AN EXPOSITION OF THE CREED.

BY

JOHN PEARSON.



LONDON,
Printed by ROGER DANIEL, for *John Williams* at the sign of the *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. cIↃ IↃc LIX.

CREED

OF THE

EXPOSITION

TO THE

Right Worſhipfull and Well-beloved

THE

Pariſhioners of

S^t. CLEMENTS EAST-CHEAPE.

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

IF I ſhould be at any time unmindfull of your commands, you might well eſteem me unworthy of your continued favours; and there is ſome reaſon to ſuſpect I have incurr'd the interpretation of forgetfulneſſe, having been ſo back-

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 publick. 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 it ſelf: which partly by the difficulty of the Work undertaken, partly by the intervention of ſome other imploiments, 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 reedifying of your Church. For though I can have little temptation to believe that my Book ſhould laſt ſo long as that Fabrick; 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 perſwade you to forget my ſlackneſſe, conſidering ye were not ready to your own expectation; your experience tells you

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 Saint *Paul*, and a ſucceſſour of Saint *Peter*; he had the honour to be numbred in the Scripture with them *vvhoſe names are vvritten in the book of life*, and when he had ſealed the Goſpell with his bloud, he was one of the firſt whoſe memory was perpetuated by the building a Church to bear his name. Thus was Saint *Clement's* Church famous in *Rome*, when *Rome* was famous for the *faith ſpoken of throughout the vvhole vvorld*. He wrote an Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* infeſted with a ſchiſme, in imitation of Saint *Paul*, which obtained ſo great authority in the Primitive times, that it was frequently read in their publick Congregations; and yet had for many hundred years bin 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 bin 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 Saint *Iude* hath already ſpoken to the whole Church, *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to vvrite unto you of the common ſalvation, it vvas needfull for me to vvrite unto you, that ye ſhould earneſtly contend for the Faith vvhich vvas once delivered to the Saints.* If it were ſo needfull for him then to write, and for them to whom he wrote to contend for the firſt Faith, it will appear as needfull for me now to follow his writing, and for you to imitate their earneſtneſſe, becauſe the reaſon which he renders as the cauſe of that neceſſity is now more prevalent then it was at that time or ever ſince. *For*, ſaith he, *there are certain men crept in unavvares, vvho vvere before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of God into laſciviouſneſſe, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Ieſus Chriſt.* The Principles of Chriſtianity are now as freely queſtion'd as the moſt doubtfull and controverted points; the grounds of faith are as ſafely denied, as the moſt unneceſſary ſuperſtructions; that Religion hath the greateſt advantage which appeareth in the neweſt dreſſe, as if we looked for another *Faith to be delivered to the Saints.*

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 then 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 vvhich are unskilfull* and *unſtable vvreſt* the words of God himſelf *unto their ovvn damnation*, ye may receive ſo much inſtruction as may ſet you beyond the imputation of unskilfulneſſe, 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 faithfull 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: leaſt 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 controverſie is a brief comprehenſion of the objects of our Chriſtian Faith, & is generally taken to contein all things neceſſary to be believed. Now whether all things neceſſary be conteined there, concerneth not an Expoſitor to diſpute, who is obliged to take notice of what is in it, but not to enquire into what is not: whether all truths comprehended in the ſame be of equall and abſolute neceſſity, we are no way forced to declare; it being ſufficient as to the deſign of an Expoſition,

to interpret the words, & 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 my self, 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 Termes, 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 conteined in those termes so explicated, & 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 recollection of all, briefly to deliver the summe of every particular truth, so that every one when he pronounceth the Creed may know what he ought to intend, and what he is understood to professe, when he so pronounceth it.

In the prosecution of the Whole according to this Method I have considered that a Work of so generall

generall a concernment muſt be expoſed to two kinds of Readers, which though they may agree in judgement, yet muſt differ much in their capacities; Some there are who underſtand the Original Languages of the Holy Scripture, the diſcourſes & Tractates of the ancient Fathers, the determinations of the Councils, and Hiſtory of the Church of God, the conſtant profeſſion of ſetled truths, the riſe and encreaſe of Schiſmes 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 con-

teineth fully what can be delivered and made intelligeable 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 onely such notions as are common, easie, and familiar of themselves, but have endeavoured to deliver the most materiall conceptions in the most plain and perspicuous manner; as desirous to comprize 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 conteined whatsoever is necessary for the illustration of any part of the Creed as to them which have any knowledge of the Latine, Greek, and Orientall 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 contein those truths Wch belong unto it as it is a religion, & those which concern it as it is ours. As it is a religion, it delivereth such principles as are to be acknowledged in Natu-

rall

rall 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 Catholick: as Chriſtian, it conteineth 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 Iews, 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 Catholick, 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 Hereticks 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 Catholick 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 alledged according to the true ſenſe, and applied by right reaſon: not urging the Authority of the Church which they reject, but onely giving in the Margine the ſenſe of the Primitive Fathers, for the ſatisfaction of ſuch as have any reſpect left for Antiquity, and are perſwaded 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 fitte to expatiate or inlarge my ſelf, but onely to mention ſuch effects as flow naturally & immediately from the doctrine, eſpecially ſuch as are delivered in the Scriptures; which I have endeavoured to ſet forth with all poſſible plainneſs and perſpicuity. 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 faithfulneſſe delivered them as they lie in the writings of thoſe holy pen-men; not referring the Reader to places named in the Margine, (wch too often I find in many books multiplyed 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

ther enquiry 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 ſeverall Notion, I have recollected briefly and plainly the ſumme of what hath bin delivered in the explication of it, and put, it as it were, into the mouth of every Chriſtian, thereby to expreſſe 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 perceive 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 publick, ancient and Orthodox Confeſſion of Faith.

I have nothing more to adde, but onely to pray that the Lord would give you and me a good underſtanding in all things,

THE

THE CREED.

I Believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ his onely Son our Lord, which was conceived by the holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, he descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty: from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the holy Ghost, the holy Catholick Church, the communion of Saints, the forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, the Reſurrection of the body, and the life everlaſting.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE *APOSTLES CREED.*

ARTICLE I.

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

AS the firſt word *Credo, I believe*, giveth a denomination to the whole Confeſſion of Faith, from thence commonly call'd the *Creed*; ſo is the ſame word to be imagin'd not to ſtand onely 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 prefix'd 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 onely Son, our Lord*; as, *I believe in the Holy Ghoſt*, ſo alſo, *I believe the Catholick Church*. Neither is it to be joyned with every compleat Article onely, but where any Article is not a ſingle verity, but comprehenſive, there it is to be look-ed upon as affix'd to every part, or ſingle truth contained in that Article: as, for example, in the 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 it self to no lesse then a double number of the Articles, and will be found at least 24 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 Truths.

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 Belief or Faith which is confessed. Secondly, as it is a confession, or externall 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 confesse; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the first word of the *Creed*, then may every one understand what it is he sayes, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe*.

For the right understanding of the true nature of Christian Belief, it will be no lesse then necessary to begin with the generall notion of Faith; which being first truly stated and defined, then by degrees deduced into its severall kindes, will at last make the nature of Christian Faith intelligible, a designe, if I mistake not, not so ordinary and usual, as usefull and necessary.

Belief in generall I define to be an *Assent to that which is Credible, as Credible*. By the word * *Assent* is expressed

* *Theodoret. de Prov. Serm. