοράζων Gal. iii, 13: Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξαγοράζων ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, ἐγομένου υπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα; and Gal. iv, 4, 5: Γεμόμενον υπὸ νόμου, ἵνα τοὺς υπὸ νόμου ἐξαγοράσῃ. Now this εξαγοράζων is proper "redemption," or ἐξαρτώσια, "upon a proper price," though not silver or gold, yet as proper as silver and gold, and far beyond them both: Οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἄργυρῳ ἡ χρυσῷ, ἐλυτρώθη ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου ἐκ παραραγόντος, ἀλλὰ τιμῶν αἰματί ὡς ἀμυνή ἀμισου καὶ ἀπόλλην Κρι- τοῦ. (1 Peter i, 18, 19.)
his own blood. Although, therefore, God be said to remit our sins by which we were captivated, yet he is never said to remit the price without which we had never been redeemed; neither can he be said to have remitted it, because he did require it and receive it.

7.—If, then, we consider together, on our side the nature and obligation of sin, in Christ the satisfaction made and reconciliation wrought, we shall easily perceive how God forgiveth sins, and in what remission of them consisteth. Man being in all conditions under some law of God, who hath sovereign power and dominion over him, and therefore owing absolute obedience to that law, whencesoever any way he transgresseth that law, or deviateth from that rule, he becomes thereby a sinner, and contracteth a guilt which is an obligation to endure a punishment proportionable to his offence; and God, who is the lawgiver and sovereign, becoming now the party wronged and offended, hath a most just right to punish man as an offender. But Christ taking upon him the nature of man, and offering himself a sacrifice for sin, giveth that unto God for and instead of the eternal death of man, which is more valuable and acceptable to God than that death could be, and so maketh a sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man; which God accepting, becometh reconciled unto us, and for the punishment which Christ endured taketh off our obligation to eternal punishment.

Thus man who violated by sinning the law of God, and by that violation offended God, and was thereby obliged to undergo the punishment due unto the sin and to be inflicted by the wrath of God, is, by the price of the most precious blood of Christ, given and accepted in full compensation and satisfaction for the punishment which was due, restored unto the favour of God, who being thus satisfied, and upon such satisfaction reconciled, is faithful and just to take off all obligation unto punishinent from the sinner; and in this act of God consisteth the forgiveness of sins. Which is sufficient for the first part of the explication of this article, as being designed for nothing else but to declare what is the true notion of remission of sins, in which that action doth consist.

8.—The second part of the explication, taking notice not only

1 Acts xx. 28.
2 As λυτρον is "a certain price given or promised for liberty," so ἀφίεναι λυτρον is "to remit the price set upon the head of any man or promised for him;" as we read in the testament of Lycon the philosopher: ΔιακότΟ ρα μέν ἐλευθερον πάλαι ὁντι ἀφίεναι τὸ λύτρον. Demetrius had been his servant, and he had set him free upon a certain price which he had engaged himself to pay for that liberty; the sum which Demetrius was thus bound to pay, Lycon at his death remits, as also to Crito: Κρίτων ρα Ἀλκησίων, καὶ τούτο τὸ λύτρον ἀφίεναι. Πίον Λαέρτ. lib. v. sec. 72.
of the substance but also of the order of the article, observing the immediate connexion of it with the holy church, and the relation, which in the opinion of the ancients it hath unto it, will endeavour to instruct us how this great privilege of forgiveness of sins is proclaimed in the church, how it may be procured and obtained by the members of the church.

9.—At the same time when our Saviour sent the apostles to gather a church unto him, he foretold that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem; and when the church was first constituted, they thus exhorted those whom they desired to come into it, Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out; and, Be it known unto you that through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins. From whence it appeareth that the Jews and Gentiles were invited to the church of Christ, that they might therein receive remission of sins; that the doctrine of remission of all sins proclaimed and preached to all men was proper and peculiar to the gospel, which teacheth us that by Christ all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. Therefore John the Baptist, who went before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways, gave knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins.

This, as it was preached by the apostles at the first gathering of the church of Christ, I call proper and peculiar to the gospel, because the same doctrine was not so propounded by the law. For if we consider the law itself strictly and under the bare notion of a law, it promised life only upon perfect, absolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was only this, Do this and live. Some of the greater sins nominated and specified in the law, had annexed unto them the sentence of death, and that sentence irreversible; nor was there any other way or means left in the law of Moses by which that punishment might be taken off. As for other less and more ordinary sins, there were sacrifices appointed for them, and when those sacrifices were offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences were released. Whosoever else we read of sins forgiven under the law, was of some special divine indulgence, more than was promised by Moses, though not more than was promulgated unto the people, in the name and of the nature of God, so far as something of the gospel was mingled with the law.

Now as to the atonement made by the sacrifices, it clearly had relation to the death of the Messias, and whatsoever virtue was in

them did operate through his death alone. As he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,\(^1\) so all atonements which were ever made were only effectual by his blood. But though no sin was ever forgiven but by virtue of that satisfaction, though God was never reconciled unto any sinner but by intuition of that propitiation, yet the general doctrine of remission of sins was never clearly revealed,\(^2\) and publicly preached to all nations, till the coming of the Saviour of the world, whose name was therefore called Jesus, because he was to save his people from their sins.\(^3\)

Being, therefore, we are assured that the preaching remission of sins belongeth not only certainly, but in some sense peculiarly, to the church of Christ, it will be next considerable how this remission is conferred upon any person in the church.

10.—For a full satisfaction in this particular two things are very observable; one relating to the initiation, the other concerning the continuation, of a Christian. For the first of these, it is the most general and irrefragable assertion of all to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of are remitted in the baptism of the same person. For the second, it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after baptism are remissible, and the person committing those sins shall receive forgiveness upon true repentance at any time, according to the gospel.

First. It is certain that forgiveness of sins was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ: and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of baptism, did also receive the benefit of that ordinance, which is remission of sins. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.\(^4\) And St. Peter made this the exhortation of his first sermon, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.\(^5\) In vain doth doubting and fluctuating Socinian endeavour to evacuate the evidence of this scripture,\(^6\) attributing the remission either to repentance without consideration of baptism, or else to the public profession of faith made in baptism; or if anything must be attributed to baptism itself, it

---

\(^1\) Rev. xiii. 8.

\(^3\) Matt. i. 21.

\(^4\) Mark i. 4.

\(^5\) Acts ii. 38.

\(^6\) "Vel baptismo illi, hoc est, [solemniter] ablationi, peccatorum remissionem nequaquum tribuit Petrus, sed totam punitentiam; vel si baptismi quoque ea in re rationem habuit, aut quatenus publicam Jesu Christi nominis professionem continebat, tum tummodo consideravit; aut si ipsius etiam externae ablutionis omnino rationem habere voluit, quod ad ipsum attinet; remissionis peccatorum nomine, non ipsam remissionem vere, sed remissionis declarationem et obsignationem quandam intellectam." — Socin De Baptismo cap. 7.
must be nothing but a declaration of such remission. For how will these shifts agree with that which Ananias said unto Saul, without any mention either of repentance or confession, Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, and that which St. Paul, who was so baptized, hath taught us concerning the church, that Christ doth sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water? It is, therefore, sufficiently certain that baptism, as it was instituted by Christ after the preadministration of St. John, wheresoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was most infallibly efficacious as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this sacrament.

As those which are received into the church by the sacrament of baptism receive the remission of their sins of which they were guilty before they were baptized; so after they are the church's members of the church they receive remission of their future sins by their repentance. Christ, who hath left us a pattern of prayer, hath thereby taught us for ever to implore and beg the forgiveness of our sins, that as we through the frailty of our nature are always subject unto sin, so we should always exercise the acts of repentance, and for ever seek the favour of God. This, then, is the comfort of the gospel, that as it discovereth sin within us, so it propoundeth a remedy unto us. While we are in this life encompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the strageloms of Satan, while the infimities and corruptions of our nature betray us to the transgression of the law of God, we are always subject to offend (from whence whosoever saith that he hath no sin is a liar, contradicting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency), and so long as we can offend, so long we

1 Acts xxii. 16. 2 Eph. v. 26.
3 St. Chrysostom, speaking of the power of the priests: Où γὰρ . . . ἡμᾶς ἀναγεννώσα μόνον ἄλλα καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἔξωσιν ἀμαρτήματα.—De Nucerd. lib. iii. "Excepto baptismatis munere, quod contra originale pecatum donatur est; (ut quod generatione attractum est, regeneratione detrahatur;) et tamen activa quoque peccata, quae necunque corde, ore, opere commissa inveniatur, tollit:) hac ergo excepta magna indulgentia, (unde indicat hominis renovatio,) in qua solvitur omnis reatus et generatus et additus; ipsa etiam vita catena iam ratione uentris aetatis, quantitatis præpolarit facultatis justitiae, sine remissione peccatorum non agitur; quoniam filii Dei, quondam mortales vivunt, cum morte conflagrando et quemvis de illis sit veracter existimant, Quotquotque positur, In quorum tur, hi filii sunt Dei; sic tamen Spiritui Dei excipiantur, et tunciam filii Dei producunt ad Deum, ut etiam spiritu suo (maxime aggravante corruptibili corpore) tanquam filii hominum quibusdam humanis motibus deficient, ad se ipsos, et ideo poeccent." — S. August. Enchir. cap. 64. "Quos et metà τὸ βάπτισμα εκκαθαριστᾷ ἢμαρτήματα μετὰ πάνων πολλῶν καὶ καμάτων. Πάσον τοινυ γνήσιος ἐπιδεξίωμαι σπουδήν, ὅπετα αὐτά ἐξαλείψασι ἐπετέθησι, καὶ αἰσχρίνθη, καὶ τῆς κολάσεως ἀπαλλαγήν τῆς ἐκκαθαρίσεως αὐτῶν τούτω ἀποθεοθήκη τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων τὰ φορτά. —S. Chrysost. Homil. in Pentecost. I. "Quod autem scriptum est, Et sanguinis Jesu Filii ejus mundat nos ab omni peccato, tam in confessione baptismatis, quam in elementis penitentialium acutipendium est." — S. Hieron. Adv. Præg. lib. ii.
may apply ourselves unto God by repentance, and be renewed by his grace and pardoned by his mercy.

And therefore the church of God, in which remission of sin is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of repentance; and to deny the church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian.\(^1\)

11.—The necessity of the belief of this article appeareth first, because there can be no Christian consolation without this persuasion. For we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God; nay, God himself hath concluded all under sin; we must also acknowledge that every sinner is a guilty person, and that guilt consisteth in an obligation to endure eternal punishment from the wrath of God provoked by our sins; from whence nothing else can arise but a fearful expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the devils, delivered into chains, and reserved unto judgment.\(^2\) For we all fell as well as they, but with this difference, remission of sins is promised unto us, but to them it is not.

12.—Secondly. It is necessary to believe the forgiveness of sins, that thereby we may sufficiently esteem God's goodness and our happiness. When man was fallen into sin, there was no possibility left to him to work out his recovery; that soul which had sinned must of necessity die, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which should move God not to show a demonstration of his justice upon him; there can be nothing without him which could pretend to rescue him from the sentence of an offended and almighty God. Glorious, therefore, must the goodness of our God appear; who dispenseth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who loecseth the obligation, who imputeth not the sin. This is God's goodness, this is man's happiness. For blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no iniquity.\(^3\) The year of release, the year of jubilee, was a time of

---

\(^1\) I call this the heresy of Novatian, rather than of Novatus, because though they both joined in it, yet it sprung rather from Novatianus the Roman presbyter, than from Novatus the African bishop. And he is thus expressed by Epiphanius: Λέγων μὴ εἶναι σωτηρίαν, ἀλλὰ μιαν μετάνοιαν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ λογουχοῦ, μηκέτι δύνασθαι ἐλεήσασθαι παραπτωμάτως: that is, he acknowledged but one repentance which was available, in baptism; after which if any man sinned, there was no mercy remaining for him. To which Epiphanius gives this reply: Η μὲν τελεία μετάνοια ἐν τῷ λογοῦ τυγχαίνει: εἰ δὲ τις παρέστηκεν, οὐκ ἀπόλλει τοῦτον ἡ ἁγία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας δίδωσι γὰρ ἐπάνοδον, καὶ μετὰ τῆς μετάνοιας τῆς μεταμεταλαίνει. And again: Δεχεται σὺν ὁ ἄγιος λόγος καὶ ἡ ἁγία θεοῦ ἐκκλησία πάντοτε τὴν μεταμεταλαίνει. Hom. lix. § 1, 2. And yet more generally: Τὰ τάστα σαφῶς τετελεῖται, μετὰ τὴν ἐνεπέμφθη ἐκδήμασιν, ἐπὶ ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ ἄγιου πάντων, καὶ μετὰ πᾶσιν ἐπὶ ἀνάστασις, ἐπὶ ἑλπίς, ἐπὶ θεραπεία, ἐπὶ ὑμνολογία· καὶ εἰ μὴ τελειωτα, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐκ ἀπηγορεύεται ἡ σωτηρία. 2 Peter ii. 4.

\(^2\) Psalm xxxiii. 1, 2.
public joy; and there is no voice like that, thy sins are forgiven thee. By this a man is rescued from infernal pains, secured from the everlasting flames; by this he is made capable of heaven, by this he is assured of eternal happiness.

13.—Thirdly, it is necessary to believe the forgiveness of sins, that by the sense thereof we may be inflamed with the love of God; for that love doth naturally follow from such a sense, appeareth by the parable in the gospel, There was a certain creditor which had two debtors, the one owed him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Upon which case our Saviour made this question, which of them will love him most? He supposeth both the debtors will love him, because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionally to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, and our debts are sins, and the creditor is God: the remission of our sins is the frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we are obliged to return our love.

14.—Fourthly, the true notion of forgiveness of sins is necessary to teach us what we owe to Christ, to whom, and how far we are indebted for this forgiveness. Through this man is preached unto us the forgiveness of sins, and without a surety we had no release. He rendered God propitious unto our persons, because he gave himself as a satisfaction for our sins. While thus he took off our obligation to punishment, he laid upon us a new obligation of obedience. We are not our own who are bought with a price; we must glorify God in our bodies and in our spirits, which are God's. We must be no longer the servants of men, we are the servants of Christ, who are bought with a price.

15.—Fifthly, it is necessary to believe remission of sins as wrought by the blood of Christ, by which the covenant was ratified and confirmed; which mindeth us of a condition required. It is the nature of a covenant to expect performances on both parts; and therefore if we look for forgiveness promised, we must perform repentance commanded. These two were always preached together, and those which God hath joined ought no man to put asunder. Christ did truly appear a Prince and a Saviour, and it was to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins; he joined these two in the apostles' commission, saying, that Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations.

16.—From hence every one may learn what he is explicitly to believe and confess in this article of forgiveness of sins; for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much, I do freely and fully acknow-

---

1 Luke vii. 41, 42. 2 Acts xiii. 38. 3 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. 4 1 Cor. vii. 22, 23. 5 Acts v. 31. 6 Luke xxiv. 47.
ledge, and with unspeakable comfort embrace this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that whereas every sin is a transgression of the law of God, upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternal punishment, s. that all men being concluded under sin, they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternal death, it pleased God to give his Son, and his Son to give himself to be a surety for this debt, and to release us from these bonds; and because without shedding of blood there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a ransom, even his precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the will and justice of God, by which propitiation God, who was by our sins offended, became reconciled, and being so, took off our obligation to eternal punishment, which is the guilt of our sins, and appointed in the church of Christ the sacrament of baptism for the first remission, and repentance for the constant forgiveness of all following trespasses; and thus I believe the forgiveness of sins.

 ARTICLE XI.

The Resurrection of the Body.

1.—THIS article was anciently delivered and acknowledged by all churches, only with this difference, that whereas in other places it was expressed in general terms, the resurrection of the flesh, they of the church of Aquileia, by the addition of a pronoun, propounded it to every single believer in a more particular way of expression, the resurrection of this flesh. And though we have translated it in our English Creed the resurrection of the body; yet neither the Greek nor Latin ever delivered this article in those terms, but in these, the resurrection of the flesh; because

1 "Cum omnes ecclesiae sacra sacramentum symboli tradant, ut postquam dixerint pecatorum remissionem, addant carnis resurrectionem; sancta Aqulleiensis ecclesiae, ubi tradit carnis resurrectionem, addit unius pronominis syllabam; et pro eo quod cateri dicunt, carnis resurrectionem, nos dicimus, hujus carnis resurrectionem."—Ruffin. Invect. in Hieron. lib. 1. "Satis curta et prudam adjunctionem idem symboli ecclesiae nostra docet, quae in eo quod a ceteris tradit, carnis resurrectionem, uno addito pronome tradit, hujus carnis resurrectionem."—Idem. In Symb. "Sive ergo corpus resurrecturum dicimus, secundum apostolum dicimus, hoc enim nomine usus est ille; sive carmem dicimus, secundum traditionem symboli confitemur."—Idem, Proo. in Apol. Pamphili.

2 The Greeks always, σαρκος ανάστασιν the Latins, carnis resurrectionem. And this was to be observed, because, being [seeing] we read of spiritual bodies, some would acknowledge the resurrection of the body, who would deny the resurrection of the flesh. Of this St. Jerome gives an account, and withal of the words of the Creed: "Exempli causa paucis subjiciam. Credimus, inquit, resurrectionem futuram corporum. Hac si bene dicatur, pura confessio est; sed quia
there may be ambiguity in the one, in relation to the celestial and spiritual bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other. Only it will be necessary, for showing our agreement with the ancient Creeds, to declare that as by flesh they understood the body of man, and not any other flesh, so we, when we translate it body, understand no other body, but such a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the soul. And this we may very well and properly do, because our church hath already taken care therein, and given us a fit occasion so to declare ourselves. For though in the Creed itself, used at morning and evening prayer, the article be thus delivered: *the resurrection of the body*; yet in the form of public baptism, where it is propounded by way of question to the godfathers, in the name of the child to be baptized, it runneth thus: *Dost thou believe—the resurrection of the flesh?* We see by daily experience that all men are mortal, that the body left by the soul, the salt and life thereof, putrififieth and consumeth, and according to the sentence of old, returneth unto dust: but these bodies, as frail and mortal as they are, consisting of this corruptible flesh, are the subject of this article, in which we profess to believe *the resurrection of the body*.

2.—When we treated concerning the resurrection of Christ, we delivered the proper notion and nature of the resurrection in general, that from thence we might conclude that our Saviour did truly rise from the dead. Being now to explain the resurrection to come, we shall not need to repeat what we then delivered, or make any addition as to that particular, but referring the reader to that which is there explained, it will be necessary for us only to consider what is the resurrection to come, who they are which shall be raised, how we are assured they shall rise, and in what manner all shall be performed. And this resurrection hath some peculiar difficulties different from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of Christ's resurrection. For the body of the Son of God did never see corruption: all the parts thereof continued in the same condition in which they were after his most precious soul had left them; they were only deposited in the sepulchre, otherwise the grave had no power over them. But other mortal bodies, after the soul hath deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality; we may say to corruption, *thou art my father, to the worm, thou art my mother and my sister*:
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Our corpses go down to the bars of the pit, and rest together in the dust. Our death is not a simple dissolution, not a bare separation of soul and body as Christ's was; but our whole tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust and ashes, scattered, mingled, and confounded with the dust of the earth. There is a description of a kind of resurrection in the prophet Ezekiel, in which there is supposed a valley full of bones, and there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, and their breath came into them, and they lived and stood upon their feet. But in the resurrection to come we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts.

3.—We must, therefore, undertake to show that the bodies of men, howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long soever dead, shall hereafter be recollected in themselves, and united to their own souls. And for the more facile and familiar proceeding in this so highly concerning truth, I shall make use of this method: First, to prove that such a resurrection is not in itself impossible. Secondly, to show that it is upon general considerations highly probable. Thirdly, to demonstrate that it is upon Christian principles infallibly certain. It is not in itself impossible, therefore no man can absolutely deny it; it is upon natural and moral grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon evangelical principles infallibly certain, therefore all Christians must firmly believe it.

4.—First, I confess philosophers of old did look upon the resurrection of the body as impossible, and though some of them thought the souls of the dead did live again, yet they never conceived that they were united to the same bodies, and that their flesh should rise out of the dust that it might be conjoined to the spirit of a man. We read of certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics, who encountered St. Paul, and when they heard of the resurrection they mocked him, some saying that he seemed to be a better forth of strange gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. But as the ancient philosophers thought a crea-

1 Job xvii. 14, 16.  2 Ezek. xxxvii. 7, 8, 10.  3 Pliny, reckoning up those things which he thought not to be in the power of God, mentions these two: "Mortales resurrectit Iomare, aut revocare defunctos."—Nat. Hist. lib. ii. cap. 7. And Aeschylus, though a Pythagorean, yet absolutely denies it to be in the power of God; for so he makes Apollo speak to the Eumenides: (Eumen. 648) "Πάντας μὲν ἀν λύσεις, ἔστιν τοῦτ' ἄκος Καὶ καρπα πολλὰ μηχανή λυτήμασι.


4 Acts xvii. 18, 32.
tion impossible, because they looked only upon the constant works of nature, among which they never find anything produced out of nothing, and yet we have already proved a creation not only possible, but performed; so did they think a resurrection of corrupted, dissolved, and dissipated bodies to be as impossible, because they could never observe any action or operation in nature, which did or could produce any such effect; and yet we being not tied to the consideration of nature only, but estimating things possible and impossible by the power of God, will easily demonstrate that there is no impossibility that the dead should rise.

5.—For, if the resurrection of the dead be impossible, it must be so in one of these respects: either in reference to the agent, or in relation to the patient; either because it is a work of so much difficulty that there neither is nor can be any agent of wisdom, power, and activity sufficient to effect it; or else because the soul of man is so far separated by death from the body, and the parts of the body so much dissolved from themselves and altered from their nature, that they are absolutely incapable by any power to be united as they were. Either both or one of these two must be the reason of the impossibility, if the resurrection be impossible; for if the body be capable of being raised, and there be any agent of sufficient ability to raise it, the resurrection of it must be possible.

6.—Now if the resurrection were impossible in respect of the agent which should effect it, the impossibility must arise either from an insufficiency of knowledge or of power; ¹ for if either the agent know not what is to be done, or if he know it, but hath not power to do it, either he will not attempt it, or if he do, must fail in the attempt; but that, of which he hath perfect knowledge and full power to effect, cannot be impossible in relation to the agent ended with such knowledge, armed with such power.

Now when we say the resurrection is possible, we say not it is so to men or angels or any creature of a limited knowledge or finite power, but we attribute it to God, with whom nothing is impossible; ² his understanding is infinite, he knoweth all the men which ever lived since the foundation, or shall live unto the dissolution of the world, he knoweth whereof all things are made, from what dust we came, into what dust we shall return. Our substance

¹ Τὸ ἀδύνατον τίνι γεγονόσκεται κατὰ ἀλήθειαν τοιούτων, ἡ ἐκ τοῦ [μὴ γεγονόσκειν τὸ γεγονόσκεμον, ἡ ἐκ τοῦ] δύναμιν ἀρκοῦσαν μὴ ἔχειν πρὸς τὸ ποίησαι καλὸς τὸ ἐγγευσµένον. Ὁ γὰρ ἄγνοος τοῖς γεγένοσι δεότως, οὐκ ἄν οὐκ ἐγχειρήσας, οὔτε ποιήσας τὸ παράγων δινήθει ὑπὲρ ἄγνοιας ἔτες γεγονόσκων καλὸς τὸ ποιηθόσκεμον, καὶ πόθεν γένοιτ' ἀν, καὶ πῶς, δύναμιν δὲ ἡ μὴ γέγονόσκειν πρὸς τὸ ποίησαι τὸ γεγονόσκεμον ἡ μὴ ἀρκοῦσαν ἔχειν, οὐκ ἄν ἐγχειρήσῃς τὴν ἀρχήν, εἰ σωφρονεῖ καὶ τὴν ἑως ἐπισκέψῃς δύναμιν ἐγχειρήσας δὲ ἀπερισκέπτως, οὐκ ἄν ἐπιτελέσῃς τὸ δόξαν. — ΑΤΕΝΑΓΟΡΑΣ Β Resurrectionis Mortuorum.

² Λουκ. 1. 37.
was not hid from thee, O Lord, when we were made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth; thine eyes did see our substance, yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all our members written, which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them. Thus every particle of our bodies, every dust and atom which belongeth to us, is known to him that made us. The generation of our flesh is clearly seen by the Father of spirits, the augmentation of the same is known to him in whom we live, move, and have our being; the dissolution of our tabernacles is perceived by that God, by whom the very hairs of our head are all numbered, and without whom one sparrow shall not fall to the ground. He which numbereth the sands of the sea knoweth all the scattered bones, seeth into all the graves and tombs, searcheth all the repositories and dormitories in the earth, knoweth what dust belongeth to each body, what body to each soul. Again, as his all-seeing eye observeth every particle of dissolved and corrupted man, so doth he also see and know all ways and means by which these scattered parts should be united, by which this ruined fabric should be recompensed, he knoweth how every bone should be brought to its old neighbour bone, how every sinew may be reembroidered on it; he understandeth what are the proper parts to be conjoined, what is the proper gluten by which they may become united. The resurrection, therefore, cannot be impossible in relation to the agent upon any deficiency of knowledge how to effect it.

And as the wisdom is infinite, so the power of this agent is unlimited; for God is as much omnipotent as omniscient. There can be no opposition made against him, because all power is his; nor can he receive a check against whom there is no resistance. All creatures must not only suffer, but do what he will have them; they are not only passively but actively obediential. There is no atom of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleaseth God, and be applied and make up what and how it seemeth good to him. The resurrection, therefore, cannot be impossible in relation unto God upon any disability to effect it, and consequently there is no impossibility in reference to the agent, or him who is to raise us.

7.—Secondly, the resurrection is not impossible in relation to the patient, because where we look upon the power of God nothing can be impossible but that which involveth a contradiction, as we before have proved; and there can be no contradiction in this, that he which was, and now is not, should hereafter be what before he was. It is far from a repugnancy, that it rather containeth a rational and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust,

1 Psalm cxxxix. 15, 16.  
2 Heb. xii. 9.  
3 Acts xvii. 28.  
4 Matt. x. 29, 30.
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becoming dust, should become man again. Whateover we lose in death, is not lost to God: as no creature could be made out of nothing but by him, so can it not be reduced into nothing but by the same: though, therefore, the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they lose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the chambers of nature, and it is no more a contradiction that they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, than that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they do. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnancy by their separation to be reunited when and how he pleaseth. The first dust of which man was made, was as far from being flesh as any ashes now or dust can be; it was only an omnipotent power which could mould that into a human body and breathe into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power, therefore, which must always be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth, human bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth; for if it be not easier, it is most certainly as easy, to make that to be again which once hath been, as to make that to be which before was not. When there was no man, God made him of the earth, and therefore, when he returns to earth, the same God can make him man again.

1 "Non sola anima sequitur; habet et caro secessas suis interim, in aquas, ignibus, in altibus, in bestiis; quum in hac dissolvi videatur, velut in vasa transfunditur."—Tertull. De Iteur. Carn. cap. 65. "Tu perire et Deo credis, si quid oculos nostris bebetibus subtrahitur? Corpus omne, sive ascesit in pulvere, sive in humorem solvit, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nudorum tenen- tur, subducitur nobis; sed Deo elementorum Custodi reservatur."—Minut. Fel. in Octav. cap. 34. "Omnia quae discerpuntur, et in vivis quasdam patrescut, integra Deo sunt; in ilia enim elementa mundi sunt, unde primo venerunt."—S. August. Enarr. in Psalm. ivi.

2 "Abisset autem ut ad resuscitanda corpora vitaeque reddenda non possit omnipotentia Creatoris omnium revocare, quae vel bestia vel ignis absumpsit, vel in pulvere chernenque collapsum, vel in humorem solutum, vel in auras est exhaliatum. Abisset ut sinus ulius secretumque naturae ita recipiat aliquid subtractum sensibus nostris, ut omnium Creatoris aut latet cognitionem, aut effugiat potestatem."—S. August. De Civit. Dei, lib. xxii. cap. 20.

3 "Reccita quid fueris antequam esses; utique nihil. Mominisses enim, si quid fusis- ses. Quid ergo nihil fueras prius quam esses idem nihil factus cum esse desieris, cur non possis rursus esse de nilio, ejusdem ipsum Anteors voluntate, qui te voluit esse de nilio? Quid novi tibi evenit? Quis non eras, factus es; cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde, si potes, rationem qua factus es, ut tuum requie qua fies. Et tamen facilius utique fies, quod fuisti aliquando, qua aequa non difficile factus es, quod nunquam fuisti aliquando."—Tertull. Apoloq. cap. 48. "Utique idoneus est reflexe, qui ictum: quanto plus est fecisse, quam refecisse; initium dedisse, quam reddidisse; ita restitutionem carnis faciliorem credas institutionem."—Idem. De Iteur. Carn. cap. 11. "Difficilis est id quod non sit incepere, quam id quod fuerit recedere."—Minut. Fel. in Octav. cap. 34. "Utique plus est facere quod nunquam fuit, quam reparare quod fuerit. Quomodo ergo impossibile esse dicas, ut Deus, qui hominem formavit, ex nilio reformet? Quomodo nos suscitare non potest conversos in pulvere qui, etiamsi in tabulis rediremus, facere poterat ut essesmus; scit et fecit nos esse, cum antea nunquam fuissemus?"—S. August. De Verb. Apost. Serm. 34. To the same purpose the Jews:
The resurrection, therefore, cannot be impossible, which is our first conclusion.

8.—Secondly, the resurrection is not only in itself possible, so that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many general considerations highly probable, so that all men may very rationally expect it. If we consider the principles of humanity, the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life to be proportionable to our composition. The souls of men, as they are immaterial, so they are immortal, and being once created by the Father of Spirits, they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into the world consisteth of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures of a longer duration. Some of the fowls of the air, several of the fishes of the sea, many of the beasts of the field, divers of the plants of the earth, are of a more durable constitution, and outlive the sons of men. And can we think that such material and mortal, that such misunderstanding souls should by God and Nature be furnished with bodies of so long permanence, and that our spirits should be joined unto flesh so subject to corruption, so suddenly dissolvable, were it not that they lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season, and then went soul and body to the same destruction, never to be restored to the same subsistence? but when the soul of man, which is immortal, is forced from its body in a shorter time, nor can by any means continue with it half the years which many other creatures live, it is because this is not the only life belonging to the sons of men, and so the soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume again.

9.—Again, if we look upon ourselves as men, we are free agents, and therefore capable of doing good or evil, and consequently ordinable unto reward or punishment. The angels who are above us, and did sin, received their punishment without a death, because being only spirits they were subject to no other dissolution than annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those who continued in their station were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity, and thus all the angels are incapable of a resurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedom cannot sin, or act anything morally either good or evil, they cannot deserve after this life either to be punished or rewarded, and therefore, when they die, they continue in the state of death for ever. Thus those who are above us shall not rise from the dead, because they are punished or rewarded without dying; and where no death is, there can be no resurrection from the dead.
Those which are below us are neither capable of reward nor punishment for anything acted in this life, and therefore though they die, yet shall they never rise, because there is no reason for their resurrection. But man, by the nobleness of his better part, being free to do what is good or evil while he liveth, and by the frailty of his body being subject to death, and yet after that, being capable of another world to receive a reward for what he hath done well, and a punishment for what he hath done ill, in the flesh, it is necessary that he should rise from the dead to enjoy the one, or suffer the other. For there is not only no just retribution rendered in this life to man, but, considering the ordinary condition of things, it cannot be. For it is possible, and often cometh to pass, that one man may commit such sins as all the punishments in this world can no way equalise them. It is just that he who sheddeth man's blood, by man his blood should be shed; but what death can sufficiently retaliate the many murders committed by one notorious pirate, who may cast many thousands overboard, or the rapines and assassinations of one rebel or tyrant, who may destroy whole nations? It is fit that he who blasphemeth God should die; but what equivalent punishment can he receive in this life who shall constantly blaspheme the name of God, destroy his priests and temples, abolish his worship, and extirpate his servants? What is then more proper, considering the providence of a most just God, than to believe that man shall suffer in another life such torments as will be proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reason think that the soul alone shall undergo those sufferings, because the laws which were given to us are not made in respect of that alone, but have most frequent reflection on the body, without which in this life the soul can neither do nor suffer anything. It is therefore highly probable, from the general consideration of human actions and divine retributions, that there shall be a resurrection of the flesh, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.

10.—Furthermore, beside the principles of which we consist, and the actions which flow from us, the consideration of the things

1 Παράγμα γὰρ λέγειν ὃτι σωζόμενης τῆς φύσεως, ἐν ἐννεακατετείχα, σοφά ἡ θρητή φύσις ἵνα γενέσθαι αὐτῆς τὴν συμμετρίαν δίκαιην πλειονώτατον ἡ βαρβαρείας φερομένων πλημμεληματος. — ΑTHENAGORAS De Resurrectione Nosterorum.

cetur, si sola decedit. At enim non magis sola decedit, quam sola decucurrit illud unde decedit: vitam hanc dico."—Ibid. cap. 15. "Cum omnis vitae nostras usus in corporis animaque consortio sit, resurrectio autem boni actus premium habeat aut pecunia impresso, necesse est corpus resurgere cujus actus expenditur. Quomodo enim in judiciocum vocabitur sine corpore, cum de suo et corporis contubernalio ratio praestanda sit?" —S. AMBROSE. De Fide Resur.

3 2 Cor. V. 10.
without us, and the natural course of variations in the creature, will render the resurrection yet more highly probable. Every space of twenty-four hours teacheth thus much, in which there is always a revolution amounting to a resurrection. The day dies into night, and is buried in silence and in darkness; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darkness, rising from the dead of night: this is a diurnal resurrection. As the day dies into night, so doth the summer into winter: the sap is said to descend into the root, and there it lies buried in the ground; the earth is covered with snow, or crusted with frost, and becomes a general sepulchre; when the spring appeareth all begin to rise, the plants and flowers peep out of their graves, revive, and grow and flourish: this is the annual resurrection. The corn by which we live, and for want of which we perish with famine, is notwithstanding cast upon the earth and buried in the ground, with a design that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this constant experiment, and we continue this present life by succession of resurrections. Thus all things are repaired by corrupting, are preserved by perishing, and revive by dying; and can we think that man, the Lord of all these things, which thus die and revive for him, should be detained in death as never to live again? 2 Is

1 Catullan verum esse dominiorem. (Ant.)

2 Ommia percedo servarent, omnia de interitu reformatur. Tu homo, tantum nomen, si intelligas te, vel de titulo Pythiae, discenda, dominus omnium morientium et resurrectum, ad hoc morieris ut peres? — Tertull. Apolog. cap. 48. "Revolutur hymenes et astates, verna et autumna, cum suis viribus, moribus, fructibus. Quippe etiam terrae de colo disciplina est arbore vestire post spolia, flores denuo colorare, herbas rursus imponere, exhibere eadem quas assumpta sunt semina; nec prius exhibere quam assumpta. Mira ratio: de fraudali transcivaria; ut rediat, interfecto; ut integret, divisi; ut etiam ampliat, prius decoquit. Siquidem ubiora et cultiora restituit, quam externavit: revera fenore interitu, et injuria usura, et lucro damnno. Semel dixerim. Universa condito rectivada est. Quodcumque conveniunt, fuit; quodcumque amiseris, nihil non iterum est. Omnia in statum reductum, quam abcesserint; omnia incepserint, cum desiderent: ideo sinuam, ut flant; nihil diperit, nisi in salutem. Totus igitur hic ordo revolutus erum, testatio est resurrectionis mortuorum. Operibus eam prescripsit Deus anti-quam literis; viribus praedictavit antiquam vocibus. Pramissit tibi naturam magistrum, s. omnisursum et prophetiam, quo facillis credas prophetiae, disciplinas naturam; quo statim admittas, cum audieris quod subique iam videris; nec dubias Deum carnis etiam Resuscitatorem, quem omnium necris Restitutorem. Et utique si omnis h: unius resurgam, cui procella sunt; vero
it imaginable that God should thus restore all things to man, and not restore man to himself? If there were no other consideration, but of the principles of human nature, of the liberty and remunerability of human actions, and of the natural revolutions and resurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly sufficient to render the resurrection of our bodies highly probable.

11.—We must not rest in this school of Nature, nor settle our persuasions upon likelihoods; but as we passed from an apparent possibility unto a high presumption and probability, so must we pass from thence unto a full assurance of an infallible certainty. And of this, indeed, we cannot be assured but by the revelation of the will of God; upon his power we must conclude that we may, from his will that we shall, rise from the dead. Now the power of God is known unto all men, and therefore all men may infer from thence a possibility; but the will of God is not revealed unto all men, and therefore all have not an infallible certainty of the resurrection. For the grounding of which assurance I shall show that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raise the dead, and that he hath not only delivered that intention in his Word, but hath also several ways confirmed the same.

12.—Many of the places produced out of the Old Testament to this purpose will scarce amount to a revelation of this truth. The Jews insist upon such weak inferences out of the law as show that the resurrection was not clearly delivered by Moses; and in the Book of Job, where it is most evidently expressed they acknowledge it not, because they will not understand the true notion of a Redeemer properly belonging to Christ. The words of Job are very express, I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God. Against the evidence of this truth, there are two interpretations: one very new of some late opinionists, who understand this of a sudden restitution.

non homini, nisi et carni, quale est ut ipsa depereat in totum, propter quam et cui nihil desperit?—Idem, De Resur. Carn. cap. 12.

They produce several places out of Moses, which when the resurrection is believed may in some kind serve to illustrate it; but can in no degree be thought to reveal so great a mystery. As, because in the formation of man Moses useth the word רַבִּי יָדִי with two יָדִים, and in the formation of beasts רַבִּי רַבִּי with but one; therefore the beasts are made but once, but man twice; once in his generation, and again in his resurrection. They strangely apprehend a promise of the resurrection, even in the male-diction, "Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return," לְכֵל אָלֶיךָ מָא מַעַרְחָה הֶבַב. "It is not, Thou shalt go to the dust, but, Thou shalt return." As if he had said: "Thou art now dust while thou livest, and after death thou shalt return unto this dust, that is, thou shalt live again as now thou dost." So from those words, Exod. xv. 1, מַעַרְחָה הֶבַב, they conclude the resurrection upon this ground: מַעַרְחָה הֶבַב, "It is not said, He sang, but, He shall sing, namely, after the resurrection in the life to come." With these and the like arguments did the rabbins satisfy themselves: which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the Sadducees; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job.

2 Job xix. 25, 26.
to his former temporal condition; the other more ancient of the Jews, who make him speak of the happiness of another life, without any reference to a resurrection. But that Job spake not concerning any sudden restitution, or any alteration of his temporal condition, is apparent out of the remarkable preface ushering in this expression, O that my words were now written, O that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! 1 He desires that his words may continue as his expectation, that they may remain in the rock, together with his hope so long as the rock shall endure, even to the day of his resurrection. The same appeareth from the objection of his friends, who urged against him that he was a sinner, and concluded from thence that he should never rise again; for his sins he pleaded a Redeemer, and for his resurrection he showeth expectation and assurance through the same Redeemer. 2 It is further confirmed by the expressions themselves, which are no way proper for his temporal restitution: the first words, 3 I also know, denote a certainty and community, whereas the blessings of this life are under no such certainty, nor did Job pretend to it, and the particular condition of Job admitted no community, there being none partaker with him of the same calamity; I know certainly and infallibly, whatsoever shall become of my body at this time, which I know not, but this I know that I shall rise; this is the hope of all which believe in God, and therefore this I also know. The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, 4 the Redeemer, showeth that he understands it of Christ: the time expressed denotes the futurity at the latter day; the description of that Redeemer, standing on the earth, representeth the judge of the quick and the dead; and, seeing God with his eyes, declares his belief in the incarnation. The Jewish exposition of future happiness to be conferred by God, fails only in this, that they will not see in this place the promised Messias; from whence this future happy condition, which they allow, would clearly involve a resurrection. Howsoever they acknowledge the words of Daniel to declare as much, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting confusion. 5

1 Job xix. 24. 2 This place is urged by St. Clemens Romanus, the immediate successor of the apostles, in his epistle to the Corinthians, where, instead of these words of the LXX., Ἀναστήσας τὸ δέμα μου τὸ ἀνανελθον ταῦτα, he reads, Καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταῦτην, τὴν ἀνανελθέσσαν ταύτα πάντα.—Ex. 26. 3 Ἰουσαμᾶς Απολλώνιος Ὀινίος ἀπολέσθω, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ πάντα ἑξαλείψην. 4 The Jews collect from hence the resurrection; as Rabina in Sankedrin, and in the Midrash Tillim, Psalm xcvii. 3: ἐπέκρινεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἔδειξεν τὸν κόσμον τῶν ἐμπορίων τοῖς πληθυσμοῖς. 5 Ὁ ἸΗρακλῆς ἔφη, ὅτι τοὺς σιωπήσας τὸν νόμον ὑπάγον ταῦτα. 6 "Rabbi Rachiom said, that the sleepers in the dust are the dead, as it is written, (Dan. xii. 2,) Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," &c. And this is only denied by the Gentiles; for Porphyrius referreth it only and wholly to the times of
13.—If these and other places of the Old Testament show that God had then revealed his will to raise the dead, we are sure those of the New fully declare the same. Christ, who called himself the resurrection and the life, 1 refuted the Sadducees, and confirmed the doctrine of the Pharisees as to that opinion. He produced a place out of the law of Moses, and made it an argument to prove as much, As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living. 2 With the force of which argument the multitude was astonished and the Sadducees silenced. For under the name of God was understood a great benefactor, a God of promise, and to be their God was to bless them and to reward them; as in them to be his servants and his people was to believe in him, and to obey him. Now Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had not received the promises which they had expected, and therefore God, after their death desiring still to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that he had a blessing and a reward for them still, and consequently that he will raise them to another life in which they may receive it. So that the argument of our Saviour is the same which the Jews have drawn from another place of Moses, I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name of Jehovah was I not known unto them. Nevertheless I have established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers. 3 It is not said, to give their sons, but, to give them the land of Canaan: and therefore, because while they lived here they enjoyed it not, they must live again that they may receive the promise.

And as our blessed Saviour did refute the Sadducees out of the law of Moses, so did St. Paul join himself unto the Pharisees Antiochus, whose words are thus left unto us translated by St. Jerome: *Tunc hi qui quasi in terrae pulvere dormiebant, et operi erant malorum pondere, et quasi in sepulchris miserariam recondit, ad insperatam victoriam de terrae pulvere resurrexerunt; et de humo elevaverunt caput, custodes legis resurgentem in vitam aeternam, et pravarica tores in opprobrium sempiternum.* 4—Ad locum. Where it is to be observed, that he gives a probable gloss of the former part of the verse, but none at all of the latter, because it is no way consistent with his exposition of the former; for they which did rise from the burden of the pressures under Antiochus, did neither rise from thence to an eternal life, nor to an everlasting contempt. Thus, I say, only the Gentiles did interpret it, but now the Jews are joined to them. So Volkelius urges, *Quod in precedentiibus de Antiochi tempore agatur, et resurrectioni illa ad temporae quam praecesserunt spectet.*—De ver. Relig. lib. iii. Dan. xii. 2.

1 John xi. 25.
2 Matt. xxii. 31, 32.
3 Exod. vi. 4.
4 Exod. vi. 4. "It is not said, to give you, but, to give them, whereby the resurrection of the dead appeareth out of the law."—R. Simai, in Perek Helek. And therefore the Jews hold the resurrection for one of the foundations of the law of Moses: 

So Moses MAIMON. EXPL. cap. 10. Tract. Sanhedrin.
in this particular, for being called before the council, and per-
ceiving that the one part were Sadducees and the other Pharisees, one
denying, the other asserting the resurrection, he cried unto the
council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, of
the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question; and
answering before Felix, that they had found no evil doing in him,
while he stood before the council, he mentioned this particularly,
except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them,
Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you
this day. It is evident, therefore, that the resurrection of the dead was
revealed under the law, that the Pharisees who sat in Moses's chair
did collect it thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into
the world, that the Sadducees, who denied it, erred, not knowing the
scriptures, nor the power of God; that our blessed Saviour clearly
delivered the same truth, proved it out of the law of Moses, refuted
the Sadducees, confirmed the Pharisees, taught it the apostles, who
followed him confirming it to the Jews, preaching it to the Gentiles.
Thus the will of God concerning the raising of the dead was made
known unto the sons of men; and because God can do whatsoever
he will, and will certainly effect whatsoever he hath foretold, there-
fore we are assured of a resurrection by virtue of a clear revelation.

14.—Beside, God hath not only foretold, or barely promised, but
hath also given such testimonies as are most proper to confirm our
faith in this particular prediction and promise. For God heard
the voice of Elijah for the dead child of the widow of Sarepta, and
the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived. Him did
Elisha succeed, not only in the same spirit, but also in the like
power, for he raised the child of the Shunammite from death; nor
did that power die together with him, for when they were burying
a dead man, they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha, and when
the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and
stood upon his feet. These three examples were so many confirma-
tions, under the law, of a resurrection to life after death; and we
have three to equal under the gospel. When the daughter of
Jairus was dead, Christ said unto her, Talitha cumi, Damsel arise,
and her spirit came again, and straightway the damsel arose. When
he came nigh to the gate of the city called Nain, there was a dead
man carried out, and he came nigh and touched the bier, and said,
Young man, I say unto thee, Arise; and he that was dead sat up and
began to speak. Thus Christ raised the dead in the chamber and

1 Acts xxiii. 6. 2 Acts xxiv. 20, 21. 3 Matt. xxii. 29. 4 1 Kings xvii. 22.
5 2 Kings iv. 6 2 Kings xiii. 21. 7 Mark v. 41, 42; Luke vii. 55.
8 Luke vii. 12, 14, 15.
in the street, from the bed and from the bier, and not content
with these smaller demonstrations, proceedeth also to the grave. When Lazarus had been dead four days, and so buried that his sister said of him, by this time he stinketh; Jesus cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth, and he that was dead came forth. These three evangelical resuscitations are so many preambulatory proofs of the last and general resurrection; but the three former and these also came far short of the resurrection of him who raised these.

Christ did of himself actually rise, others who had slept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actual testimony of the resurrection. For if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, saith St. Paul to the Corinthians, how say some among you that there is no resurrection from the dead? if it be most infallibly certain that one man did rise from the dead, as we have before proved that Christ did, then it must be as certainly false to assert that there is no resurrection. And therefore when the Gentiles did themselves confess that some particular persons did return to life after death, they could not rationally deny the resurrection wholly. Now the resurrection of Christ doth not only prove by way of example, as the rest who rose, but hath a force in it to command belief of a future general resurrection. For God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. All men, then, are assured that they shall rise, because Christ is risen. And since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

15.—This consequence of a future resurrection of the dead from that of Christ already past, either hath a general or particular consideration. In a general reference it concerneth all; in a more peculiar way it belongeth to the elect alone. First, it belongeth generally unto all men in respect of that dominion of which Christ at his resurrection did obtain the full possession and execution. For to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived, that he migh.

1 John xi. 39, 43, 44. 2 1 Cor. xv. 12. 3 There were not only certain persons under the law, and among the Jews, who were raised to life; but there were also histories amongst the Gentiles of several who rose to life after death. We mentioned before one out of Plutarch, (p. 400, note 2,) who rose the third day; and Plato mentioneth another who revived the twelfth day after death: 'ΑΛΛ' ου μέγετος σοι, ἡν δ' ἐγώ, Δάκίου γε ἀπόλογου ἑρώ, ἀλλ' ἀλκίμου μεν ἀνδρός, Ἡρός τοῦ Ἀρμενίου, τὸ γενος Παμφύλου, οὐ ποτε ἐν πολέμῳ τελευτάσας ἀναιρεθέντων δεκατιον τῶν τεκρων, ἥδη διεφθαρμένων, υγής μὲν αγνησθεὶς κομπάθει δε οίκαδε, μέλλων δαπεσθαι, δι' ἄδεκαταιος ἔποιμαν τοῦ πυρὸς κείμενος ἀνεθία,--Plato De Republica, lib. x. Vide Plini Naturalem Historiam, lib. vii. cap. 52. De his quae elati revivissent.

4 Acts xvii. 31. 5 1 Cor. xv. 20-22.
be Lord both of the dead and living. ¹ Now as God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, ² so Christ is not the Lord of the dead, as dead, but as by his power he can revive them, and rule them when and in what they live. By virtue of this dominion entered upon at his resurrection he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death; ³ and there is no destruction of death but by a general resurrection. By virtue of this did he declare himself after this manner to St. John, I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, amen, and have the keys of hell and of death. ⁴ Thus are we assured of a general resurrection, in that Christ is risen to become the Lord of the dead, and to destroy death.

Secondly, Christ rising from the dead assureth us of a general resurrection in respect of the judgment which is to follow. For as it is appointed for all men once to die, so after death cometh judgment; ⁵ and as Christ was raised that he might be judge, so shall the dead be raised that they may be judged. As, therefore, God gave an assurance to all men that he would judge the world by that man, in that he raised him from the dead, ⁶ so by the same act did he also give an assurance of the resurrection of the world to judgment.

Now as the general resurrection is evidenced by the rising of Christ, so in a more special and peculiar manner the resurrection of the chosen saints and servants of God is demonstrated thereby. For he is risen not only as their Lord and judge, but as their head, to which they are united as members of his body (for he is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead?); as the first-fruits, by which all the lump is sanctified and accepted, for now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept. ⁹ The saints of God are endued with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby their bodies become the temples of the Holy Ghost: now as the promise of the Spirit was upon the resurrection of Christ, so the gift and possession of the Spirit is an assurance of the resurrection of a Christian. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in us. ⁹

Thus God hath determined, and revealed that determination, to raise the dead, and confirmed that revelation by the actual raising of several persons as examples, and of Christ as the highest assurance which could be given unto man, that the doctrine of the resurrection might be established beyond all possibility of contra-
diction. Wherefore I conclude that the resurrection of the body is in itself considered possible, upon general considerations highly probable, upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

16.—But as it is necessary to a resurrection that the flesh should rise, neither will the life of the soul alone continuing amount to the reviviscence of the whole man, so it is also necessary that the same flesh should be raised again; for if either the same body should be joined to another soul, or the same soul united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man. Now the soul is so eminent a part of man, and by our Saviour's testimony not subject to mortality, that it never entered into the thoughts of any man to conceive that men should rise again with other souls; if the spirits of men departed live, as certainly they do, and when the resurrection should be performed, the bodies should be informed with other souls; neither they who lived before then should revive, and those who live after the resurrection should have never been before. Wherefore being at the latter day we expect not a new creation but a restitution, not a propagation but a renovation, not a production of new souls, but a reunion of such as before were separated, there is no question but the same souls should live the second life which have lived the first. Nor is this only true of our souls, but must be also made good of our bodies, those houses of clay, those habitations of flesh: as our bodies while we live are really distinguished from all other creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose body it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other creature, no body of any other man, shall be vitally re-united unto the soul at the resurrection.

That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life, which died; that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day; that the same tabernacle, which was dissolved, shall be reared up again; that the same temple, which was destroyed, shall be rebuilt; is most apparent out of the same Word, most evident upon the same grounds upon which we believe there shall be any resurrection. Though after my skin worms destroy this body, saith Job, yet in my flesh (in flesh, showing the reality, in my flesh, showing the propriety and identity) shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, or a stranger, eye. He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal

1 "Quid hac prophetia manifesta? Nullus tam sperante post Christum, quam iste ante Christum de resurrectione loquitur."—S. Hieron. Epist. 61, ad Pammachianum. Job xix 26, 37.
bodies; for after the resurrection our glorified bodies shall become spiritual and incorruptible, but in the resurrection of our mortal bodies those bodies, by reason of whose mortality we died, shall be revived. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. But this corruptible and this mortal is the same body which dieth, because mortal, and is corrupted because corruptible; the soul, then, at the resurrection of that man which is made immortal, must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

The identity of the body raised from death is so necessary, that the very name of the resurrection doth include or suppose it; so that when I say there shall be a resurrection of the dead, I must intend thus much, that the bodies of men which lived and are dead shall revive and rise again. For at the death of man nothing falleth but his body: the spirit goeth upward, and no other body

1 Rom. viii. 11.
2 "Et nunc, quia de morte iterum non potuisti, et quia mortale stare potui, et quia mortale rerum est, ita et resurrectionis mortui est. Ergo, si resurrectionis mortui est, resurrectionis corporis est et resurrectionis animae,
3 1 Cor. xv. 53.
4 The spirit goeth upward, and no other body
falleth but his own; and therefore the body, and no other but that body, must rise again, to make a resurrection. If we look upon it under the notion of reviviscency, which is more ordinary in the Hebrew language, it proves as much; for nothing properly dieth but the body: the soul cannot be killed, and nothing can revive but that which dieth. Or to speak more punctually, the man falleth not in respect of his spirit but of his flesh, and therefore he cannot be said to rise again but in respect of his flesh which fell: man dieth not in reference to his soul, which is immortal, but his body; and therefore he cannot be said to revive, but in reference to his body before deprived of life; and because no other flesh fell at his death, no other body died but his own, therefore he cannot rise again but in his own flesh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

17.—Again, the description of the place from whence the resurrection shall begin is a sufficient assurance that the same bodies which were dead shall revive and rise again. They which sleep in the dust of the earth, they which are in the graves shall hear the voice and rise: the sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them. But if the same bodies did not rise, they which are in the dust should not revive; if God should give us any other bodies than our own, neither the sea nor the grave should give up their dead. That shall rise again which the grave gives up: the grave hath nothing else to give up but that body which was laid into it; therefore the same body which was buried at the last day shall be revived.

18.—The immediate consequent of the resurrection proveth the identity of the dying and rising body, We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done


The rabbins use sometimes ἀνάστασις, which is properly “resurrection,” ἀναφέρεται according to that of our Saviour, Tāli-thā cumś; but more often they make use of ὄλυμπος, which is reviviscencia or ἀναβίωσις. And though they make a distinction sometimes between them, attributing the first to the wicked, the second to the just; yet it must not be so understood as if there could be a reviviscency without a resurrection, a ὄλυμπος without a ἀνάστασις, but that there is to the wicked a ὄλυμπος which cannot properly be called a ἀνάστασις, because they rise not to the happiness of eternal life.

1 Dan. xii. 2.
2 This argument is so cogent, that the Socinians are forced to deny that Christ speak of the resurrection; affirming that the graves of ignorance and impiety are only there intended, and “rising” is nothing else but coming to the knowledge of Christ by the preaching of the Gospel. Whereas Christ expressly speaks of bringing men to judgment, John v. 27, and divides those which are to come out of the graves into two ranks; neither of which can be so understood. The first are those which “have done good,” before they come out of the graves; these therefore could not be the graves of ignorance and impiety, from which no good can come. The second are such who “have done evil,” and so remain as evil-doers; and therefore cannot be said to have come forth out of the graves of ignorance and impiety, or to rise by the preaching of the gospel to newness of life, because they are expressly said to come forth “unto the resurrection of damnation.” John v. 28.
in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad: That which shall be then received is either a reward or punishment, a reward for the good, a punishment for the evil, done in the body; that which shall receive the reward, and be liable to the punishment, is not only the soul but the body: it stands not, therefore, with the nature of a just retribution that he which sinned in one body should be punished in another, he which pleased God in his own flesh should see God with other eyes. As for the wicked, God shall destroy both their soul and body in hell; but they which glorify God in their body and their spirit, which are God's, shall be glorified by God in their body and their spirit, for they are both bought with the same price, even the blood of Christ. The bodies of the saints are the members of Christ, and no members of his shall remain in death: they are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and therefore if they be destroyed they shall be raised again. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, as he doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, he which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us.

19. — Further, the identity of the dying and the rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise because they shall never die. This may be considered not only in the translations of Enoch and Elias, but also in those whom Christ shall find alive at his coming, whom he shall not kill but change: the dead in Christ shall rise first, then they which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the Lord. If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, only changed into glorified and spiritual bodies, that is, with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified; certainly those which were dead shall rise out of their graves to life in the same bodies in which they lived, that they may both appear alike before the Judge of the quick and the dead. Otherwise the saints which shall be with God

1 Cor. v. 10.
2 "Quam absurdum, quam vero et iniquum; utrumque autem quam Deo indignantum, aliam substantiam operari, aliam mercede dispensati: ut hoc quidem caro per mortiarias lamietur, ali vero coronetur: item e contrario, hae quidem caro in spurcilitias volutas, ali vero damnetur! Nonne præstat omnem semel fidem a spe resurrectionis abscedere, quam de gratitate atque justitiae Dei ludere? Marcionem pro Valentino resuscitaris?" — TERTULLIANUS, De Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 56. And, speaking to the soul of man, "Affirmamus te manere post vitam disputationem, et expectare diu judicium, quia meritis aut cruciatui destitutus est refrigerio, utroque sempiterno. Quibus sustinendis necessario tibi substantiam provisionem, ejusdemque hominis materiam et membris reversurum, quod et nihil aliud boni sentire possis sine carnis passionalis facultate, et nulla ratio sit judicium sine ipsius exhibitione, qui meruit judicium passione." — Idem, De Testimonio Anima, cap. 4.
3 Matt. x. 23.
4 1 Cor. vi. 20.
5 1 Cor. vi. 15, 19.
6 Rom. viii. 11.
7 "Enoch translatus est in carne; Elias carneus rapitus est in celum: necum mortuus et paradisi jam coloni habent membra eam quibus rapiunt atque translati." — HIERON. Epist. 61.
8 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.
9 Acts x. 41.
The Resurrection of the Body.

and with the Lamb for evermore would be chequered with a strange disparity, one part of them appearing and continuing with the same bodies in which they lived, another part with others.

20.—Lastly, those examples which God hath been pleased to give us to confirm our faith in the resurrection, do at the same time persuade us that the same body which died shall rise again. For whether we look upon the three examples of the Old Testament, or those of the New, they all rose in the same body before it was dissolved: if we look upon those which rose upon our Saviour's death, it is written that the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose and came out of their graves, certainly the same bodies which were laid in. If, then, they were to us examples of the resurrection to come, as certainly they were, then they resemble in their substance after they lived again the substance in which all the rest shall rise. And being Christ himself did raise his own body, according to his prediction, Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up, and declared it to be his own body, saying, Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself; being he shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body; it followeth that we shall rise in the same bodies as our Saviour did, that every particular person at the resurrection may speak the words which Christ then spake, Behold it is I myself.

We can, therefore, no otherwise expound this article, teaching the resurrection of the body, than by asserting that the bodies which have lived and died shall live again after death, and that the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored; whatsoever alteration shall be made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition; not of their substance, but of their qualities. Which explication

2 Matt. xxvii. 52, 53.
3 "Post dicta Domini, facta etiam ejus quid sapere crederamus, de capulis, de sepulchris, mortuos resuscitantis? cui rei istud? Si ad simplicem ostentationem potestatis, aut ad presentem gratiam redaminonis, non adeo magnum illi denuo mortuuros suscipire. An imvero, si ad fidem potius sequenturam futurae resurrectionis, ergo et illa corporaillis prescriberit, de documentis sui forma."—Tertull. De Resur. Carn. cap. 38. "At ego Deum male declinere non posse, de fallacia solummodo infirmum, ne altera documenta praemisses, quam rem disposisse videatur; imo, ne si exemplum resurrectionis sine carne non valuit inducere, multo magis plenitudinem exempli in eadem substantia exhibere non possit. Nullum vero exemplum majus est eo, cujus exemplum est. Majus est autem, si animae cum corpore resuscitabantur in documentum sine corpore resurgendi, ut tota hominis salus dimidia patrocinaretur: quando exemplorum conditio illud potius expectet, quod minus haberetur; animae dico solius resurrectionem, velut gustum carnis etiam resurrectionis suo in tempore."—Tertull. ibid.
4 John ii. 19.
6 "Expectamus in hujus morte et sanguine emundatos remissionem peccatorum consequuturos: resuscitandos nos ab eo in his corporibus, et in eadem carne qua nunc sumus, sicut et ipse in eadem, qua natus et passus et mortuos est resurrexit."—So we read in the creed which by some is attributed to St. Athanasius, by others to St. Gregory Nazianzen. "Si ad exemplum Christi resurgamus qui resurrexit in carne, jam non ad exemplum Christi resurgamus si non in carne et ipsi resurgamus." Phil. iil. 21.
7 "Hace est vera resurrectionis confessio, quae satis gloriam carni tribuit, ut non au'erat
is most agreeable to the language of the scriptures, to the principles of religion, to the constant profession of the church, against the Origenists of old, and the Socinians of late.

21. —Having hitherto proved the certainty of this article, that there shall be a resurrection, and declared the verity and propriety of it, that it shall be the resurrection of the same body which was dead; we may now proceed farther to inquire into the latitude of the same, to whom the resurrection doth belong. And here we find a great difference between the revelation of this truth under the law and under the gospel; Christ proved out of the law that there should be a resurrection, but by such an argument as reacheth no farther than unto the people of God, because it is grounded upon those words, I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. Job speaketh most expressly of the resurrection, but mentioneth no other than his Redeemer and himself. The place of Daniel, which was always accounted the most evident and uncontradicted testimony, though it deliver two different sorts of persons rising, yet it seems to be with some limitation, Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. From whence the Jews generally have believed that some men should live again and some should not; because it is written, Many shall awake, but it is not written, All shall awake. Nay, some of them have gone so far by way of restriction, that they have maintained a resurrection of the just alone, according to that ancient saying accepted amongst them, that the Sending of the rain is of the just and unjust, but the resurrection of the dead is of the just alone.

22. —Against which two restrictions by the light delivered in the gospel we shall deliver the latitude of this article in these two propositions. First, the resurrection of the dead belongeth not to the just alone, but to the unjust also. Secondly, the resurrection of the dead belongeth not only to some of the just, but to all the just; not to some of the unjust only, but to all the unjust, even unto all the dead.

For the first, it is most evident, not only out of the New, but also out of the Old Testament, the words of Daniel prove it sufficiently; for of those many which shall awake, some shall rise to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. But it is most certain that the just shall never rise to shame and ever-
lasting contempt; therefore it is most evident that some shall awake and rise beside the just. The Jews themselves did understand and believe thus much, as appeareth by St. Paul's apology to Felix, But this I confess unto thee, that I have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and unjust.¹ The just shall rise to receive their reward, the unjust to receive their punishment: the first unto a resurrection, called, in reference unto them, the resurrection of life; the second unto a resurrection, named, in relation unto them, the resurrection of damnation.² For as there is a resurrection of the just, so there must also be a resurrection of the unjust: that as Christ said unto the charitable person, Thou shalt be blessed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just;³ so it may be said to the wicked and uncharitable, Thou shalt be accursed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the unjust. For there shall be a resurrection, that there may be a judgment, and at the judgment there shall appear sheep on the right hand of the Son of Man, and goats on the left, therefore they both shall rise; those, that they may receive that blessing, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:⁴ these, that they may receive that sentence, Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.⁵ At that resurrection then which we believe, there shall rise both just and unjust.

Secondly, as no kind of men, so no person shall be excluded: whosoever dieth is numbered with the just or unjust. Adam the first of men shall rise, and all which come from him. For as in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive.⁶ Christ is the Lord of the dead, and so hath a right by that dominion to raise them all to life: it is called the resurrection of the dead indefinitely, and comprehendeth them universally. By man came death, by man came the resurrection of the dead,⁷ and so the resurrection adequately answereth unto death. Christ shall destroy death; but if any one should be left still dead, death were not destroyed. The words of our Saviour are express and full, The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.⁸ In the description of the judgment which followeth upon the resurrection, when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, it is said that,

¹ Acts xxiv. 14, 15. ² ἀνάστασις ὑδίων and ἀνάστασις κρίσεως. The first is called ἀνάστασις δικαιών, and therefore the second may as well be called ἀνάστασις ὑδίων. John v. 29. ³ Luke xiv. 14. ⁴ Matt. xxv. 31. ⁵ Verse 41. ⁶ 1 Cor. xv. 22. ⁷ Verse 21. ⁸ John v 28, 29.
before him shall be gathered all nations. We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and if so, the dead must all rise, for they are all fallen. We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil; and before we all appear, the dead must rise that they may appear. This is the latitude of the resurrection; the resurrection of the dead is the resurrection of all the dead, or of all mankind.

23.—Now this resurrection, as an object of our faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futurity of it. There were heretics in the apostles’ days who acknowledged a resurrection, but yet destroyed this article by denying the relation of it to the time, as Hymeneus and Philetus, who erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already, and so overthrow the faith of some. To believe it already past, is to deny it, because it cannot be believed past, but by such an interpretation as must destroy it. As they which interpret this resurrection of the likeness of Christ’s resurrection, that as he died and rose again, so we should die unto sin and live again unto righteousness, attributing all to the renovation of the mind, must deny the resurrection of the body.

Now as we know the doctrine of the resurrection was first delivered to be believed as to come, so we are assured that it is not yet come since the doctrine of it was first delivered, and is to be believed as to come to the end of the world; because, as Martha called it, it is the resurrection at the last day. Job, who knew that his Redeemer lived, did not expect that he should stand upon the earth till the latter day; Christ hath no otherwise declared his

1 Matt. xxv. 32, 33.
2 Rom. xiv. 10.
3 Cor. v. 10.
5 Nonnulli enim attendentes verba quae assidue dicit apostolus, Quaà et mortui sumus cum Christo, et resurreximus cum eo, nec intelligentes quatenus dicantur, arbitrati sunt jam factam esse resurrectionem, nec ullam uestiriam in fine tempore esse sperandam. Ec quisbus est, Inquit, Hymeneus et Philetus, qui visco veritatem aberraverint, dicentes resurrectionem jam factum esse, et idem quorundam subverterunt. Idem apostolus eos arguens detestatur, qui tamen dicit nos resurrexi esse cum Christo."—S. August. Epist. cxix. ad Januar. cap. 3. This was the heresy of the Selcuciani or Herme-

6 John xi. 24.
Further's will, than that of all which he hath given him, he should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.\(^1\) The corn is sown and laid in the ground, and the harvest is the end of the world.\(^2\) We must not expect to rise from the dead till the last trump.\(^3\) The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel and with the trump of God,\(^4\) before all that are in the graves shall hear his voice.\(^5\) God shall judge the world,\(^6\) and therefore shall raise the world; but he will not raise them to that judgment till the end of the world.

Thus having demonstrated that the will of God hath been revealed that there should be a resurrection; that the resurrection which was revealed is the resurrection of the body; that the bodies which are to be raised are the same which are already dead or shall hereafter die; that this resurrection is not past, but that we which live shall hereafter attain unto it; I conceive I have declared all which is necessary by way of explication and confirmation of the truth of this article.

24.—The value of this truth, the necessity of this doctrine will appear: first, in the illustration of the glory of God, by the most lively demonstration of his wisdom, power, justice, and mercy. God first created all things for himself, and the resurrection is as it were a new creation. The wisdom and power of God are manifested in this acknowledgment, inasmuch as without infinite knowledge he could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles and individual dusts of all the bodies of all men; and without an infinite power he could not conjoin, cement, conglutinate, and incorporate them again into the same flesh. The mercy and justice of God are declared by the same profession: the mercy, in promising life after that death which we had so justly deserved; the justice, in performing that promise unto all true believers, and in punishing the disobedient with everlasting flames. When ye see this, saith the prophet, your hearts shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb; and the hand of the Lord shall be known towards his servants, and his indignation towards his enemies.\(^7\)

25.—Secondly, it is necessary to profess the belief of the resurrection of the body, that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerful work of our redemption, confessing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have obtained another life had not the Saviour of the world abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.\(^8\) If Christ were not the life, the dead could never live: if he were not the resurrection they could never rise. Were it not for him

\(^{1}\) John vi. 39.  
\(^{2}\) Matt. xiii. 39.  
\(^{3}\) 1 Cor. xv. 52.  
\(^{4}\) 1 Thess. iv. 16.  
\(^{5}\) John v. 28.  
\(^{6}\) Acts viii. 31  
\(^{7}\) 1 and 1 Thes. i. 14.  
\(^{8}\) 2 Tim. i. 10.
that liveth and was dead and is alive for evermore; had not he the keys of hell and of death, we could never break through the bars of death, or pass the gates of hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our last enemy to be destroyed is death: that the prophecy may be fulfilled, Death is swallowed up in victory, and we may cry out with the apostle, Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

26.—Thirdly, the belief of this article is necessary to strengthen us against the fear of our own death, and immoderate sorrow for the death of others. The sentence of death passed upon us for our sins cannot but affright and amaze us, except we look upon the suspension, relaxation, or revocation of it in the resurrection; but when we are assured of a life after death, and such a life as no death shall follow it, we may lay down our fears arising from corrupted nature, upon the comforts proceeding from our faith. The departure of our friends might overwhelm us with grief, if they were lost for ever; but the apostle will not have us ignorant concerning those which are asleep, that we sorrow not even as others which have no hope.

27.—Fourthly, the belief of the resurrection hath a necessary reflection upon this life by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from sin, as encouraging to holiness, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the judgment-seat, and give an account, and suffer for ever the punishment due unto it? What pleasure can entice him, what inclination can betray him, for a momentary satisfaction to incur an eternal rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory hereafter, except it here become the temple of the Holy Ghost? Saint Paul, who had delivered the doctrine, hath taught us by his own example what work is expected to be wrought upon our souls by it. I have hope, saith he, towards God that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. This is the proper work of a true belief and a full persuasion of a resurrection; and he which is really possessed with this hope cannot choose but purify himself; always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as he knoweth that his labour is not in vain in the Lord. This encourageth all drooping spirits, this sustaineth all fainting hearts, this sweeteneth all present miseries, this lighteneth all heavy burdens, this encourageth in all dangers, this supporteth in all calamities.
ART. XII.

And the Life Everlasting.

1. THIS last article, though not to be found in all, yet was expressed in many, ancient Creeds: in some by way of addition, and the life everlasting; in others by way of conjunction

1 Not in all; for divers ended with that of the resurrection, as appeareth by Ruffinus; who not only expounded the Aquileian Creed, but collated it with the Greek and Roman, and yet makes no mention of this Article, but concludes with that of the resurrection: “Sed et ultimus iste sermo qui resurrectionem carnis pronuntiat, summam totius perfectionis succincta brevitate conclusit.”—Expos. in Symbol. And whereas he shows the custom of the Aquileian church to make a cross upon their forehead at the naming of hujus carnis, he tells us elsewhere in his Apology against St. Jerome, that it was to conclude the Creed: “Quo sibipect frontem, ut mos est, in fine symboli signaculo contingentes, et ope carnis hujus, videlicet quam contingimus, resurrectionem patentes, omnes venenate adversum nostrum linguae calumniand aditum praestramus.” In the same manner St. Jerome, his contemporary: “In symbolo fidel et spei nostre, quod, ab Apostolis traditum, non scribatur in charta et agramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalius, post confessionem Trinitatis et unitatem ecclesiae, omne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione conclusit.”—Epist. 61. So St. Chrysostom: Μετά τὴν ἀπαγελίαν τῶν μυστικῶν ῥημάτων ἑκείνων καὶ φοβερῶν, καὶ τῶν φρικτῶν κανόνων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατενέχεσσιν δογμάτων, καὶ τούτῳ πρὸς τῷ τέλει προστίθημεν, ὅταν μελλόμενοι βαπτίσθην, κελεύουσιν λέγειν ὅτι πιστεύω εἰς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ έπί τῇ πίστει ταύτῃ βαπτιζόμεθα: μετά γὰρ τὸ ὁμολογήσαν τούτῳ μετά τῶν ἄλλων, τότε καθελεύεσα τῆς τὴν πηγὴν τῶν οἰενων νυματῶν ἑκείνων.—Homil. 40 in 1 ad Corinthis, p. 514. So Maximus Taurinensis after those words, carnis resurrectionem, adds, Hie religiosis nostris finis, hac summa credendi est. And Venantius Fortunatus after the same words, Summa professionis conclusit. And in the ms. set forth by the bishop of Armagh, σάρκις ἀνάστασιν καὶ carnis resurrectionem, are the last words

2 As Petrus Chrysologus expressly: Τὸς carnis vital untern; quia post resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est, nec mala. rum. Signate vos.”—Serm. 60. And again
with the former, the resurrection of the body unto everlasting life. Upon this connexion with the former will follow the true interpretation of this concluding article; for thereby we are persuaded to look upon it as containing the state of man after the resurrection in the world to come.

2. — As therefore St. Paul hath taught us to express our belief of a resurrection both of the just and the unjust, so after the resurrection we are to consider the condition of the both of the one as risen to everlasting life, of the other as risen to everlasting punishment and contempt, and so those who first acknowledged this article did interpret it. Although therefore life everlasting, as it is used in the scriptures, belongeth to the just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise than as a reward promised and given to them who fear and serve the Lord, yet the same words may be used to express the duration of any persons which live never to die again, whatsoever their state and condition in itself shall be. For as the resurrection of the dead is taken in the scriptures for the happy and eternal condition which followeth after it, as when the apostle saith, If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead; 3 which he must needs be most certain to attain unto,
who believed the resurrection of the just and unjust, and therefore if he had spoken of the resurrection in general, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expression, if by any means, nor that which went before, the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, for without them he should certainly rise from the dead; but he meant that resurrection which followeth upon the being made conformable unto his death, which is a resurrection in conformity to the resurrection of Christ. As, I say, the resurrection of the dead is taken in the scripture for everlasting happiness, and yet the same language is and may be used for the general resurrection of all men, even of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy; so the life everlasting,¹ though used for a reward given only unto the elect, may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the reprobate also, understood barely for the duration of persons living.

All those, then, who shall rise from the dead shall rise to life, and after the resurrection live by a true vital union of their souls unto their bodies: and because that union shall never cease; because the parts united shall never be dissolved; because it is appointed for men once to die,² and after their reviviscency never to die again, it followeth that the life which they shall live must be an everlasting life.

3.—To begin, then, with the resurrection to condemnation: the truth included in this article in reference unto that is to this effect, that those who die in their sins and shall be raised to life, that they may appear before the judgment-seat of Christ and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergo the punishment due unto their sins; in which two particulars are contained, the duration of their persons, and of their pains. For two ways this eternity may be denied: one, by a destruction or annihilation of their persons, with which the tortments must likewise cease; the other, by a suspension or relaxation of the punishment, and a preservation of the persons, never to suffer the same pains again. Both of which are repugnant to the clear revelations of the justice of God against the disobedience of man.

4.—Our first assertion therefore is, that the wicked after the day of judgment shall not be consumed or annihilated, but shall remain alive in soul and body to endure the tortments to be inflicted

—Ruffin, Orig. in Psalm. i. [Heb. ix. 27.]
upon them by the justice of God for all the sins committed by them while they were in the body. They who of late oppose the eternal subsistence and misery of the wicked, strangely maintain their opinion not as a position to be proved by reason, as some of the heathens did, 1 but as a truth delivered in the scriptures; as if the word itself taught nothing but an annihilation of the enemies of God, and no lasting torment; as if all the threats and menaces of the justice and wrath of God were nothing else but what the scoffing atheist expects, that is, after death never to be again; or if they be, as it were in a moment to lose that being for ever. Because the scripture speaks of them as of such as shall be destroyed, and perish, and die, therefore they will give that comfort to them here, that though their life in which they sin be short, yet the time in which they are to be tormented for their sins shall be shorter far. They tell us where the scripture mentioneth destruction in hell, it speaks of perdition, but no torment there. In this sense will they understand those words of Christ (so full of terror in the true, so full of comfort to the wicked, in their exposition), Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. 2 If this place speak, as those men would have it, of perdition only, not of cruciation, then will it follow that God is not able to cruciate and torment a man in hell; for there can be no other reason why it must be spoken of perdition only excluding cruciation, but because he is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, and perish, to be lost, and dead, who is rejected, separated, and disjoined from God the better and the nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still subsist, and be what in his own nature he was before, and live the life which doth consist in the vital union of his soul and body, and so subsisting undergo the wrath of God for ever. Nor shall any language, phrases, or expressions give any comfort to the wicked or strength to this opinion, if the same scriptures, which say the wicked shall be destroyed, and perish, and die, say also that they shall be tormented with never-dying pains, as they plainly and frequently do.

Depart from me ye cursed, shall the Judge eternal say to all the reprobate, into everlasting fire; 3 and lest any should imagine that

---


2 "Locus Matthaei, cap. x. 28, perditionem tantum ablata in gehenna, non cruciadam, denounced."—Smalcus Cont. Mei. ner. "Igni aeterno siti Christi hostes,—qui quidem sunt diabolus et angeli ipsius, vel saltum quorum nomine isti quoque continetur, cum implis cruciabuntur, et ita delabuntur."—Crefiles, Comment. in 1 Cor. xxvii. 24. Matt. x. 28.

3 "Quibuscumque enim dixerit Dominus, Disciple a me, maledicti, in ignem perpetuum, isti erunt semper damniati: et quibuscumque dixerit, Venite, benedicite Patris mei, [percipite hereditatem regni quod preparatum est vobis in sepulchrum.] hi sem-

---
the fire shall be eternal, but the torments not, it followeth, and these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. Now, if the fire be everlasting by which God punisheth the reprobates; if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting; then must the reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punishment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. Now the life eternal may as well be affirmed to have an end, as the everlasting punishment because they are both delivered in the same expression.2

Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the devil and his angels is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question only can be what that eternity doth signify. For, because some things are called in the scriptures eternal which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of hell to be in that sense eternal, as lasting to the time appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the fire is termed eternal, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, presupposing from all determinations. The end of the burning of fire is by extinguishing, and that which cannot be extinguished can never end: but such is the fire which shall torment the reprobate; for he, whose "fan is in his hand, shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire;" and hath taught us before, that it is better to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; and hath farther yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition and undeniable description of the place of torments, Where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.4 And that we may be yet farther assured


4 "Quid illum thesaurum ignis aeterni aeternam, quum fumariola quaedam ejus tales damnumur? Ictus suscinit, ut proxime urbes aut jam nulla extant, aut idem sibi de die sperent? Dissillunt superbissimi mones ignis intrinsecus freta; et, quod nobis judicii perpetuitatem probat, cum dissilliant, cum devorentur, nunquam tamen finimur." — TERTULL. De Pass. moral. cap. 12. Matt. xviii. 8; Mark ix. 43-46.
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that this fire shall be never extinguished, we read that the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, and that those which are cast into the lake of fire and brimstone shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever; which expression of day and night is the same with that which declareth the eternal happiness in the heavens, where They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy; where they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple. If, then, the fire in which the reprobates are to be tormented be everlasting; if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be quenched; if so certainly never to be quenched, that the smoke thereof shall ascend for ever and ever; if those which are cast into it shall be tormented for ever and ever (all which the scriptures expressly teach), then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated, but shall subsist for ever and be co-eternal to the tormenting flames. And so this language of the scriptures proves not only an effect eternal, as annihilation may be conceived, but an eternal efficient never ceasing to produce the same effect, which cannot be annihilation, but cruciation only. And therefore the fire which consumed Sodom and Gomorrah bears no proportion with the flames of hell; because all men know that fire is extinguished, nor doth the smoke thereof ascend for ever and ever.

Neither doth this only prove the eternity of infernal pains, but clearly refute the only material argument brought against it, which is laid upon this ground, that the wicked after the resurrection shall be punished with death, and that a second death; and so they shall be no more, nor can in any sense be said to live or subsist. For, the enduring of this fire is that very death, and they are therefore said to die the second death because they endure eternal torments. He that overcometh shall not be hurt by the second death: it seems that they which shall die that death shall be hurt by it; whereas if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it would be no way hurtful or injurious, but highly beneficial to them. But the living torments are the second death: for death and hell were cast into the lake of fire, that is the second death. Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire, this is the second death. The Jews before our Saviour's time believed there was a second death, and though it were not expressed in the oracles themselves which were committed to them, yet in the received exposition of them it was often mentioned, and that as the punishment of the wicked in the life to come; and

1 Rev. xiv. 11.
2 Εἰς αἰῶνα, δὲ αἰώνων αὐτῶν ἀναβαίνων λέγεται, οὐ τίνι μάθωμεν ἀπελεύθητον εἶναι τὴν κόλασιν τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν, οὐτε τίνι τῶν δικαίων τρυφήν αἰώνον.—Andreas Cæsar.
3 Rev. iv. 8; vii. 15
4 Rev. ii. 11.
5 Rev. xx. 10.
6 The Chaldee Paraphrase maketh often mention of it; as Deut. xxxiii. 6, "Let
what this punishment shall be was in these words revealed to St John. But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable and murderers and whoremongers and sorcerers and idolators, and all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. Now if the part in the lake be the second death; if that part be a perpetual peremption in torment, as before is proved; then to say that the wicked shall die the second death is not a confutation of their eternal being in misery, but an assertion of it, because it is the same thing with everlasting torments, but delivered in other terms.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or infer a conclusion of torment, much less will the bare phrases of perdition and destruction; for we may as well conclude that whoever says he is undone, intends thereby that he shall be no more: beside, the eternity of destruction in the language of the scripture signifies a perpetual peremption and duration in misery. For when Christ shall come to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, they shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. Wherefore I conclude that the wicked shall rise to everlasting punishment, continuing both in soul and body under the wrath of God and the torments proceeding from it, never to be quitted of them by annihilation; which is our first assertion, against the covert doctrine of the Socinian.

Reuben live and not die,” he expoundeth thus: "Let Reuben live in life of the world, and not die the second death." So the Targum of Onkelos. The Jerusalem Targum more expressly: "Let Reuben live in life of the world, and not die the second death, which the wicked die in the world to come." So Isai. xxii. 14: "Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die;" and, ixv. 6: "I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom." And, at Psalms xliii. 4. Alius Alius alio luminis eminentia, quod non solus aciam laudem, sed etiam celebritate visibilibus, "I will not give them an end in (this) life, but will recompense them with vengeance for their sins, and deliver their bodies to the second death." From these and the like places it appeareth, that the Jews believed that the wicked after death should be delivered to a second death; that this death should be in the world to come; that they should by this death be punished for their sins. And St. John revealed that this punishment shall be by everlasting burnings. "Quod ais ea in Disputatione mea cum Puclo, tum de Christianorum resurrectione, tum de morte impiorum passim contineri, quae a multis sine magno offensione, tum nostris, tum alienis, legi non possint; scio equidem ista ibi contineri, sed, meo judicio nec passim, nec in sua parte (cavi enim instud quantum potuit) ut quisquam vir plus facile offendi possit; adeo ut, quod nominatim att-
The second assertion teacheth us, that as the reprobates shall never fail to endure the torments due unto their sins, so the justice of God will never fail to inflict those torments for their sins. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing, they shall never come to the days of refreshment who are cast into perpetual burnings. One part of their misery is the horror of despair, and it were not perfect hell if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance. If there be now such a vast distance between the tormenting flames and Abraham’s bosom, that none could pass from one to the other, what impossibility must there be when the final sentence is passed upon all! As certainly as no person once received into the heavenly mansions shall ever be cast into outer darkness, so certainly none which is once cast into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels shall ever enter into their master’s joy. As the tree falleth so it lieth: there is no change to be wrought in man within those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of Christ no man shall ever enter into heaven, and when he hath delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, then shall the office of the mediator cease.

5.—So groundless was the opinion of Origen, who conceived that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments and made partakers of the joys of heaven, or at least try their fortunes in such regions of the world as he conceived should be reserved for their habitation. For he may as well imagine that Christ shall be born and die again (who being risen dieth not), as that any person being condemned to the flames for contemning of his death should ever come to live again, and by believing in the death of Christ, to be after saved. For certainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation is irreversible, their torments inevitable, their miseries eternal. As they shall not be taken from their punishment by annihilation of themselves, which is our first; so the punishment shall not be taken off them by any compassion upon them, which is our second assertion.

net ad impiorum mortem, in quo dogmate majus est multo offendisnis periculum, ea potius ex his colligi possit, quas ibi disputantur, quam expressa literis consignata extet; adeo ut lector, qui aliquil sententiam meam adversus Puccium de mortalitate primit hominis, quae toto libro agitatur, quaque, ob non paucos quos habet fautores, parum aut nihil offensiois parere potest, probandum censeat, prius censeat doctrinam istam sibi jam persuasam esse, quam suaderi animadvertat." Against this, Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, in his defence of Gregory Nyssen, showed from the words of Christ, the apostles, prophets, and the fathers, φαρ περ αιωνων την των δικαιων ανεκαληση την απολουσην, οου ταυ την των αμαρτωλων ατελευτησεν θεοι και ανυποτατων κολασας— Нотт Biblioth. cod. 233.
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To conclude this branch of the article, I conceive these certain and infallible doctrines in Christianity:—That the wicked after this life shall be punished for their sins, so that in their punishment there shall be a demonstration of the justice of God revealed against all unrighteousness of men. That to this end they shall be raised again to life, and shall be judged and condemned by Christ, and delivered up under the curse to be tormented with the devil and his angels. That the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins, as a recompense of their demerits, so that no man shall suffer more than he hath deserved. That they shall be tormented with a pain of loss, the loss from God, from whose presence they are cast out; the pain from themselves, in a despair of enjoying him, and regret for losing him. That they farther shall be tormented with the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire. That their persons shall continue for ever in this remediless condition, under an everlasting pain of loss, because there is no hope of heaven; under an eternal pain of sense, because there is no means to appease the wrath of God which abideth on them. Thus the Athanasian Creed, They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

6.—The next relation of this article to the former is in reference to the resurrection of the just; and then the life everlasting is not to be taken in a vulgar and ordinary sense, but raised to the constant language of the scriptures, in which it signifieth all which God hath promised, which Christ hath purchased, and with which man shall be rewarded in the world to come. 1

Now this life eternal may be looked upon under three considerations; as initial, as partial, and as perfectional. I call that eternal life initial, which is obtained in this life, and is as it were an earnest of that which is to follow; of which our Saviour spake, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. 2 I call that partial, which belongeth, though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is, the soul of the just separated from

---

1 "Eam quippe vitam aeternam dicitus, ubi est sine fine felicitas. Nam si anima in poenis vivit aeternis, quibus et ipsi spiritus cruciabantur inmundi, moris illa potius aeterna dicenda est, quam vita. Nulla quippe major et peior est moris, quam ubi non moritur moris."—S. AUGUSTINUS, De Civitate Dei, lib. vi. cap. 12. "Quia vita aeterna, ab his qui familiaritatem non habent, cum scripturis sanctis, potest accipiri etiam malorum vita; vel, secundum quosdam etiam philosophos, propter animae immortalitatem; vel etiam, secundum fidem nostram, propter pomas interminabiles impiorum, qui utique in aeternum cruciari non poterunt, nisi etiam vixerint in aeternum; profecto finis civitatis Iuhus, in quo summum habebit bonum, vel paz in vita aeterna, vel vita aeterna in paz dicendus est, ut facilius ab omnibus positi intelligi."—Ibid. lib. xix. cap. 11.

2 John v 21.
the body. I dispute not whether the joys be partial as to the soul, I am sure they are but partial as to the man. For that life consisteth in the happiness which is conferred on the soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the presence of God. St. Paul had a desire to depart and to be with Christ; he was willing rather to travel and be absent from the body, and to be present and at home with the Lord: and certainly where St. Paul desired to be when he departed, there he then was, and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them which ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is, with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happiness which the saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day is the partial life eternal. Thirdly, I call that perfectional which shall be conferred upon the elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ, Come ye blessed children of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.

This eternal life is to be considered in the possession and in the duration: in the first, as it is life; in the second, as it is eternal. Now this life is not only natural, that is, the union of the soul to the body, which is the life of the reprobate; but spiritual, which consisteth in the union of the soul to God, as our Saviour speaks, He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life. And it is called after an especial manner life, because of the happiness which attendeth it; and therefore to understand that

1 Phil. i. 23. 2 Cor. v. 8. 2 Matt. xxv. 34. 4 "Dum vita sunt, una corporis, altera animae: scut vita corporis anima, sic vita animae Deus: quo modo si anima deserat, moritur corpus; sic anima moritur, si deserat Deus." — S. August. Enarr. in Psalmum lixv. Serm. 2. 1 John v. 12. 5 For "life" is taken for happiness, and "to live" for being happy. As among the Greeks and Latins corpore and anima were taken for living a cheerful and a merry life; as—

"Vivamus, mea Lesbia." —

In Catullus, Carm. v. 1; and in Martial:—

"Sera nimirum vita est crasshina; vive hodie." —

Lib. i. Epigr. 16; and as it is in an old inscription, AMICI, DUM VIVIMUS VIVAMUS, and in the convivial wish, Zopreias, mentioned by Dio in the Life of Commodus: so in the language of the scriptures, and a religious notion, they signify an happy and a blessed life: as, 1 Sam. x. 24, ניל יתי "Let the king live," is translated by the Chaldee paraphrast, פ"ת מילול "Let the king prosper." And when David sent unto Nabai, he said, "Thus shall ye say to him that liveth in prosperity;"

which is in the original nothing but ית. (1 Sam. xxv. 6.) So the Psalmist is to be understood, Psalm cxix. 32: "The humble shall see this and be glad, and your heart shall live that seek God." And St. Paul, 1 Thess. iii. 8: "Ori non coram Deo, faci inerno vivere. Thus "life" of itself is often taken in the scriptures for a happy and glorious life, even that which is eternal, as St. Augustin observeth upon these words of Psalm cxix. 77, Veniant mihi miserations tuae, et vivam: "Tunc enim vive vivam, quando nihil potero timere ne moriar. Ipsa enim et sine ullo additamento dicitur vita, nec intelligitur nisi aeterna et beata, tanquam sola dicenda sit vita, in cujus comparatione ista quam ducimus mortem potius sit appellanda quam vita; quaie illud est in evangelio, Si vis ventire ad vitam, serva mandata. Nuncquid addidit, aternam, vel beata? Item de resurrectione carnis cum loqueretur. Qui bene fecerunt, inquit, in resurrectionem vitam; neque hic alt, aterna, seu beata. Sic et hic, Veniant, inquit, misera miserations tuae, et vivam; neque hic alt, aternum, vivam, vel, beata vivam; quasi aternum non sit vivere, quam sine ullo fine et sine ullo miseria vivere." Thus St. Austin. And again: "Non est vera vita, nisi ut feliciter vivitur; nec vera incorruptio, nisi ut
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life is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happiness doth consist.

To begin with that which is most intelligible: the bodies of the saints after the resurrection shall be transformed into spiritual and incorruptible bodies. The flesh is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption; sown in dishonour, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power; sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body. This perfective alteration shall be made by the Son of God, who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. Thus when we come into that other world, the world of spirits, even our bodies shall be spiritual.

As for the better part of man, the soul, it shall be highly exalted to the utmost perfection in all the parts or faculties thereof. The understanding shall be raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now we know but in part, but then shall we know even as also we are known. And this even now we know, that when God shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. Our first temptation was, that we should be like unto God in knowledge, and by that we fell; but being raised by Christ we come to be truly like him, by knowing him as we are known, and by seeing him as he is. Our wills shall be perfected with absolute and indefectible holiness, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin. They shall be troubled with no doubtful choice, but with their radical and fundamental freedom shall fully embrace the greatest good. Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation, and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction; and all this shall be effected that we may be thereby made capable and then happy by a full fruition.

To this internal perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, consisting in an absolute freedom from all pain, misery, labour, and want; an impossibility of sinning and offending God;
on an hereditary possession of all good, with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it, and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God: this is the life.

And now the duration of this life is as necessary as the life itself, because to make all already mentioned amount unto a true felicity, there must be added an absolute security of the enjoyment, void of all fear of losing it or being deprived of it. And this is added, to complete our happiness, by the adjection of eternity. Now that this life shall be eternal we are assured who have not yet obtained it, and they much more who do enjoy it. He which hath purchased it for us and promised it unto us, often calleth it eternal life; it is described as a continuing city, as everlasting habitations, as an house eternal in the heavens; it is expressed by eternal glory, eternal salvation; by an eternal inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away; by the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And lest we should be discouraged by any short or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in such terms as are liable to no mistake. For our Saviour hath said, If any man keep my saying he shall never see death. And, whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall not die. When God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes there shall be no more death; and where there is life and no death, there must be everlasting life. Which is expressed by St. Paul by way of opposition, calling it life and immortality, and that together with the abolition of death, saying that our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.

7.—The belief of this article is necessary (as to the eternity of torment) to deter us from committing sin, and to quicken us to holiness of life and a speedy repentance for sin committed. For, the wages of sin is death; nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin, no sin but that which is unrepented of; nothing can save that man from the never-dying worm who dieth in his sins; and no other reason can bring him thither, but because he sinned and repented not. They which imagine the pains inflicted for sin to be either small or short, have but a slender motive to innocence or repentance; but such as firmly believe them sharp and endless have by virtue of that faith within themselves a proper and natural spur and incitement to avoid them: for who can dwell with everlasting burnings?

1 Heb. xiii. 14. 2 Cor. v. 1. 3 Luke xvi. 9. 4 1 Peter v. 10. 5 Heb. v. 9; ix. 15. 6 1 Peter i. 4. 7 2 Peter i. 11. 8 John viii. 51; xi. 26. 9 2 Tim. i. 10. 10 Rom. vi. 23. 11 Tertullian, recounting the advantages of the Christians towards innocence and holiness of life, which the Heathens had not: “Recogitate etiam pro brevitate supplicii
8.—Secondly, the belief of eternal pains after death is necessary
to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God, a jealous God, a
consuming fire, a God that will not be mocked; and to teach us
to tremble at his word, to consider the infinity of his justice and
the fierceness of his wrath, to meditate on the power of his
menaces, the validity of his threats, to follow that direction, to
embrace that reduplicated advice of our Saviour, I will forewarn
you whom ye shall fear; fear him which, after he hath killed,
hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.¹ And
that exclusively of such fear as concerns the greatest pains of
this life, which the martyrs undervalued out of a belief of eternal
torments.²

9.—Thirdly, this belief is necessary to teach us to make a fit
estimate of the price of Christ’s blood, to value sufficiently the
work of our redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of
God to us in Christ. For he which believeth not the eternity of
torments to come, can never sufficiently value that ransom by
which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankful
to his Redeemer by whose intervention we have escaped them.
Whereas he who is sensible of the loss of heaven and the ever-
lasting privation of the presence of God, of the torments of fire,
the company of the devil and his angels, the vials of the wrath of
an angry and never to be appeased God, and hopeth to escape all
these by virtue of the death of his Redeemer, cannot but highly
value the price of that blood, and be proportionably thankful for
so plenteous a redemption.³

10.—Again, as this article followeth upon the resurrection of
the just, and containeth in it an eternal duration of infinite felicity
belonging to them, it is necessary to stir us up to an earnest desire
of the kingdom of heaven and that righteousness to which such a
life is promised, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, said
Moses, when he saw the burning bush;⁴ It is good for us to be here,
said St. Peter, when he saw our Saviour transfigured in the Mount;⁵
how much more ought we to be inflamed with a desire of the joys
of heaven, and that length of days which only satisfieth by its

cujuslibet, non tamen ultra mortem remans-
suri. Sic et Epicurus omnem cruciatum
doloremque deprecat, medium quidem
contemptibilem pronunciando, magnum vero
non diuturnum. Enimvero nos qui sub Deo
omnia Speculatoris dispensamur, quique
eternam ab eo penam providemus, merito
soil innocentia occurrimit, et pro scientia
plentudine, et pro latebrarum difficultate, et
pro magnitudine cruciatum, non diuturni,
verum sempiterni, eum timentes, quem
timore debeat et ipse qui timentes judi-
cat, Deum, non proconsulem, timentes.—
Apolog. cap. 45.

³ So Polycarp the martyr answered the proconsul threatening to consume him with
fire: Πορ ἀπελείας το πρὸς ὅραν καὶ ὁμνή, 
καὶ με ἅλαγον σβενιμένοι. Αγνοεῖς γὰρ
τὸ τῆς μελλόντος κρίσεως καὶ αἰώνιου καλο-
sow τον διαθεμένον ποιήσας.—Epist.
y Smyrn. Eccles. cap. 11.
⁴ Psalm cxxx. ⁵ Exod. iil. 3.
⁵ Matt. xvii. 4.
eternity; to a careful and constant performance of those commands to which such a reward is so graciously promised! For as all our happiness proceedeth from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holiness no man shall see him.

11.—Secondly, this belief is necessary to take off our inclinations and desires from the pleasures and profits of this life; to breed in us a contempt of the world, and to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven; to set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth, considering we are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God. For where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also. Therefore we must forget those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, press toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

12.—Thirdly, an assent unto this truth is necessary to encourage us to take up the cross of Christ, and to support us under it, willingly and cheerfully to undergo the afflictions and tribulations of this life, reckoning with the apostle, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us: and knowing that our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory: and this knowledge is not to be obtained, this comfort is not to be expected, except we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.

13.—And now having thus showed the propriety, proved the verity, and declared the necessity of this article, we may fully instruct every Christian how to express his belief in the last object of his faith, which he may most fitly thus pronounce: I do fully and freely assent unto this as unto a most necessary and infallible truth, that the unjust after their resurrection and condemnation shall be tormented for their sins in hell, and shall so be continued in torments for ever, so as neither the justice of God shall ever cease to inflict them, nor the persons of the wicked cease to subsist

---

1 So St. Austin upon those words, Longitudine diemum replebo eum, in Psalm xci.:
2 Quae est longitudo diemum? Vita aeterna. Fratres, nolite putare longitudinem diemum dici, sicut sunt hyeme dies minores, astate dies majores. Tales dies nobis habet dare?
5 Phil. iii. 13, 14. Rom. viii. 18.
6 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.
and suffer them; and that the just after their resurrection and absolution shall as the blessed of the Father obtain the inheritance, and as the servants of God enter into their master's joy, freed from all possibility of death, sin and sorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fulness of happiness, confirmed in an absolute security of an eternal enjoyment, and so they shall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe the life everlasting.
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<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>135, 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv 1, 2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv 6</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv 18</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii 13</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi 22</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii 1</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii 6</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv 9</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlix 1, 2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlix 5</td>
<td>204, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlix 11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl 7</td>
<td>153, 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi 5</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlx 3</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li 10</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvii 11</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxii 1</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxii 9</td>
<td>350, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxii 2</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvii 18</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxix 21</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxx 12</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxi 19</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxii 11</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxiii 2</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxvi 1, 2</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxvii 4</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxviii 5</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxviii 18</td>
<td>226, 227, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxix 3</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxxx 5</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xc 2</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xcl 3</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xclii 4</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xciv 9, 10</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xciv 5</td>
<td>67, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cii 13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv 3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cl 1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>70, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvi 16</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cx 1</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139, 234, 237, 421, 422, 426, 432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxv 3</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236, 236, 334, 392, 420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvpv 3</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxix 66</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxi 2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxix 3</td>
<td>248, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxix 7</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxxi 11, 12</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxxi 12</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxvii 6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxxi 15</td>
<td>230, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxli 1</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxlv 10, 11</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxv 5, 6</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxvii 19</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxvii 2-5</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxvi 13</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cxxli 1</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Proverbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>152, 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70, 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72, 211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Ecclesiastes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>452, 457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Song of Solomon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>131, 283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Isaiah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>1, 3, 9</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>2, 6, 3</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 151, 203, 233, 476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi</td>
<td>1, 2, 10</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>129, 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xili</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxii</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv</td>
<td>4, 10</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xli</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xliii</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlv</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>66, 82, 183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 21, 22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>105, 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlix</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap.</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lviii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxv</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75, 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEREMIAH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>229, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvii</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMENTATIONS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>410, 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICAH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxviii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZEKIEL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiv</td>
<td>7, 8, 10</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxvii</td>
<td>22, 25</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlviii</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxviii</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxviii</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSEA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxviii</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>431, 586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEREMIAH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxviii</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvii</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>431, 586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOEL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxviii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxviii</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>431, 586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105, 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxvii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105, 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.ACCABEES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 M.MACABEES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110, 132, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110, 132, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>133,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>112,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>202,267</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>132,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lii</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>455,522,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>164,165,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>48,121,156</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23, 24</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>41, 45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24, 25</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>377,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>322,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18, 25</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>326,362,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29, 30</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xli</td>
<td>6, 8</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>132,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31, 32</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>336,379,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Index of Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>122, 123, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xli</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>107, 233, 362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlv</td>
<td>3, 8</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300, 304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41, 167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>263, 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>403, 404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44, 45</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>339, 341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>273, 339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>198, 423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUKE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap.</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 9, 15, 25, 46</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 21, 22</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 57</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>147, 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>261, 262, 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>111, 255, 256, 274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 33</td>
<td>151, 234, 429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 51, 147, 154, 157, 165, 256, 489, 489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>256, 437, 565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>274, 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67, 69</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>12, 427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76, 77</td>
<td>556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>133, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>263, 274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JOHN.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap.</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51, 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>77, 185, 479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>120, 430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>48, 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>257, 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16, 203, 215, 251, 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 16</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13, 115, 148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49, 50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>399, 531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 21</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16, 294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Index of Texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>xix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 10</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>134, 148</td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35, 36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>37, 33</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>350, 392, 413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>316, 317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>122, 122, 476</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>497, 553</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>394, 573</td>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>262, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>170, 208</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39, 43, 44</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>333, 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39, 40</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>339, 340</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 19</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>54, 106</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66, 430</td>
<td>2, 18, 20, 25</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>36-38, 40, 41</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 23, 27</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>467, 555</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>53, 54, 135, 209</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>17, 47, 214, 413, 414</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td>235, 452, 579</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>19, 26</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 29</td>
<td>579, 685</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>173, 418</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>3, 28</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8, 39</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>25, 27</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 46, 47</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45, 46, 47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>203, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17, 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14, 472, 488, 489, 491, 497</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>489, 491, 497</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 51</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53, 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>170, 241</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>11, 198, 447, 451</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>59, 58, 240</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>122, 332</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>183, 416</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>22, 164</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>474, 488, 489, 491, 493</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>7, 8, 13, 14, 472</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 31</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>14, 474, 497, 529</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>3, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>53, 56, 209</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>474, 476, 488</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>208, 493</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13, 196</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13, 196</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>266, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>208, 493</td>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 41</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>25-27, 30, 31</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, 42</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>25, 34</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 20, 23, 24, 25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30, 31</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>8, 14</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>117, 18</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>30, 31</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>20, 21, 23</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 36</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note:* The table is a partial listing of the Index of Texts, covering various chapters and verses, with corresponding pages. Each entry is a combination of numerical and literal data, indicating specific references within the text. The structure is consistent, with chapters (III, IV, etc.) and verses (1, 2, 3, etc.) paired with page numbers (339, 42, 499, etc.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii 33</td>
<td>5055</td>
<td>33, 41, 42</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>33, 32, 33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>141, 406, 511</td>
<td>33, 166, 396, 408</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>558, 561</td>
<td>ii 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44, 45</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115, 568</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>611, 530</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>520, 505</td>
<td>iiii 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>240, 430</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>233, 556</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150, 201</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 4</td>
<td>114, 112, 230, 530</td>
<td>24, 27</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27, 23</td>
<td>286, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>230, 329</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>117, 118, 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115, 389</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v 3, 4</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>141, 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>320, 329</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>617, 561, 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi 1, 7</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>11, 13</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii 5</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>18, 19</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii 1</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>5, 35</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15, 512</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44, 45</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43, 46</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56, 56</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>38, 37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii 5</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 1, 6, 10, 11, 15</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>17, 27, 31, 42, 225</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 20, 21</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>141, 513</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td>472, 473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>205, 233, 239</td>
<td>33, 230</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>420, 399</td>
<td>40, 41, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>458, 580</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43, 50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi 16, 21</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>16, 24</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii 12</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>183, 513</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii 1</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>472, 473</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROMANS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>206, 247, 279</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>106, 289, 408</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 R
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17, 18</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40, 41, 60, 63,</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69, 103</td>
<td></td>
<td>69, 102, 226</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>iiv</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6, 8, 14</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>236, 334, 455, 463, 576</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>457, 584</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>375, 457, 569,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>505</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>200, 513</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>580, 584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>18, 22</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18, 19</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>226, 232</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>2, 8, 11-13, 22</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>233, 504</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>269, 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>xii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>233, 504</td>
<td></td>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>262, 263</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>505, 537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>472, 473</td>
<td></td>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>597</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 23, 24</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>513, 514</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>324, 582</td>
<td></td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>262, 263</td>
<td></td>
<td>8, 23</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11, 12</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>230, 237, 594</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48, 206, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24, 25</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td>xii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>237, 426, 432</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78, 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1 CORINTHIANS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap.</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200, 514, 521, 537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>143, 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>231, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>226, 240, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18, 477, 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11, 12</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>480, 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>278, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>499, 537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15, 19</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17, 19</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td>210, 345, 505, 555, 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160, 221, 486, 555, 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>10, 12</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22, 25</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>116, 221, 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27, 195, 220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GALATIANS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap.</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>202, 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>319, 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>127, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>190, 305, 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>218, 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>47, 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>491, 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2 CORINTHIANS.**
Index of Texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap. Verse</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v 6</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi 14</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 1</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>63, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>116, 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>37, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>151, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>236, 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>418, 434, 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23, 43, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4, 489, 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 10, 21</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 1, 5 17</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>518, 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>228, 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27, 40, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>579, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 11, 13</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>171, 348, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v 30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>149, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 19</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 25, 27, 29, 32</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 2, 14</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>491, 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>395, 596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 1</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>137, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>123, 198, 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 19, 24, 29</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 1, 20</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>114, 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>345, 410, 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 1, 2, 10</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 1</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>116, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>77, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>157, 186, 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>121, 553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 9</td>
<td>13, 30, 135, 198, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 19</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>240, 334, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 1-4</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 1</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 9</td>
<td>54, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 8</td>
<td>234, 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 1, 15, 17</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>448, 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 2, 12</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 1</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii 1</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>121, 209, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lii 6</td>
<td>116, 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 15</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.v</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>334, 385, 431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chap.</td>
<td>Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 JOHN.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap.</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Page.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57, 553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43, 158, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6, 8</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7, 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>204, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>529, 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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GENERAL INDEX.

A.

Absolution of the church, heresy to deny it, 559.
Adam, how many generations we are probably removed from him, 98.
Adon or Adonai, meaning of this name of God, 234.
Adoption, what it is, 42—Christ not the Son of God by adoption, 218.
Adoration. See Worship.
Ailius, 480, n.
Ainsworth's Literal Translation of the Pentateuch, quoted, 357.
Akoran, it teacheth that God hath no Son, 211.
Almighty, the notion of it, 65, 71—three degrees of God's almighty power, 66—how some extend the word "almighty," 72—a distinction between the first and second "Almighty," in the Creed, 72, 436—why God the Father only is called "Almighty" in the Creed, 441, 442—necessity of believing in God as Almighty, 70, 442, 443.
"Alpha and Omega," applied to the Son as well as to the Father, 193.
Ammonius, 88, n.
Anabaptists of Flanders, their heresy, 250.
Angels, the third heaven their proper habitation, 78—created, 79.
Anointing, the use and design of it, 126—the anointings under the law typified that of Christ, 145—the Jews' anointing oil was hid in the days of Josiah, 153—Christ was anointed with the Holy Ghost, 154—this proved to be a proper and sufficient unction, 156—where see the general reasons for anointing.
Anomoeans, 480, n.
Antidicomarianite, 269, n.
Apelles, Apellita, 415, n.
Arb, peculiar meaning of the preposition, 29, n.
Apollinaris, Apollinarions, 290, 364—367; 249, 263, 364, 366, n.
Apostles, the simplicity of their teaching proof of their divine mission, 144.
Arius, Arians, 203, 290, 480; 208, 249, 290, 364, 430, n.
Aristotle, his maxim, that "out of nothing, nothing can be produced," refuted, 84.
Appasew, this word explained, 602, n.
Article, Greek, use or omission of the, with respect of the titles of God, 197, 202, et seq.
Articles, number of, in the Creed, 1.
Ascension, that Christ ascended not into heaven till after his resurrection, proved, 163—his ascension typified by the high priest's entering into the holy of holies, 412—necessity of believing in Christ's ascension, 417—the effects of it, 419.

Ascent, what it is, 2—difference of the manner of ascent in different kinds of believers, 8, 7.
Augustin, St., his wish, 17.
Authority of testimony, wherein it consisteth, 5.

B.

Baptism, available for the remission of sins before it, 553. See Faith.
Belief, general notion of it, 2—of the hea.
Blessed, an epithet, attributed by the Jews to the supreme God, applied by St. Paul to Christ, 206.
Blessing. See Priest.
Body. See Resurrection.
Bosorus, 269, n.
Bosom of Abraham, the meaning of this expression, 379.
Brethren of our Lord, not the sons of his mother, 272.
Buddas, 100, n.
Burial, not allowed by the Roman law to persons crucified, 336—reasons of our Saviour's burial, with the manner of it, 368, 367—necessity of believing in the burial of our Saviour, 339—grounds for decent burial of all Christians, 344.
Burning of bodies, practice of, discontinued on the spread of Christianity, 344. See Dead.

C.

Caligula, 34.
Call, "to call," "to be called," the meaning of these expressions in the scriptures, 83.
Calvin, his explication of Christ's descent into hell, 354.
Catechising before Easter, very ancient, and the reason of it, 21.
Catholic, the general meaning of the word, and the particular sense of it, when applied to the church, 524.
Cerdon, 100, 248, 235, n.
Chaldeans, their forged accounts of time, 92, 93.
Chalde Paraphrase. See Word of God.
Charity, motive to it, 544.
Christ, the signification of that name, 121—the Jews expected Christ, and upon what grounds, 127—the time of his coming ascertained, 129—to what end Christ was anointed,
for what offices, and in what manner, 145, et seq—that Christ had a real existence in heaven, before he was born of the Virgin, proved, 163—Christ the true God, 203, 204—how he is born in us, 261—Christ's prophetic office, 147, 331—his priestly office, 149, 332—his kingly office, 151 334—the Son of David, 273—the Son of God, 164—he is to be worshipped, 221.

Christians, the origin and import of that name, 161, 162.

πατρινος, the original meaning of this word among the Greeks, 124, n.

Church, derivation of this word, 509—what it is in the language of the New Testament, 510—the author's definition of it, 512-518—why called "holy," 521—in what persons this holiness is really inherent, 521—wherein its catholicism consists, 526—necessity of believing in the holy catholic church, 523.

Clergy, constantly repeated the Creed to the people, 20-22.

Clouds, how this word was expounded by the Jews, 447.

Former name, what it was, 403, n.

Communication of the Divine Essence from the Father to the Son, 208—from the Father and the Son to the Holy Ghost, 490—difference of the manner in which the Divine Essence is communicated from the Father to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, 219, 220.

Communion of saints, with God and angels, 533-540—with one another, 540—of saints on earth with saints departed, 542—how saints communicate with hypocrites, 540—necessity of believing the communion of saints, 543-545—to communicate with sinners in that which is no sin, is lawful, 541.

Conception. See Virgin.

Confession of the mouth, 19—necessity of it, 19—practice of it useful, 19, 20—every one obliged to it, 22.

Conscience, twofold, 443—bears witness to a future judgment, 449—to the being of a God, 33.

Contradiction, how an action may imply it, 439.

Covenant, nature of it, a, 561.

Creation, the oldest poets and philosophers taught it, 79—some in after-ages denied it upon weak arguments, which are there set down, 80—creation defined, 81—two different modes of creation, 87—why attributed to the Father, 101—what uses may be drawn from the doctrine of the creation, 102—two ways by which heretics elude the force of those scriptures which ascribe the creation to Christ, 178.

Creation, the production out of nothing, 82.

Creature, God cannot receive any real benefit from it, 70—every creature is good, 99—a new creature, and a new creation, what, 179, 180.

Credible, Credibility, what it is, 3.

Cred, whence so called, 1—a threefold signification of it, 1—recess at baptism, and at the administration of the Lord's supper, 20-22—we believe what it contains no other

D.

David, a type of Christ in being twice: anointed, 154—Christ himself so-called, 237, 423—was descended from him, 279—throne of David, how continued for evermore, 428.

Days of Christ's death, how made out to be three, 379-402.

Dead, the Jews never burnt the bodies of their dead, 333, n.—the Romans and Greeks did, 344—why they left this custom off, 344.

Death, what it is, 326—opinions of the ancient philosophers concerning it, 326, n.—death of Christ necessary for more ends than one, 331—how Christ destroys the power of death, 431.

Deipara, the Virgin Mary styled, 275.

Deity, the true notion of, 27.

Deluge, the universal confirmation of, 95.

Descent into hell, this Article not always in the Creed, 346—understood by some of Christ's burial only, 348—three scriptures of greatest validity to prove Christ's real descent into hell, 350-352—various opinions respecting it, 353, et seq.—the most received and reasonable notion of it, 361—the end and design of it, with various opinions concerning it, 366, et seq.

Devotion, a proper motive to it, 444.

Divinity of Christ, proved, 137-208—the identity of it with that of the Father, 191, et seq.—he has it, not of himself, but by communication from the Father, 268-211—Divinity of Christ suffered not, 238-299—"How then can we say that God suffered?" answered, 291.

Doceto, what their heresy was, 248, 255, n.

Donatists, their error, 523, 524.

Durandus, his explication of Christ's descent into hell, 353.

E.

Earth the foundation, and heaven the roof, of the temple of God, 77.

Eclipses, not to be depended on in chronological calculations, 93.

Egyptians, their forged accounts of time, 92—they said the sun had twice risen in the west, 93.

Ἐκκλησία, the meaning of this word, 508, n.

Εἰπανδαύς, 218, 346, 533, n.

Emmanuel, how that prophecy, "They shall call his name Emmanuel," was fulfilled in Christ, 112, 202.
Enemies of Christ, description of the, 429—
destruction of the, 430.
Epiphanes, 248, n.
Eternity, of God, proved, 29, 77—of hell-
torment, 239-593—Origen's error about
them, 594—of the universe, considered, 79,
88, 87—of matter, opinion of, refuted, 83, 84.
Eudoxius, 489, n.
Eunomius, 249, 283, 480, n.
Eutyches, bishop of Antioch, the author of
the name of "Christians," 162, n.
Eutyches, Eutychians, 251, 252, 365, n.
Evident to sense, what is so, 3—to the under-
standing, what is so, 4.

F.

Faith, the object of it, 3, 9—difference be-
tween, and science, 3—difference between,
and opinion, 4—human faith, what it is, 6
—divine faith, what it is, 7—how to come
to the right notion of faith, 9—nature and
definition of apostolic faith, 14—another
definition of Christian faith, 17—what pro-
cession of faith was required at baptism,
49—faith, that is, alliance in God, the
 grounds of it, 442—the act of faith must be
applied to the object, according to the
nature of it, 519.

Father, the Heathens worshipped God as
such, 40—why God is so called, 49—neces-
sity of believing in God as our Father, 44,
64—it is a reason for our imitation of God,
47—why Christ says your, but never our,
Father, 49—God is called "Father" in the
Creed, with respect chiefly to Christ, 49
—how many ways he is the Father of Christ,
51—"Father" denotes priority, and how,
53, 490—difference which the ancients made
between the person of the Father, and that
of the Son, 60—proper notion of the Father,
62—why in the Creed the creation of the
world is peculiarly attributed to the Father,
101, 162—how the fathers are to be under-
stood, when they seem to speak of the
Father as the cause of his own existence,
61, 62, n. See God.

Felix, 218, n.
First-born, Jewish law respecting the, 270.

Flesh, resurrection of the, expression used in
the ancient Creeds, 562.

Footstool, how the enemies of Christ, the Jews
and the Romans, were made his footstool,
429.

Forgiveness of sins, a motive to the love of
God and Christ, 553—necessity of believing
the forgiveness of sins, 560-562. See Re-
mission.

G.

Géne, the meaning of this word, 88, n.

Generation, diverse significations of, 40, 41
— proper notion of, 212, 213—of the Son of
God, 210, et seq.

Gentiles, distinction between, and Jews, was
to cease at the coming of Christ, 140—mirac-
culous conversion of the, by the preaching
of the apostles, 141.

Ghost, Holy, why not the Son of God, 219—
why not the Father of Christ, 258—his
operation in the incarnation of Christ, 258,
479—his personality proved, 470—and Scoli-
onian objections refuted, 472-476—his Divi-
ity proved, 476-479—his operations, 447—
how he is distinguished from the Father
and the Son, 488—proved to proceed from
the Father and the Son, 490—the Greek
and Latin churches reconciled about this
procession, 492—the occasion of the dis-
ference about this, which ended in a schism,
493-495—Holy Ghost, why called "Holy,"
496-503—his offices, 496-503—necessity of
believing in the Holy Ghost, 503-5.

Glaucias, 312, n.

Gnostics, 264, n.

God, his knowledge, wisdom, justice, holiness,
7, 8—how God's omnipotence consists with
his holiness and truth, 9—name of God
understood wherever belief is ex-
pressed, 23, 21—notion and name of God,
27—his existence, 27, 32—how known to
us, 23, 31—God proved to have no begin-
ing, 31, 32—no nation without its God, 32
—all creatures depend on God, 33—a two-
fold necessity to believe a God, 31, 35—
unity of God proved, 35—its nature, 36
—a twofold necessity to believe this unity,
35—God our Father by creation, 40—by
conservation, 42—by redemption, 42—by
regeneration, 42—by resurrection, 43—by
adoption, 43, 44—his infinity, 67—God con-
sidered as the Agent in creation, 87.

"God," taken absolutely, how to be under-
stood, 62—often of Christ, 197.

"Gmonds," men sometimes so called in the
scriptures, and why, 27—notion of two
gods, one good, the other evil, confused, 99.

Goodness of God, infinite, how it consists
with it to defer the creation so long as
he did, 88—two distinct notions of good-
ness, 90.

Gospel, its miraculous success, 140, 141.

Guilt, what it is, 548.

H.

Hades. See Hell.

Happiness, of God, not to be augmented or
diminished by the creatures 89—eternal,
wherein it consists, 596-598.

Heathen, began every action in the name of
God, 21—the most ancient of the Heathen
believed the world to have been made, 79—
their opinions of the duration of the world,
80-88.

Heaven and earth, in what latitude taken
77—three heavens, and how different its
 glory, 78—Christ ascended into the highest
heaven, 415, 416.

Hebrew language, no single word in it which
signifies "the world," 76.

Hell, how Christ descended into it, 353, et
seq.—why he could not suffer the pains of
it, 36—"hell" sometimes put for the
grave, 356—Calvin's explication of Christ's descent into hell, 354—what the ancients understood by it, 363-372—the opinion of bishop Bilson and others concerning what Christ did in hell, 379-380—how Christ destroys the powers of hell, 431.
Heliandus, Heliandiani, 269, 272, 273, n.
Herclemon, Herclemoniter, 100, 248, n.
Heretics who taught there were two Gods, one the author of good, the other of evil, 99.
Hermian, 417, 584, n.
Hermogenes, 246, n.
High priests, under the law, anointed, 145—termed "the anointed," 145.
Holiness, what it denotes, when applied to persons or things, 553-558—motives to holiness, 543-546.
Holy. See Ghost, Church, Saints.
Holy of Holies, was to the Jews an emblem of the highest heavens, 412, n.
Homoiousians, 480, n.
Hope, the grounds of it, 19, 409, 465, 505.
Humility, a motive to it, 103, 104.

I.
IXΩYS, a title given to our Saviour, 164, n.
Idolatry, more prevalent in the world than atheism, 35—what it is, 222.
Impossible, what may be so to God, without derogation of power, 439, 440.
Incarnation of the Son of God, 24", 256, 290, 291.
Inferna, various translations of this term, 317, 318.
Intercession, of Christ for us at God's right hand, 435—of the Holy Ghost, 499.
Issac, a type of Christ, 308, 324.
Isidorus, 248, n.

J.
Jehovah, a name attributed to Christ, 226-235.
Jeremiah, a spurious passage attributed to him, 371.
Jesus, a name commonly used by the Jews, 108—the derivation and interpretation of it, 108, 109—Jesus proved to be the Christ, 131-133—was of the family of David, 131, 132, 278, 279—place and manner of his birth, 132, 133—predicted to be born of a virgin, 265.
Jonah, a type of Christ, 387.
Joseph, a type of Christ dying, rising again, and sitting at the right hand of God, 388, 420.
Joshua, a type of Christ, 117-121.
Jasonianus, 269, n.
Judgment of the world, proved from reason and scripture, 448-452—believed by the Heathen, 450—in it Christ shall preside as Judge, with the reasons for it, 462-463—an account of the process in the day of judgment, 456—necessity of believing a future judgment, 463-466.

K.
Kingdom of Christ, two fold, 235, 434—kingdom of Christ as man, eternal, and in what respect, 236, 237—"Whose kingdom shall have no end," why inserted in the Nicene Creed, 433, n.
Kingly power of Christ, the benefits of it to us, 151, 152, 431, 432.
Kings and high priests, were appointed under the law, 145.
Kyprios, the use of this word among the ancient Greeks, 225-226, n—the original meaning of it, 228, 229, n.

L.
Law of God, the reason and extent of it, 550.
Life, in the Creator originally, in the creature derivatively, 54—what it is, 326—"everlasting," taken in the Creed for the endless duration of all men, 587, 588—for the endless duration of the wicked, 589-593—"eternal life," the full importance of it, 598-599.
Life, taken for happiness, and to live, to be happy, by the ancients, 596, 597, n.
Light, Christ so called from the perspicuity of his doctrine, 134.
Lithus Patrum, whether Christ delivered souls out of that place, 376.
Lord, determinately used for Christ in the New Testament, 22—but sometimes used for men both in the Old and New Testament, 225—how the Greek and Hebrew words for "Lord" correspond, 226—that Christ is "Lord," as that word is the interpretation of the name "Jehovah," proved, 229-231—"Lord," applied to Christ as the interpretation of the name "Adon," or "Adonai," 234—how and in what respect Christ is Lord, 235-238—how many ways he hath a right to be our Lord, 238-240—necessity of believing in Christ as Lord, 240-243.
Lucanus, 248, n.
Aupor, the meaning of this word, 554, n.

M.
Macedonius, Macedonians, their heresy, 480 481; 480, 494, n.
Mahometans, have corrupted a passage in the Psalms relating to Christ, 211—keep their sabbath on Friday, the sixth day of the week, and why, 408.
Manes, an account of him, 100, n.
Manes, the word signifies "an heretic" in the Syriac, 100, n.
Manichæus, Manichæans, 100, 210, 248, 285, n.
Marcion, 100, 248.
Marcus, Markocians, 248, 285.
Mary, various opinions of the ancient fathers about the meaning of this name, 262, 263, n.—several women of that name mentioned in the Gospel, 273. See Virgin.
Matter, the opinion of the eternity of it, refuted, 89-90.
Mediatorship of Christ, when and why it shall cease, 432, 433.

Mocander, 248, n.

Messias. See Christ. A word of the same signification with “Christ,” 124-126—expectation of the, among the Jews, 125—promised, 125—the Jews make a double Messias, 136, 232-285, 445—all the Jews formerly believed that the Messias should be the Son of God, though since Christ they have denied it, 164—that the Messias should suffer, proved from prophecies, 231-233—suffer death, 323, 324—rise again, 387, 388—ascend into heaven, 412—come a second time, 445-447.

Ministry, what sanctification necessary for the work of it, 502, 505.

Miracles, the use of them, 14, 443—they prove the being of God, 33—of Christ, comparison of, with those recorded in the Old Testament, 134, 135—power of working, conferred on the apostles, 135.

Moses, upon what grounds he, and the prophets, and the apostles, received and propagated the faith, 10-14—credibility of, 15—endued with the power of working miracles, 15—how short Moses came of Christ in his miracles, 134.

Montanus, 500, n.

N.

Nail, struck through a bond, cancelled it, 321.

Nature, of no creature is originally evil, 101—divine nature indivisible, 210—it suffered not in Christ, 289, 290, 296—distinction of natures in Christ asserted, 249, 250—they cannot be commixed or transubstantiated, 250—necessity of two natures in one person of Christ, 293.

Nazarens, 259, n.

Nestorius, Nestorians, 253; 254, 275, 276, 305, n.

Nestor, 247, 489, n.

"None good but one," explained, 87.

"Nothing can be produced out of nothing," how far true, 84, 85

Novatian heresy, 560; 524, 560, n.

O.

Obedience, our obligation of, to Christ, 240, 241.

Oil, why used in anointing, 156.

Omnipotence, the notion of it explained, 436.

Only-begotten, distinguishing feature of Christ's Sonship, 167, et seq.—true notion of the term, 215, 216—applied particularly to Christ, 217-220.

Ophiants, Ophites, 229, 248, n.

Opinion, what it is, 4.

Origen, his erroneous opinion of the eternity of the world, 97—his error about hells, 594.

Origensae, their error, 582.

Napokrapórop, meaning of the word, 66, n.

Paraclete, explained, 499; 499, n.

Harapakwv, the meaning of it, 403, n.

Passion of Christ, why the Jews gave a false account of the time of it, 304.

Patience, the proper foundation of it in a Christian, 45.

Patrurians, 245; 245, 247.

Paulus Samosataenus, 244, 453, n.

Pelagians, their heresy, 498—renewed by the Socinians, 498, n.

Pliamasiaier, the same with Doceta, 248, 250, n.

Philidas, 23.

Philosophers, what they taught about the existence of the world, 75-81, 88, 89

Philostratus, Philistines, 186; 138, n.

Pilate, Pontius, a man of a rough, untractable spirit, 303—his testimony to the death of Christ, 304—necessity of expressing in the Creed that our Saviour "suffered under Pontius Pilate," 304.

Hieris, this word sometimes taken for the Creed, 21.

Plato, his distinction between the name of "God," and of "Gods," 36.

Power, the object, nature, and extent of God's power, 67, 68, 90, 438—on what accounts the belief of it is necessary, 70—Christ had not all power till after his resurrection, 296.

Prazicex, 246, 489, n.

Pre-existence of Christ asserted and proved, 163-173.

Preparation, day of, explained, 403, 404.

Priests, their peculiar office to bless, 149—why under the law they blessed the people at the morning, but not at the evening, sacrifice, 150.

Priority of the Father before the Son, 49—terms of priority given him by the ancients, 60.

Priscillianus, 246, n.

Prposable, what is so, 4.

Procurator, the nature of his office, and the extraordinary power of the procurator of Judea, 301, 302.

Psapoporos, its several meanings, 418, n.

Properties, communication of, in the person of Christ, 290, 291.

Prophecy, a proof of a Divine Being, 33.

Prophet. See Christ.

Prophets, their faith and testimony, 10-13.

Q.

Quick, what is meant by that word in the Creed, 458-461—the quick, that is, those that are alive in the day of judgment, shall not be dissolved by death, 460-463.

R.

Rationalism summorum, 525, n.

Reconciliation between God and man, 554-555—to be reconciled to God, meaning of the phrase, 553.
Second death, the, described, 592, 593.
Secundus, 248, 326, 327, n.
Seleucian, 417, 584, n.
Shaddai, the notion and importance of that word, 71.
Sheaf, waved, a type of Christ rising from the dead, 397.
Simon Magnus, 218, 285, n.
Sin, what it is, 547, 548—the obligation of sin, what it is, 544-550—sin and Satan, how Christ destroys their power, 431.
Sitting at the right hand of God, explained, 424—the notion of sitting in the Creed, 426—necessity of believing in Christ sitting at the right hand of God, 434, 435.
Son of God, congruity of his mission argued from the pre-eminence of the Father, 55—"Only-begotten Son," interpreted by ancient heretics, "begotten of the Father only;" by Socinians, "most beloved of the Father," 213, 214—creation ascribed to him, 176, 177.
Son of man, Christ the, what power was given unto him by the Father, 238-238.
Sonship, the several degrees of it, 47-48—the peculiarity of the Sonship of Christ, 164—necessity of the belief of it, 220-224.
Soul of Christ, human, with the affections and passions, 248, 249—it descended to the mansions of departed souls, 363.
Soul of man, hath no innate ideas, 28—"soul," sometimes used to signify the dead body, 356, 357.
Spirit. See Ghost.
Sufferings of Christ, how ancient prophecies were fulfilled in them, 138, 139—that the Messias was to suffer, proved, 281-283—the measure and manner of the sufferings of Christ were pre-determined between the Father and him, 233, 286—description of the sufferings of Christ, 283-286—necessity of believing that our Saviour suffered, 296-297—why Christ could not suffer the pains of hell, 354-356.
T.
Tabernacle, the Jews believed that it signified this world, 412.
Temple of Jerusalem, the inferiority of the second to the first, 130, 131.
Terebinthus, 100, n.
Tessarades, 306, n.
Testimony, two sorts of it, and what makes it valid, 5—testimony of God, the nature of it, 9, 10.
Three days of Christ's sepulture, explained 399-402.
Transubstantiation, the primitive church ignorant of this doctrine, 252.
Trinity, the order of it may not be inverted, 57, 489, 490—difference between the Persons in it, 61, 62, 489, 490.
Trust in God, the grounds of it, 443.
Types of the sufferings of Christ, 225, 226—of

Sabbath, reasons for changing it from the seventh to the first day, 406-408.
Sabbath, the, explained, 408-409.
Sacrifice, under the Jewish dispensation, typical of the sufferings of Christ, 286—and of his great atonement, 557.
Saints, who they are, and how a man may become one, 533-538.
Sanctification, the work of the Holy Ghost, 497-503.
Sapoo, this term explained, 92, 93, n.
Saturminus, 248, 286, n.
Saviour, an appellation given to the Hebrew gods and men, 114—reasons at large why Christ is peculiarly called so, 114-121.
Science, Scientific, what it is, 4.
Scriptures, why written, 15, 16.
Scoethus, the first author of the Manichcean heresy, 100, n.
Second coming of Christ. See Messias.

Remission of sins, explained, 551, 552—how propounded and conferred in the church, 556-560.
Repentance, a motive to it, 464—the necessity of it, 559.
Resurrection, the definition of it, 390, 391—of Christ, 268, 358, 390, 396—typified in Joseph and Jesus in Jonas, 397—confirmed by human and divine testimony, 391, 392—not less than omnipotence can effect it, 393—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost raised Christ from the dead, 394-396—distance between the death and resurrection of Christ, how necessary, 395—necessity of believing the resurrection of Christ, 408-410—of the "body," the term not in the ancient Creeds, 562—the possibility of our resurrection, 563-568—the probability of it upon natural and moral grounds, 568-571—the certainty of it upon Christian principles demonstrated, 571-576—identity of the body necessarily supposed, 577-582—latitude of the resurrection, 582-584—necessity of believing the resurrection, 585, 586. See Flesh.
Relation, of two kinds, mediate and immediate, 10.
Right hand of God, what it signifies, 424; 425, n.
Roman governor, had the power of life and death in Judea sixty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, 302, 303.
Rufinus, his explanation of Christ's descent into hell, 358, n.

8.

S

9.

T
General Index.

His crucifixion, 307-309. See also Sacrifices, Son of God.

U.

Union of the two natures of Christ, not dissolved by death, 329-331—of Christ with the church, by the Holy Ghost, 500, 501, 541.

Unity, in the Godhead, the ground of it, 63—of the church, wherein it consists, 514-519.

Universe, the notion and extent of it, 73—divided by the Jews into three worlds, 76—philosophers thought it infinite, eternal, God himself, 79—the philosophers probably learned the doctrine of the eternity of the universe from the Christians, 88, n.

V.


Virgin, two prophecies that Christ should be born of a virgin, cleared, 285-287—miraculous conception of Jesus Christ by the Virgin Mary, 254-256, 274—proofs that Mary was a Virgin when she conceived, when she brought forth, and ever after, and objections answered, 267-274—the Virgin styled Deipara, and "the mother of God," 275—what honour is due to her, 277—necessity of believing that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, 276-279

W.

"Way, the," Christianity so called in the scriptures, 161, n.

Will of God absolutely free, 37, 89—God created by willing the creation, 90—seat of the two wills in Christ, 248.

Word of God, the Chaldee Paraphrase constantly teaches that the Word of God is the same with God, and that by that Word all things were made, 183—the Word was with God, how, 184—the Word was God, 187.

World. See Universe. The manner how the world was made, 81, 82. See Creation. No instant assignable before which God could not have made the world, 91—arguments to prove that the world is no older than the scriptures represent it to be, 94-97.

Worship and adoration, due to God, 35—paid to Christ by all creatures, 221.

Z.

Zaranes, 100, n.

THE END.
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— COMTE'S Philosophy of the Sciences, being an Exposition of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— COXE'S Memoirs of the Duke of Marlborough. With his original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— History of the House of Austria (1218-1792). With a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* An Atlas of the plans of Marlborough's campaigns, 4to. 10s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— History of the House of Austria (1218-1792). With a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAIK’S (G.L.) Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties. Illustrated by Anecdotes and Memoirs. Revised edition, with numerous Woodcut Portraits and Plates. 5s.</td>
<td>DEFOE’S Novels and Miscellaneous Works. With Prefaces and Notes, including those attributed to Sir W. Scott. 7 vols. 3s. 6d. each.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNNINGHAM’S Lives of the Most Eminent British Painters. A New Edition, with Notes and Sixteen fresh Lives. By Mrs. Heaton. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.</td>
<td>DEMMIN’S History of Arms and Armour, from the Earliest Period. By Auguste Demmin. Translated by C. C. Black, M.A. With nearly 2000 Illustrations. 7s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANTE. Divine Comedy. Translated by the Rev. H. F. Cary, M.A. 3s. 6d.</td>
<td>DEMOSTHENES’ Orations. Translated by C. Rann Kennedy. 5 vols. Vol. I., 3s. 6d.; Vols. II.—V., 5s. each.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Translated into English Verse by I. C. Wright, M.A. 3rd Edition, revised. With Portrait, and 34 Illustrations on Steel, after Flaxman.</td>
<td>DE STAËL’S Corinne or Italy. By Madame de Staël. Translated by Emily Baldwin and Paulina Driver. 3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANTE. The Inferno. A Literal Prose Translation, with the Text of the Original printed on the same page. By John A. Carlyle, M.D. 5s.</td>
<td>DEVEY’S Logic, or the Science of Inference. A Popular Manual. By J. Devey. 5s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— The Purgatorio. A Literal Prose Translation, with the Text printed on the same page. By W. S. Dugdale. 5s.</td>
<td>DICTIONARY of Latin and Greek Quotations; including Proverbs, Maxims, Mottoes, Law Terms and Phrases. With all the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantities marked, and English Translations. With Index Verborum (622 pages). 5s.


**DIDRON'S** Christian Iconography: a History of Christian Art in the Middle Ages. Translated by E. J. Millington and completed by Margaret Stokes. With 240 Illustrations. 2 vols. 5s. each.

**DIOGENES LAERTIUS.** Lives and Opinions of the Ancient Philosophers. Translated by Prof. C. D. Yonge, M.A. 5s.

**DOBREE'S** Adversaria. Edited by the late Prof. Wagner. 2 vols. 5s. each.


**DRAPER'S** History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. By John William Draper, M.D., LL.D. 2 vols. 5s. each.


**DYER (Dr. T. H.)**. Pompeii: its Buildings and Antiquities. By T. H. Dyer, LL.D. With nearly 300 Wood Engravings, a large Map, and a Plan of the Forum. 7s. 6d.

—— The City of Rome: its History and Monuments. With Illustrations. 5s.

**DYER (T. F. T.)**. British Popular Customs, Present and Past. An Account of the various Games and Customs associated with Different Days of the Year in the British Isles, arranged according to the Calendar. By the Rev. T. F. Thiselton Dyer, M.A. 5s.

**EBERS'** Egyptian Princess. An Historical Novel. By George Ebers. Translated by E. S. Buchheim. 3s. 6d.

**EDGEWORTH'S** Stories for Children. With 8 Illustrations by L. Speed. 3s. 6d.

**ELZE'S** William Shakespeare. —See SHAKESPEARE.

**EMERSON'S** Works. 5 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

I.—Essays and Representative Men.


III.—Society and Solitude—Letters and Social Aims—Addresses.

VI.—Miscellaneous Pieces.

V.—Poems.

**ENNEMOSER'S** History of Magic. Translated by William Howitt. 2 vols. 5s. each.

**EURIPIDES.** A New Literal Translation in Prose. By E P. Coleridge, M.A. 2 vols. 5s. each.
EUTROPIUS.—See Justin.

EUSEBIUS PAMPYILUS, Ecclesiastical History of. Translated by Rev. C. F. Cruse, M.A. 5s.

EVELYN’S Diary and Correspondence. Edited from the Original MSS. by W. Bray, F.A.S. With 45 engravings. 4 vols. 5s. each.


FIELDING’S Adventures of Joseph Andrews and his Friend Mr. Abraham Adams. With Cruikshank’s Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

— History of Tom Jones, a Foundling. With Cruikshank’s Illustrations. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Amelia. With Cruikshank’s Illustrations. 5s.

FLAXMAN’S Lectures on Sculpture. By John Flaxman, R.A. With Portrait and 53 Plates. 6s.

FOSTER’S (John) Life and Correspondence. Edited by J. E. Ryland. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Critical Essays. Edited by J. E. Ryland. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Essays: on Decision of Character; on a Man’s writing Memoirs of Himself; on the epithet Romantic; on the aversion of Men of Taste to Evangelical Religion. 3s. 6d.

— Essays on the Evils of Popular Ignorance; to which is added, a Discourse on the Propagation of Christianity in India. 3s. 6d.

FOSTER’S Essays on the Improvement of Time. With Notes of Sermons and other Pieces. 3s. 6d.

GASPARY’S History of Italian Literature. Translated by Herman Oelsner, M.A., Ph.D. Vol. I. 3s. 6d.

GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH, Chronicles of.—See Old English Chronicles.


GILDAS, Chronicles of.—See Old English Chronicles.

GIBBON’S Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Complete and Unabridged, with Variorum Notes. Edited by an English Churchman. With 2 Maps and Portrait. 7 vols. 3s. 6d. each.


GIL BLAS, The Adventures of. Translated from the French of Lesage by Smollett. With 24 Engravings on Steel, after Smirke, and 10 Etchings by George Cruikshank. 6s.


GOETHE’S Faust. Part I. German Text with Hayward’s Prose Translation and Notes. Revised by C. A. Buchheim, Ph.D. 5s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOETHE'S Works. Translated into English by various hands. 14 vols. 3s. 6d. each.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. and II.—Autobiography and Annals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.—Faust. Two Parts, complete. (Swanwick.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.—Novels and Tales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.—Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.—Conversations with Eckermann and Soret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.—Dramatic Works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.—Wilhelm Meister's Travels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.—Tour in Italy, and Second Residence in Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.—Miscellaneous Travels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.—Early and Miscellaneous Letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.—Reineke Fox, West-Eastern Divan and Achilleid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMONT'S Memoirs of the Court of Charles II. Edited by Sir Walter Scott. Together with the BOSCOBEL TRACTS, including two not before published, &amp;c. New Edition. 5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY'S Letters. Including the Correspondence of Gray and Mason. Edited by the Rev. D. C. Tovey, M.A. Vols. I. and II. 3s. 6d. each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEK ANTHOLOGY. Translated by George Burges, M.A. 5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEK ROMANCES of Heliodorus, Longus, and Achilles Tatius—viz., The Adventures of Theagenes &amp; Chariclea; Amours of Daphnis and Chloe; and Loves of Clitopho and Leucippe. Translated by Rev. R. Smith, M.A. 5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREGORY'S Letters on the Evidences, Doctrines, &amp; Duties of the Christian Religion. By Dr. Olinthus Gregory. 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENE, MARLOWE, and BEN JONSON. Poems of. Edited by Robert Bell. 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIMM'S TALES. With the Notes of the Original. Translated by Mrs. A. Hunt. With Introduction by Andrew Lang, M.A. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMER GRETHER; or, German Fairy Tales and Popular Stories. Containing 42 Fairy Tales. Trans. by Edgar Taylor. With numerous Woodcuts after George Cruikshank and Ludwig Grimm. 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSSI'S Marco Visconti. Translated by A. F. D. The Ballads rendered into English Verse by C. M. P. 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIZOT'S History of the English Revolution of 1640. From the Accession of Charles I. to his Death. Translated by William Hazlitt. 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Civilisation, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated by William Hazlitt. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL'S (Rev. Robert) Miscellaneous Works and Remains. 3s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON COURT: A Short History of the Manor and Palace. By Ernest Law, B.A. With numerous Illustrations. 5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDWICK'S History of the Articles of Religion. By the late C. Hardwick. Revised by the Rev. Francis Procter, M.A. 5s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HAUFF’S Tales. The Caravan—The Sheik of Alexandria—The Inn in the Spessart. Trans. from the German by S. Mendel. 3s. 6d.

HAWTHORNE’S Tales. 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
I.—Twice-told Tales, and the Snow Image.
II.—Scarlet Letter, and the House with the Seven Gables.
III.—Transformation [The Marble Faun], and Blithedale Romance.
IV.—Mosses from an Old Manse.

HAZLITT’S Table-talk. Essays on Men and Manners. By W. Hazlitt. 3s. 6d.
—Lectures on the Literature of the Age of Elizabeth and on Characters of Shakespeare’s Plays. 3s. 6d.
—Lectures on the English Poets, and on the English Comic Writers. 3s. 6d.
—The Plain Speaker. Opinions on Books, Men, and Things. 3s. 6d.
—Round Table. 3s. 6d.
—Sketches and Essays. 3s. 6d.
—The Spirit of the Age; or, Contemporary Portraits. Edited by W. Carew Hazlitt. 3s. 6d.
—View of the English Stage. Edited by W. Spencer Jackson. 3s. 6d.

HEATON’S Concise History of Painting. New Edition, revised by Cosmo Monkhouse. 5s.

HEGEL’S Lectures on the Philosophy of History. Translated by J. Sibree, M.A.

HEINE’S Poems, Complete. Translated by Edgar A. Bowring, C.B. 3s. 6d.
—Travel-Pictures, including the Tour in the Harz, Norderney, and Book of Ideas, together with the Romantic School. Translated by Francis Storr. A New Edition, revised throughout. With Appendices and Maps. 3s. 6d.

HELP’S Life of Christopher Columbus, the Discoverer of America. By Sir Arthur Helps, K.C.B. 3s. 6d.
—Life of Hernando Cortes, and the Conquest of Mexico. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
—Life of Pizarro. 3s. 6d.
—Life of Las Casas the Apostle of the Indies. 3s. 6d.

HENDERSON (E.) Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages, including the most famous Charters relating to England, the Empire, the Church, &c., from the 6th to the 14th Centuries. Translated from the Latin and edited by Ernest F. Henderson, A.B., A.M., Ph.D. 5s.


HENRY OF HUNTINGDON’S History of the English. Translated by T. Forester, M.A. 5s.

HENRY’S (Matthew) Exposition of the Book of the Psalms. 5s.

HELIODORUS. Theagenes and Chariclea.—See Greek Romances.

HERODOTUS. Translated by the Rev. Henry Cary, M.A. 3s. 6d.
—Notes on, Original and Selected from the best Commentators. By D. W. Turner, M.A. With Coloured Map. 5s.
—Analysis and Summary of By J. T. Wheeler. 5s.
### An Alphabetical List of Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Editor</th>
<th>Edition Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HESIOD, CALLIMACHUS, and THEOGNIS.</strong> Translated by the Rev. J. Banks</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOFFMANN'S (E. T. W.) The Serapion Brethren.</strong> Translated from the German by Lt.-Col. Alex. Ewing.</td>
<td>2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOLBEIN'S Dance of Death and Bible Cuts.</strong> Upwards of 150 Subjects, engraved in facsimile, with Introduction and Descriptions by Francis Douce and Dr. Thomas Frognall Dibden.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOMER'S Iliad.</strong> Translated into English Prose by T. A. Buckley, B.A.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>— Odyssey.</strong> Hymns, Epigrams, and Battle of the Frogs and Mice. Translated into English Prose by T. A. Buckley, B.A.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>— See also POPE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOOPER'S (G.) Waterloo: The Downfall of the First Napoleon: A History of the Campaign of 1815.</strong> By George Hooper. With Maps and Plans.</td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>— The Campaign of Sedan: The Downfall of the Second Empire, August – September, 1870.</strong> With General Map and Six Plans of Battle.</td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HORACE.</strong> A new literal Prose translation, by A. Hamilton Bryce, L.L.D.</td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUGO'S (Victor) Dramatic Works.</strong> Hernani—Ruy Blas—The King's Diversion. Translated by Mrs. Newton Crosland and F. L. Slous.</td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>— Poems, chiefly Lyrical.</strong> Translated by various Writers, now first collected by J. H. L. Williams.</td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMBOLDT'S Cosmos.</strong> Translated by E. C. Otté, B. H. Paul, and W. S. Dallas, F.L.S.</td>
<td>5 vols. 3s. 6d. each, excepting Vol. V. 5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMBOLDT'S Personal Narrative of his Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of America during the years 1799-1804.</strong> Translated by T. Ross. 3 vols.</td>
<td>5s. each.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>— Views of Nature.</strong> Translated by E. C. Otté and H. G. Bohn.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMPHREYS' Coin Collector's Manual.</strong> By H. N. Humphreys. with upwards of 140 Illustrations on Wood and Steel.</td>
<td>2 vols. 5s. each.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNGARY: its History and Revolution, together with a copious Memoir of Kossuth.</strong></td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUTCHINSON (Colonel). Memoirs of the Life of.</strong> By his Widow, Lucy: together with her Autobiography, and an Account of the Siege of Lathom House.</td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUNT'S Poetry of Science.</strong> By Richard Hunt. 3rd Edition, revised and enlarged.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INGULPH'H Chronicles of the Abbey of Croyland, with the Continuation by Peter of Blois and other Writers.</strong> Translated by H. T. Riley, M.A.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRVING'S (Washington) Complete Works.</strong> 15 vols. With Portraits, &amp;c.</td>
<td>3s. 6d. each.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. — Salmagundi, Knickerbocker's History of New York.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. — The Sketch-Book, and the Life of Oliver Goldsmith.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. — Bracebridge Hall, Abbotsford and Newstead Abbey.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. — The Alhambra, Tales of a Traveller.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. — Chronicle of the Conquest of Granada, Legends of the Conquest of Spain.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRVING'S (WASHINGTON) COMPLETE WORKS continued.

VI. & VII.—Life and Voyages of Columbus, together with the Voyages of his Companions.

VIII.—Astoria, A Tour on the Prairies.

IX.—Life of Mahomet, Lives of the Successors of Mahomet.


XI.—Biographies and Miscellaneous Papers.


JOSEPHUS (Flavius), The Works of. Whiston's Translation, revised by Rev. A. R. Shilleto, M.A. With Topographical and Geographical Notes by Colonel Sir C. W. Wilson, K.C.B. 5 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

JOYCE'S Scientific Dialogues. With numerous Woodcuts. 5s.

JUKES-BROWNE (A. J.), The Building of the British Isles: a Study in Geographical Evolution. Illustrated by numerous Maps and Woodcuts. 2nd Edition, revised, 7s. 6d.

JULIAN, the Emperor. Containing Gregory Nazianzen's Two Invectives and Libanus' Monody, with Julian's extant Theosophical Works. Translated by C. W. King, M.A. 5s.

JUNIUS'S Letters. With all the Notes of Woodfall's Edition, and important Additions. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

JUSTIN CORNELIUS NEPOS, and EUTROPIUS. Translated by the Rev. J. S. Watson, M.A. 5s.

JUVENAL, PERSIUS, Sulpicia and Lucilius. Translated by L. Evans, M.A. 5s.

KANT'S Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by J. M. D. Meiklejohn. 5s.

— Prolegomena and Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science. Translated by E. Belfort Bax. 5s.

KEIGHTLEY'S (Thomas) Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy. 4th Edition, revised by Leonard Schmitz, Ph.D., LL.D. With 12 Plates from the Antique. 5s.
An Alphabetical List of Books

KEIGHTLEY'S Fairy Mythology, illustrative of the Romance and Superstition of Various Countries. Revised Edition, with Frontispiece by Cruikshank. 5s.

LA FONTAINE'S Fables. Translated into English Verse by Elizur Wright. New Edition, with Notes by J. W. M. Gibbs. 3s. 6d.

LAMARTINE'S History of the Girondists. Translated by H. T. Ryde. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

LAMBERT'S (Charles) Essays of Elia and Eliana. Complete Edition. 3s. 6d.

LANE'S Arabian Nights' Entertainments. Edited by Stanley Lane-Poole, M.A., Litt.D. 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

LANZI'S History of Painting in Italy, from the Period of the Revival of the Fine Arts to the End of the Eighteenth Century. Translated by Thomas Roscoe. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.


LECTURES ON PAINTING, by Barry, Opie, Fuseli. Edited by R. Wornum. 5s.


LEPSIUS'S Letters from Egypt, Ethiopia, and the Peninsula of Sinaí. Translated by L. and J. B. Horner. With Maps. 5s.

LESSING'S Dramatic Works, Complete. Edited by Ernest Bell, M.A. With Memoir of Lessing by Helen Zimmern. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

LESSING'S Dramatic Notes, and the Representation of Death by the Ancients. Translated by E. C. Beasley and Helen Zimmern. Edited by Edward Bell, M.A. With a Frontispiece of the Laokoon group. 3s. 6d.

LILLY'S Introduction to Astrology. With a Grammar of Astrology and Tables for Calculating Nativities, by Zadkiel. 5s.

LIVY'S History of Rome. Translated by Dr. Spillan, C. Edmonds, and others. 4 vols. 5s. each.

LOCKE'S Philosophical Works. Edited by J. A. St. John. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

LOCKHART (J. G.)—See Burns.
LODGE’S Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain, with Biographical and Historical Memoirs. 240 Portraits engraved on Steel, with the respective Biographies unabridged. 8 vols. 5s. each.

LONGFELLOW’S PROSE Works. With 16 full-page Wood Engravings. 5s.

LOUDON’S (Mrs.) Natural History. Revised edition, by W. S. Dallas, F.L.S. With numerous Woodcut Illus. 5s.


LONGUS. Daphnis and Chloe. —See GREEK ROMANCES.

LUCAN’S Pharsalia. Translated by H. T. Riley, M.A. 5s.

LUCIAN’S Dialogues of the Gods, of the Sea Gods, and of the Dead. Translated by Howard Williams, M.A. 5s.

LUCRETIUS. Translated by the Rev. J. S. Watson, M.A. 5s.

LUTHER’S Table-Talk. Translated and Edited by William Hazlitt. 3s. 6d.

— AUTOBIOGRAPHY. —See MICHELET.

MACHIAVELLI’S History of Florence, together with the Prince, Savonarola, various Historical Tracts, and a Memoir of Machiavelli. 3s. 6d.

MALLETT’S Northern Antiquities, or an Historical Account of the Manners, Customs, Religions and Laws, Maritime Expeditions and Discoveries, Language and Literature, of the Ancient Scandinavians. Translated by Bishop Percy. Revised and Enlarged Edition, with a Translation of the PROSE EDDA, by J. A. Blackwell. 5s.

MANTELL’S (Dr.) Petrifications and their Teachings. With numerous illustrative Woodcuts. 6s.


MANZONI. The Betrothed: being a Translation of ‘I Promessi Sposi.’ By Alessandro Manzoni. With numerous Woodcuts. 5s.

MARCO POLO’S Travels; the Translation of Marsden revised by T. Wright, M.A., F.S.A. 5s.

MARRYAT’S (Capt. R.N.) Masterman Ready. With 93 Woodcuts. 3s. 6d.

— Mission; or, Scenes in Africa. Illustrated by Gilbert and Dalziel. 3s. 6d.

— Pirate and Three Cutters. With 8 Steel Engravings, from Drawings by Clarkson Stanfield, R.A. 3s. 6d.

— Privateersman. 8 Engravings on Steel. 3s. 6d.

— Settlers in Canada. 10 Engravings by Gilbert and Dalziel. 3s. 6d.

— Poor Jack. With 16 Illustrations after Clarkson Stansfield, R.A. 3s. 6d.

— Peter Simple. With 8 full-page Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

— Midshipman Easy. With 8 full page Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

MARTIAL’S Epigrams, complete. Translated into Prose, each accompanied by one or more Verse Translations selected from the Works of English Poets, and other sources. 7s. 6d.
MARTINEAUS (Harriet) History of England, from 1800-1815. 3s. 6d.
— History of the Thirty Years' Peace, A.D. 1815-46. 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
— See Comte's Positive Philosophy.

MATTHEW PARISS'S English History, from the Year 1235 to 1273. Translated by Rev. J. A. Giles, D.C.L. 3 vols. 5s. each.

MATTHEW OF WESTMINSTER'S Flowers of History, from the beginning of the World to A.D. 1307. Translated by C. D. Yonge, M.A. 2 vols. 5s. each.

MAXWELL'S Victories of Wellington and the British Armies. Frontispiece and 5 Portraits. 5s.

MENZEL'S History of Germany, from the Earliest Period to 1842. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

MICHAEL ANGELO AND RAPHAEL, their Lives and Works. By Duppa and Quatremere de Quincy. With Portraits, and Engravings on Steel. 5s.

MICHELET'S Luther's Autobiography. Trans. by William Hazlitt. With an Appendix (110 pages) of Notes. 3s. 6d.
— History of the French Revolution from its earliest indications to the flight of the King in 1791. 3s. 6d.

MIGNET'S History of the French Revolution, from 1789 to 1814. 3s. 6d.

MILL (J. S.). Early Essays by John Stuart Mill. Collected from various sources by J. W. M. Gibbs. 3s. 6d.

MILLER (Professor). History Philosophically Illustrated, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

MILTON'S Prose Works. Edited by J. A. St. John. 5 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
— Poetical Works, with a Memoir and Critical Remarks by James Montgomery, an Index to Paradise Lost, Todd's Verbal Index to all the Poems, and a Selection of Explanatory Notes by Henry G. Bohn. Illustrated with 120 Wood Engravings from Drawings by W. Harvey. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

MITFORD'S (Miss) Our Village Sketches of Rural Character and Scenery. With 2 Engravings on Steel. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

MOLIÈRE'S Dramatic Works. A new Translation in English Prose, by C. H. Wall. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.


MONTAIGNE'S Essays. Cotton's Translation, revised by W. C. Hazlitt. New Edition. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.


MORPHY'S Games of Chess. Being the Matches and best Games played by the American Champion, with Explanatory and Analytical Notes by J. Löwenthal. 5s.

| **MUDIE'S British Birds**; or, History of the Feathered Tribes of the British Islands. Revised by W. C. L. Martin. With 52 Figures of Birds and 7 Coloured Plates of Eggs. 2 vols. |
| **NEANDER (Dr. A.). History of the Christian Religion and Church.** Trans. from the German by J. Torrey. 10 vols. 3s. 6d. each. |
| **Life of Jesus Christ.** Translated by J. McClintock and C. Blumenthal. 3s. 6d. |
| **History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.** Translated by J. E. Ryland. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each. |
| **Memorials of Christian Life in the Early and Middle Ages; including Light in Dark Places.** Trans. by J. E. Ryland. 3s. 6d. |
| **NIBELUNGEN LIED. The Lay of the Nibelungs,** metrically translated from the old German text by Alice Horton, and edited by Edward Bell, M.A. 'To which is prefixed the Essay on the Nibelungen Lied by Thomas Carlyle. 5s. |
| **NEW TESTAMENT (The) in Greek.** Griesbach's Text, with various Readings at the foot of the page, and Parallel References in the margin; also a Critical Introduction and Chronological Tables. By an eminent Scholar, with a Greek and English Lexicon. 3rd Edition, revised and corrected. Two Facsimiles of Greek Manuscripts. 900 pages. 5s. The Lexicon may be had separately, price 2s. |
| **NICOLINI'S History of the Jesuits: their Origin, Progress, Doctrines, and Designs.** With 8 Portraits. 5s. |
| **NUGENT'S (Lord) Memorials of Hampden, his Party and Times.** With a Memoir of the Author, an Autograph Letter, and Portrait. 5s. |
| **OLD ENGLISH CHRONICLES,** including Ethelward's Chronicle, Asser's Life of Alfred, Geoffrey of Monmouth's British History, Gildas, Nennius, and the spurious chronicle of Richard of Cirencester. Edited by J. A. Giles, D.C.L. 5s. |
| **OMAN (J. C.) The Great Indian Epics: the Stories of the RAMAYANA and the MAHABHARATA.** By John Campbell Oman, Principal of Khalsa College, Amritsar. With Notes, Appendices, and Illustrations. 3s. 6d. |
| **ORDERICUS VITALIS' Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy.** Translated by T. Forester, M.A. To which is added the CHRONICLE OF ST. EVROULT. 4 vols. 5s. each. |
| **OVID'S Works,** complete. Literally translated into Prose. 3 vols. 5s. each. |
| **PASCAL'S Thoughts.** Translated from the Text of M. Auguste Molinier by C. Kegan Paul. 3rd Edition. 3s. 6d. |
| **PAULI'S (Dr. R.) Life of Alfred the Great.** Translated from the German. To which is appended Alfred's ANGLO-SAXON VERSION |
of Orosius. With a literal Translation interpaged, Notes, and an Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Glossary, by B. Thorpe. 5s.

Pausanius' Description of Greece. Newly translated by A. R. Shilleto, M.A. 2 vols. 5s. each.

Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. Edited by E. Walford, M.A. 5s.

Pepys' Diary and Correspondence. Deciphered by the Rev. J. Smith, M.A., from the original Shorthand MS. in the Pepysian Library. Edited by Lord Braybrooke. 4 vols. With 31 Engravings. 5s. each.


Percy.—See Juvenal.

Petrarch's Sonnets, Triumphs, and other Poems. Translated into English Verse by various Hands. With a Life of the Poet by Thomas Campbell. With Portrait and 15 Steel Engravings. 5s.

Philo Judaeus, Works of. Translated by Prof. C. D. Yonge, M.A. 4 vols. 5s. each.

Pickering's History of the Races of Man, and their Geographical Distribution. With an Analytical Synopsis of the Natural History of Man by Dr. Hall. With a Map of the World and 12 coloured Plates. 5s.

Pindar. Translated into Prose by Dawson W. Turner. To which is added the Metrical Version by Abraham Moore. 5s.


Plato's Works. Literally translated, with Introduction and Notes. 6 vols. 5s. each.


II.—The Republic, Timæus, and Critias. Translated by Henry Davis.


V.—The Laws. Translated by G. Burgess.

VI.—The Doubtful Works. Translated by G. Burgess.


Plautus's Comedies. Translated by H. T. Riley, M.A. 2 vols. 5s. each.

Pliny's Natural History. Translated by the late John Bostock, M.D., F.R.S., and H. T. Riley, M.A. 6 vols. 5s. each.


PLUTARCH'S Lives. Translated by A. Stewart, M.A., and George Long, M.A. 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Morals. Theosophical Essays. Translated by C. W. King, M.A. 5s.


POETRY OF AMERICA. Selections from One Hundred American Poets, from 1776 to 1876. By W. J. Linton. 3s. 6d.

POLITICAL CYCLOPAEDIA. A Dictionary of Political, Constitutional, Statistical, and Forensic Knowledge; forming a Work of Reference on subjects of Civil Administration, Political Economy, Finance, Commerce, Laws, and Social Relations. 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

POPE'S Poetical Works. Edited, with copious Notes, by Robert Carruthers. With numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. 5s. each.

— Homer's Iliad. Edited by the Rev. J. S. Watson, M.A. Illustrated by the entire Series of Flaxman's Designs. 5s.

— Homer's Odyssey, with the Battle of Frogs and Mice, Hymns, &c., by other translators. Edited by the Rev. J. S. Watson, M.A. With the entire Series of Flaxman's Designs. 5s.

— Life, including many of his Letters. By Robert Carruthers. With numerous Illustrations. 5s.

POUSHKIN'S Prose Tales: The Captain's Daughter—Doubrovsky — The Queen of Spades — An Amateur Peasant Girl—The Shot —The Snow Storm—The Postmaster — The Coffin Maker — Kirdjali—The Egyptian Nights—Peter the Great's Negro. Translated by T. Keane. 3s. 6d.

PRESCOTT'S Conquest of Mexico. Copyright edition, with the notes by John Foster Kirk, and an introduction by G. P. Winship. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Conquest of Peru. Copyright edition, with the notes of John Foster Kirk. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Copyright edition, with the notes of John Foster Kirk. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

PROPERTIUS. Translated by Rev. P. J. F. Gantillon, M.A., and accompanied by Poetical Versions, from various sources. 3s. 6d.

PROVERBS, Handbook of. Containing an entire Republication of Ray's Collection of English Proverbs, with his additions from Foreign Languages and a complete Alphabetical Index; in which are introduced large additions as well of Proverbs as of Sayings, Sentences, Maxims, and Phrases, collected by H. G. Bohn. 5s.

PROVERBS, A Polyglot of Foreign. Comprising French, Italian, German, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, and Danish. With English Translations & a General Index by H. G. Bohn 5s.

POTTERY AND PORCELAIN, and other Objects of Vertu. Comprising an Illustrated Catalogue of the Bernal Collection of Works of Art, with the prices at which they were sold by auction, and names of the possessors. To which are added, an Introductory Lecture on Pottery and Porcelain, and an Engraved List of all the known Marks and Monograms. By Henry G. Bohn. With numerous Wood Engravings, 5s.; or with Coloured Illustrations, 10s. 6d.

PROUT'S (Father) Reliques. Collected and arranged by Rev. F. Mahony. New issue, with 21 Etchings by D. Maclise, R.A. Nearly 600 pages. 5s.
QUINTILIAN’S Institutes of Oratory, or Education of an Orator. Translated by the Rev. J. S. Watson, M.A. 2 vols. 5s. each.

RACINE’S (Jean) Dramatic Works. A metrical English version. By R. Bruce Boswell, M.A. Oxon. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

RANKE’S History of the Popes, their Church and State, and especially of their Conflicts with Protestantism in the 16th and 17th centuries. Translated by E. Foster. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

RECREATIONS in SHOOTING. By ‘Craven.’ With 62 Engravings on Wood after Harvey, and 9 Engravings on Steel, chiefly after A. Cooper, R.A. 5s.

RENNIE’S Insect Architecture. Revised and enlarged by Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A. With 186 Woodcut Illustrations. 5s.

REYNOLD’S (Sir J.) Literary Works. Edited by H. W. Beechy. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

RICARDO on the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. Edited by E. C. K. Gonner, M.A. 5s.

RICHTER (Jean Paul Friedrich). Levana, a Treatise on Education: together with the Autobiography (a Fragment), and a short Prefatory Memoir. 3s. 6d.

— Flower, Fruit, and Thorn Pieces, or the Wedded Life, Death, and Marriage of Firmian Stanislaus Siebenkaes, Parish Advocate in the Parish of Kuhsschnapptel. Newly translated by Lt.-Col. Alex. Ewing. 3s. 6d.

ROGER DE HOVEDEN’S Annals of English History, comprising the History of England and of other Countries of Europe from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201. Translated by H. T. Riley, M.A. 2 vols. 5s. each.


ROME in the NINETEENTH CENTURY. Containing a complete Account of the Ruins of the Ancient City, the Remains of the Middle Ages, and the Monuments of Modern Times. By C. A. Eaton. With 34 Steel Engravings. 2 vols. 5s. each.

— See BURN and DYER.

ROSCOE’S (W.) Life and Pontificate of Leo X. Final edition, revised by Thomas Roscoe. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Life of Lorenzo de’ Medici, called ‘the Magnificent.’ With his poems, letters, &c. 10th Edition, revised, with Memoir of Roscoe by his Son. 3s. 6d.

RUSSIA. History of, from the earliest Period, compiled from the most authentic sources by Walter K. Kelly. With Portraits. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

SALLUST, FLORUS, and VELLÉIUS PATERCELUS. Translated by J. S. Watson, M.A. 5s.

SCHILLER’S Works. Translated by various hands. 7 vols. 3s. 6d. each:

I.—History of the Thirty Years’ War.
Schiller’s Works continued.

II.—History of the Revolt in the Netherlands, the Trials of Counts Egmont and Horn, the Siege of Antwerp, and the Disturbances in France preceding the Reign of Henry IV.

III.—Don Carlos, Mary Stuart, Maid of Orleans, Bride of Messina, together with the Use of the Chorus in Tragedy (a short Essay). These Dramas are all translated into metre.

IV.—Robbers (with Schiller’s original Preface), Fiesco, Love and Intrigue, Demetrius, Ghost Seer, Sport of Divinity. The Dramas in this volume are translated into Prose.

V.—Poems.

VI.—Essays, Esthetical and Philosophical

VII.—Wallenstein’s Camp, Piccolomini and Death of Wallenstein, William Tell.

Schiller and Goethe. Correspondence between, from A.D. 1794–1805. Translated by L. Dora Schmitz. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

Schlegel’s (F.) Lectures on the Philosophy of Life and the Philosophy of Language. Translated by the Rev. A. J. W. Morrison, M.A. 3s. 6d.

Lectures on the History of Literature, Ancient and Modern. Translated from the German. 3s. 6d.

Lectures on the Philosophy of History. Translated by J. B. Robertson. 3s. 6d.

Schlegel’s Lectures on Modern History, together with the Lectures entitled Caesar and Alexander, and The Beginning of our History. Translated by L. Purcell and R. H. Whitetock. 3s. 6d.

Esthetic and Miscellaneous Works. Translated by E. J. Millington. 3s. 6d.


Schopenhauer on the Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason, and On the Will in Nature. Translated by Madame Hillebrand. 5s.

Essays. Selected and Translated. With a Biographical Introduction and Sketch of his Philosophy, by E. Belfort Bax. 5s.

Schouw’s Earth, Plants, and Man. Translated by A. Henfrey. With coloured Map of the Geography of Plants. 5s.

Schumann (Robert). His Life and Works, by August Reissmann. Translated by A. L. Alger. 3s. 6d.

Early Letters. Originally published by his Wife. Translated by May Herbert. With a Preface by Sir George Grove, D.C.L. 3s. 6d.

Seneca on Benefits. Newly translated by A. Stewart, M.A. 3s. 6d.

Minor Essays and On Clemency. Translated by A. Stewart, M.A. 5s.

Shakespeare Documents. Arranged by D. H. Lambert, B.A. 3s. 6d.

Shakespeare’s Dramatic Art. The History and Character of Shakespeare’s Plays. By Dr. Hermann Ulrici. Translated by L. Dora Schmitz. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
SHAKESPEARE (William). A Literary Biography by Karl Elze, Ph.D., LL.D. Translated by L. Dora Schmitz. 5s.

SHARPE (S.) The History of Egypt, from the Earliest Times till the Conquest by the Arabs, A.D. 640. By Samuel Sharpe. 2 Maps and upwards of 400 Illustrative Woodcuts. 2 vols. 5s. each.

SHERIDAN'S Dramatic Works, Complete. With Life by G. G. S. 3s. 6d.

SISMONDI'S History of the Literature of the South of Europe. Translated by Thomas Roscoe. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

SMITH'S Synonyms and Antonyms, or Kindred Words and their Opposites. Revised Edition. 5s.

— Synonyms Discriminated. A Dictionary of Synonymous Words in the English Language, showing the Accurate signification of words of similar meaning. Edited by the Rev. H. Percy Smith, M.A. 6s.

SMITH'S (Adam) The Wealth of Nations. Edited by E. Belfort Bax. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— Theory of Moral Sentiments. With a Memoir of the Author by Dugald Stewart. 3s. 6d.

SMYTH'S (Professor) Lectures on Modern History. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

SMYTH'S (Professor) Lectures on the French Revolution. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

SMITH'S (Pye) Geology and Scripture. 2nd Edition. 5s.

SMOLLET'S Adventures of Roderick RANDOM. With short Memoir and Bibliography, and Cruikshank's Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

SMOLLET'T'S Adventures of Peregrine FLECKLE. With Bibliography and Cruikshank's Illustrations. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

— The Expedition of Humphry CLINKER. With Bibliography and Cruikshank's Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

SOCRATES (surnamed 'Scholasticus'). The Ecclesiastical History of (A.D. 305-445). Translated from the Greek. 5s.

SOPHOCLES, The Tragedies of. A New Prose Translation, with Memoir, Notes, &c., by E. P. Coleridge, M.A. 5s.

SOUTH'Y'S Life of Nelson. With Portraits, Plans, and upwards of 50 Engravings on Steel and Wood. 5s.

— Life of Wesley, and the Rise and Progress of Methodism. 5s.

— Robert Southey. The Story of his Life written in his Letters. Edited by John Dennis. 3s. 6d.

SOZOMEN'S Ecclesiastical History. Translated from the Greek. Together with the ECClesiasticl HISTORY OF PHILOSTORGIUS, as epitomised by Phoebus. Translated by Rev. E. Walford, M.A. 5s.

SPINOZA'S Chief Works. Translated, with Introduction, by R.H.M. Elwes. 2 vols. 5s. each.

STANLEY'S Classified Synopsis of the Principal Painters of the Dutch and Flemish Schools. By George Stanley. 5s.

STARLING'S (Miss) Noble Deeds of Women. With 14 Steel Engravings. 5s.

STAUNTON'S Chess-Player's Handbook. 5s.

— Chess Praxis. A Supplement to the Chess-player's Handbook. 5s.
STAUTON'S Chess-player's Companion. Comprising a Treatise on Odds, Collection of Match Games, and a Selection of Original Problems. 5s.
— Chess Tournament of 1851. With Introduction and Notes. 5s.

STOCKHARDT'S Experimental Chemistry. Edited by C. W. Heaton, F.C.S. 5s.

STOWE (Mrs. H. B.) Uncle Tom's Cabin. Illustrated. 3s. 6d.

STRABO'S Geography. Translated by W. Falconer, M.A., and H. C. Hamilton. 3 vols. 5s. each.

— Life of Mary Queen of Scots. 2 vols. 5s. each.
— Lives of the Tudor and Stuart Princesses. With Portraits. 5s.

STUART and REVETT'S Antiquities of Athens, and other Monuments of Greece. With 71 Plates engraved on Steel, and numerous Woodcut Capitals. 5s.

SUETONIUS' Lives of the Twelve Caesars and Lives of the Grammarians. Thomson's translation, revised by T. Forester. 5s.

SWIFT'S Prose Works continued.

II. — The Journal to Stella. Edited by Frederick Ryland, M.A. With 2 Portraits and Facsimile.

III. & IV. — Writings on Religion and the Church.

V. — Historical and Political Tracts (English).

VI. — The Drapier's Letters. With facsimiles of Wood's Coinage, &c.

VII. — Historical and Political Tracts (Irish).


IX. — Contributions to Periodicals.

X. — Historical Writings.

XI. — Literary Essays. [In preparation.

XII. — Index and Bibliography. [In preparation.

TACITUS. The Works of. Literally translated. 2 vols. 5s. each.

TALES OF THE GENII. Translated from the Persian by Sir Charles Morell. Numerous Woodcuts and 12 Steel Engravings. 5s.

TASSO'S Jerusalem Delivered. Translated into English Spenserian Verse by J. H. Wiffen. With 8 Engravings on Steel and 24 Woodcuts by Thurston. 5s.

TAYLOR'S (Bishop Jeremy) Holy Living and Dying. 3s. 6d.

TEN BRINK.—See Brink.

TERENCE and PHÆDRUS. Literally translated by H. T. Riley, M.A. To which is added, Smart's Metrical Version of Phædrus. 5s.

THEOCRITUS, BION, MOSCHUS, and TYRTÆUS. Literally translated by the Rev. J. Banks, M.A. To which are appended the Metrical Versions of Chapman. 5s.
THEODORET and EVAGRIUS. Histories of the Church from A.D. 332 to A.D. 427; and from A.D. 431 to A.D. 544. Translated. 5s.

THIERRY’S History of the Conquest of England by the Normans. Translated by William Hazlitt. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

THUCYDIDES. The Peloponnesian War. Literally translated by the Rev. H. Dale. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

THUDICHIMES. An Analysis and Summary of. By J. T. Wheeler. 5s.

THUDICHIMES (J. L. W.) A Treatise on Wines. Illustrated. 5s.

URE'S (Dr. A.) Cotton Manufacture of Great Britain. Edited by P. L. Simmonds. 2 vols. 5s. each.

— Philosophy of Manufactures. Edited by P. L. Simmonds. 7s. 6d.

VASARI’S Lives of the most Eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects. Translated by Mrs. J. Foster, with a Commentary by J. P. Richter, Ph.D. 6 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

VIRGIL. A Literal Prose Translation by A. Hamilton Bryce, LL.D. With Portrait. 3s. 6d.

VOLTAIRE’S Tales. Translated by R. B. Boswell. Containing Bebouc, Memnon, Candide, L’Ingénue, and other Tales. 3s. 6d.

WALTON’S Complete Angler. Edited by Edward Jesse. With Portrait and 203 Engravings on Wood and 26 Engravings on Steel. 5s.


WELLINGTON, Life of. By ‘An Old Soldier.’ From the materials of Maxwell. With Index and 18 Steel Engravings. 5s.

WELLINGTON, Victorios of. See Maxwell.

WERNER’S Templars in Cyprus. Translated by E.A.M. Lewis. 3s. 6d.

WESTROPP (H. M.) A Handbook of Archeology, Egyptian, Greek, Etruscan, Roman. Illustrated. 5s.

WHITE’S Natural History of Selborne. With Notes by Sir William Jardine. Edited by Edward Jesse. With 40 Portraits and coloured Plates. 5s.

WHEATLEY’S A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer. 3s. 6d.

WHEELER’S Noted Names of Fiction, Dictionary of. 5s.

WIESELER’S Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels. Translated by the Rev. Canon Venables. 3s. 6d.


YOUNG (Arthur). Travels in France during the years 1787, 1788, and 1789. Edited by M. Betham Edwards. 3s. 6d.

— Tour in Ireland, with General Observations on the state of the country during the years 1776-79. Edited by A. W. Hutton. With Complete Bibliography by J. P. Anderson, and Map. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.

YULE-TIDE STORIES. A Collection of Scandinavian and North-German Popular Tales and Traditions. Edited by B. Thorpe. 5s.
THE YORK LIBRARY

A NEW SERIES OF REPRINTS ON THIN PAPER.

The volumes are printed in a handy size (6½ x 4½ in.), on thin but opaque paper, and are simply and attractively bound.

Price, in cloth, 2s. net; in leather, 3s. net.

The York Library is noticeable by reason of the wisdom and intelligence displayed in the choice of unhackneyed classics. . . . A most attractive series of reprints. . . . The size and style of the volumes are exactly what they should be.'—Bookman.

'These books should find their way to every home that owns any cultivation.'—Notes and Queries.

The following volumes are now ready:

CHARLOTTE BRONTË'S JANE EYRE.

BURNEY'S Evelina. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Annie Raine Ellis.

BURNEY'S Cecilia. Edited by Annie Raine Ellis. 2 vols.


BURTON'S (SIR RICHARD) Pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Mecca'h. With Introduction by Stanley Lane-Poole. 2 vols.

CERVANTES' DonQuixote. Motteux's Translation, revised. With Lockhart's Life and Notes. 2 vols.

CLASSIC TALES: Johnson's Rasselas, Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield, Sterne's Sentimental Journey, Walpole's Castle of Otranto. With Introduction by C. S. Fearenside, M.A.

COLERIDGE'S AIDS TO REFLECTION, and the Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit.

COLERIDGE'S FRIEND. A series of Essays on Morals, Politics, and Religion.

COLERIDGE'S TABLE TALK AND OMNIANA. Arranged and Edited by T. Ashe, B.A.

DRAPER'S HISTORY OF THE INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE. 2 vols.

GEORGE ELIOT'S Adam Bede.

EMERSON'S WORKS. A new edition in 5 volumes, with the Text edited and collated by George Sampson.

FIELDING'S Tom Jones. 2 vols.

GASKELL'S Sylvia's LOVERS.
THE YORK LIBRARY—continued.

GESTA ROMANORUM, or Entertaining Moral Stories invented by the Monks. Translated from the Latin by the Rev. Charles Swan. Revised edition, by Wynnard Hooper, M.A.

GOETHE'S FAUST. Translated by Anna Swanwick, LL.D. Revised edition, with an Introduction and Bibliography by Karl Breul, Litt.D., Ph.D.

HAWTHORNE'S TRANSFORMATION (THE MARBLE FAUN).

IRVING'S SKETCH BOOK.

JAMESON'S SHAKESPEARE'S HEROINES. Characteristics of Women: Moral, Poetical, and Historical.

LAMB'S ESSAYS. Including the Essays of Elia, Last Essays of Elia, and Eliana.

MARCUS AURELIUS ANTONINUS, THE THOUGHTS OF. Translated by George Long, M.A. With an Essay on Marcus Aurelius by Matthew Arnold.

MARRYAT'S MR. MIDSHIPMAN EASY. With 8 Illustrations by E. T. Wheeler.

MARRYAT'S PETER SIMPLE. With 8 Illustrations by F. A. Fraser.

MONTAIGNE'S ESSAYS. Cotton's translation. Revised by W. C. Hazlitt. 3 vols.

MORE'S UTOPIA. With the Life of Sir Thomas More, by William Roper, and his Letters to Margaret Roper and others. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by George Sampson. [In the Press.

MOTLEY'S RISE OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC. With a Biographical Introduction by Moncure D. Conway. 3 vols.


SWIFT'S GULLIVER'S TRAVELS. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by G. R. Dennis, with facsimiles of the original illustrations.

SWIFT'S JOURNAL TO STELLA. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by F. Ryland, M.A.

TROLLOPE'S THE WARDEN. With an Introduction by Frederic Harrison.

TROLLOPE'S BARCHESTER TOWERS.

TROLLOPE'S DR. THORNE.

TROLLOPE'S FRAMLLEY PARSONAGE.

TROLLOPE'S SMALL HOUSE AT ALLINGTON. 2 vols.

TROLLOPE'S LAST CHRONICLE OF BARSET. 2 vols.

ARTHUR YOUNG'S TRAVELS IN FRANCE, during the years 1787, 1788, and 1789. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by M. Betham Edwards.

Other Volumes are in Preparation.
BELL'S HANDBOOKS
OF
THE GREAT MASTERS
IN PAINTING AND SCULPTURE.

EDITED BY G. C. WILLIAMSON, Litt.D.

Post 8vo. With 40 Illustrations and Photogravure Frontispiece. 5s. net each.

The following Volumes have been issued:

BOTTICELLI. By A. Streeter. 2nd Edition.
BRUNELLESCHI. By Leader Scott.
CORREGGIO. By Selwyn Brinton, M.A. 2nd Edition.
CARLO CRIVELLI. By G. McNeil Rushforth, M.A.
DELLA ROBBIA. By the Marchesa Burlamacchi. 2nd Edition.
ANDREA DEL SARTO. By H. Guinness. 2nd Edition.
DONATELLO. By Hope Rea. 2nd Edition.
GERARD DOU. By Dr. W. Martin. Translated by Clara Bell.
GAUDENZIO FERRARI. By Ethel Halsey.
FRANCIA. By George C. Williamson, Litt.D.
GIORGIONE. By Herbert Cook, M.A.
GIOTTO. By F. Mason Perkins.
FRANS HALS. By Gerald S. Davies, M.A.
LEONARDO DA VINCI. By Edward McCurdy, M.A.
MANTEGNA. By Maud Cruttwell.
MEMLINC. By W. H. James Weale.
MICHEL ANGELO. By Lord Ronald Sutherland Gower, M.A., F.S.A.
PIERO DELLA FRANCESCA. By W. G. Waters, M.A.
PINTORICCHIO. By Evelyn March Phillipps.
RAPHAEL. By H. Strachey. 2nd Edition.
REMBRANDT. By Malcolm Bell. 2nd Edition.
RUBENS. By Hope Rea.
LUCA SIGNORELLI. By Maud Cruttwell. 2nd Edition.
SODOMA. By the Contessa Lorenzo Priuli-Bon.
TINTORETTO. By J. B. Stoughton Holborn, M.A.
VAN DYCK. By Lionel Cust, M.V.O., F.S.A.
WATTEAU. By Edgcumbe Staley, B.A.
WILKIE. By Lord Ronald Sutherland Gower, M.A., F.S.A.

Others to follow.
THE
CHISWICK SHAKESPEARE.
Illustrated by BYAM SHAW.
With Introductions and Glossaries by JOHN DENNIS.

Printed at the Chiswick Press, pott 8vo., price 1s. 6d. net per volume; also a cheaper edition, 1s. net per volume; or 2s. net in limp leather; also a few copies, on Japanese vellum, to be sold only in sets, price 5s. net per volume.

Now Complete in 39 Volumes.

ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL.
ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA.
AS YOU LIKE IT.
COMEDY OF ERRORS.
CORIOLANUS.
CYMBELINE.
HAMLET.
JULIUS CAESAR.
KING HENRY IV. Part I.
KING HENRY IV. Part II.
KING HENRY V.
KING HENRY VI. Part I.
KING HENRY VI. Part II.
KING HENRY VI. Part III.
KING HENRY VIII.
KING JOHN.
KING LEAR.
KING RICHARD II.
KING RICHARD III.

LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST.
MEASURE FOR MEASURE.
MERRY WIVES OF VENICE.
MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM.
MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING.
OTHELLO.
PERICLES.
ROMEO AND JULIET.
THE TAMING OF THE SHREW.
THE TEMPEST.
TIMON OF ATHENS.
TITUS ANDRONICUS.
TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.
TWELFTH NIGHT.
TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA.
WINTER'S TALE.
POEMS.
SONNETS.

A fascinating little edition.—Notes and Queries.
A cheap, very comely, and altogether desirable edition.—Westminster Gazette.

But a few years ago such volumes would have been deemed worthy to be considered éditions de luxe. To-day, the low price at which they are offered to the public alone prevents them being so regarded.—Studio.

Handy in shape and size, wonderfully cheap, beautifully printed from the Cambridge text, and illustrated quaintly yet admirably by Mr. Byam Shaw, we have nothing but praise for it. No one who wants a good and convenient Shakespeare—without excursuses, discursuses, or even too many notes—can do better, in our opinion, than subscribe to this issue: which is saying a good deal in these days of cheap reprints.—Vanity Fair.

What we like about these elegant booklets is the attention that has been paid to the paper, as well as to the print and decoration; such stout laid paper will last for ages. On this account alone, the ‘Chiswick’ should easily be first among pocket Shakespeares.—Pall Mall Gazette.

* * The Chiswick Shakespeare may also be had bound in 12 volumes, full gilt back, price 36s. net.
New Editions, fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each net.

THE ALDINE EDITION
OF THE
BRITISH POETS.

'This excellent edition of the English classics, with their complete texts and scholarly introductions, are something very different from the cheap volumes of extracts which are just now so much too common.'—St. James's Gazette.

'An excellent series. Small, handy, and complete.'—Saturday Review.

Blake. Edited by W. M. Rossetti.
Burns. Edited by G. A. Aitken. 3 vols.
Butler. Edited by R. B. Johnson. 2 vols.
Campbell. Edited by His Son-in-law, the Rev. A. W. Hill. With Memoir by W. Allingham.
Chaucer. Edited by Dr. R. Morris, with Memoir by Sir H. Nicolas. 6 vols.
Collins. Edited by W. Moy Thomas.
Cowper. Edited by John Bruce, F.S.A. 3 vols.
Gray. Edited by J. Bradshaw, LL.D.
Herbert. Edited by the Rev. A. B. Grosart.
Herrick. Edited by George Saintsbury. 2 vols.
Keats. Edited by the late Lord Houghton.
KIrke White. Edited, with a Memoir, by Sir H. Nicolas.
Milton. Edited by Dr. Bradshaw. 2 vols.
Parnell. Edited by G. A. Aitken.
Pope. Edited by G. R. Dennis, With Memoir by John Dennis. 3 vols.
Raleigh and Wotton. With Selections from the Writings of other COURTLY POETS from 1540 to 1650. Edited by Ven. Archdeacon Hannah, D.C.L.
Rogers. Edited by Edward Bell, M.A.
Scott. Edited by John Dennis. 5 vols.
Shelley. Edited by H. Buxton Forman. 5 vols.
Spenser. Edited by J. Payne Collier. 5 vols.
Surrey. Edited by J. Yeowell.
Swift. Edited by the Rev. J. Mitford. 3 vols.
Thomson. Edited by the Rev. D. C. Tovey. 2 vols.
Wordsworth. Edited by Prof. Dowden. 7 vols.
Wyatt. Edited by J. Yeowell.
Young. 2 vols. Edited by the Rev. J. Mitford.
THE ALL-ENGLAND SERIES.

HANDBOOKS OF ATHLETIC GAMES.

The only Series issued at a moderate price, by Writers who are in the first rank in their respective departments.

'The best instruction on games and sports by the best authorities, at the lowest prices.'—Oxford Magazine.

Small 8vo. cloth, Illustrated. Price 1s. each.

Cricket. By Fred C. Holland.

Cricket. By the Hon. and Rev. E. Lyttelton.

Croquet. By Lieut.-Col. the Hon. H. C. Needham.

Lawn Tennis. By H. W. W. Wilberforce, with a Chapter for Ladies, by Mrs. Hilliard.

Squash Tennis. By Eustace H. Miles. Double vol. 2s.


Rowing and Sculling. By Guy Rixon.

Rowing and Sculling. By W. B. Woodgate.

Sailing. By E. F. Knight, dbl. vol. 2s.


Camping out. By A. A. Macdonell. Double vol. 2s.

Canoeing. By Dr. J. D. Hayward. Double vol. 2s.

Mountaineering. By Dr. Claude Wilson. Double vol. 2s.

Athletics. By H. H. Griffin.

Riding. By W. A. Kerr, V.C. Double vol. 2s.

Ladies' Riding. By W. A. Kerr, V.C.


With Prefatory Note by Bat Mullins.

THE CLUB SERIES OF CARD AND TABLE GAMES.

No well-regulated club or country house should be without this useful series of books.

Small 8vo. cloth, Illustrated. Price Is. each.

Bridge. By 'Templar.'

Whist. By Dr. Wm. Pole, F. R. S.


Hints on Billiards. By J. P. Buchanen. Double vol. 2s.


Chess Openings. By I. Gunsberg.

Draughts and Backgammon. By 'Berkeley.'

Reversi and Go Bang. By 'Berkeley.'

Dominoes and Solitaire. By 'Berkeley.'

Bézique and Cribbage. By 'Berkeley.'

Écarté and Euchre. By 'Berkeley.'

Piquet and Rubicon Piquet. By 'Berkeley.'

Skat. By Louis Diehl.

Round Games, including Poker, Napoleon, Loo, Vingt-et-un, &c. By Baxter-Wray.

Parlour and Playground Games. By Mrs. Laurence Gomez.
BELL'S CATHEDRAL SERIES.

Profusely Illustrated, cloth, crown 8vo. 1s. 6d. net each.


BANGOR. By P. B. Ironside Bax.
BRISTOL. By H. J. L. J. Massé, M.A.
CANTERBURY. By Hartley Withers. 5th Edition.
CARLISLE. By C. King Eley.
CHESTER. By Charles Hiatt. 3rd Edition.
LICHFIELD. By A. B. Clifton. 2nd Edition.
MANCHESTER. By Rev. T. Perkins, M.A.
RIPON. By Cecil Hallett, B.A.
ST. ALBANS. By Rev. T. Perkins, M.A.
ST. ASAPH. By P. B. Ironside Bax.
ST. DAVID'S. By Philip Robson, A.R.I.B.A.
ST. SAVIOUR'S, SOUTHWARK. By George Worley.
WINCHESTER. By P. W. Sergeant. 3rd Edition.
WORCESTER. By E. F. Strange. 2nd Edition.
YORK. By A. Clutton-Brock, M.A. 3rd Edition.

Uniform with above Series. Now ready. 1s. 6d. net each.

ST. MARTIN'S CHURCH, CANTERBURY. By the Rev. Canon Routledge, M.A., F.S.A.
BEVERLEY MINSTER. By Charles Hiatt.
WIMBORNE MINSTER and CHRISTCHURCH PRIORY. By the Rev. T. Perkins, M.A.
TEWKESBURY ABBEY AND DEERHURST PRIORY. By H. J. L. J. Massé, M.A.
BATH ABBEY, MALMESBURY ABBEY, and BRADFORD-ON-AVON CHURCH, By Rev. T. Perkins, M.A.
WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By Charles Hiatt.
STRATFORD-ON-AVON CHURCH. By Harold Baker.

BELL'S HANDBOOKS TO CONTINENTAL CHURCHES.

Profusely Illustrated. Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d. net each.

AMIENS By the Rev. T. Perkins, M.A.
BAYEUX. By the Rev. R. S. Mylne.
CHARTRES: The Cathedral and Other Churches. By H. J. L. J. Massé, M.A.
MONT ST. MICHEL. By H. J. L. J. Massé, M.A.
PARIS (NOTRE-DAME). By Charles Hiatt.
ROUEN: The Cathedral and Other Churches. By the Rev. T. Perkins, M.A.
The Best Practical Working Dictionary of the English Language.

WEBSTER'S INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY.

2348 PAGES.  5000 ILLUSTRATIONS.

NEW EDITION, REVISED THROUGHOUT WITH A NEW SUPPLEMENT OF 25,000 ADDITIONAL WORDS AND PHRASES.

The Appendices comprise a Pronouncing Gazetteer of the World, Vocabularies of Scripture, Greek, Latin, and English Proper Names, a Dictionary of the Noted Names of Fiction, a Brief History of the English Language, a Dictionary of Foreign Quotations, Words, Phrases, Proverbs, &c., a Biographical Dictionary with 10,000 names, &c., &c.

Dr. MURRAY, Editor of the 'Oxford English Dictionary,' says:—'In this its latest form, and with its large Supplement and numerous appendices, it is a wonderful volume, which well maintains its ground against all rivals on its own lines. The "definitions," or more properly, "explanations of meaning" in "Webster" have always struck me as particularly terse and well-put; and it is hard to see how anything better could be done within the limits.'

Professor JOSEPH WRIGHT, M.A., Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Editor of the 'English Dialect Dictionary,' says:—'The new edition of "Webster's International Dictionary" is undoubtedly the most useful and reliable work of its kind in any country. No one who has not examined the work carefully would believe that such a vast amount of lexicographical information could possibly be found within so small a compass.'

Professor A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., D.D., says:—'It is indeed a marvellous work; it is difficult to conceive of a Dictionary more exhaustive and complete. Everything is in it—not only what we might expect to find in such a work, but also what few of us would ever have thought of looking for.'

Rev. JOSEPH WOOD, D.D., Head Master of Harrow, says:—'I have always thought very highly of its merits. Indeed, I consider it to be far the most accurate English Dictionary in existence, and much more reliable than the "Century." For daily and hourly reference, "Webster" seems to me unrivalled.'

Prospectuses, with Prices and Specimen Pages, on Application.

LONDON: GEORGE BELL & SONS, YORK HOUSE, PORTUGAL STREET, W.C.

50,000. S. & S. 11.66.
An exposition of the Creed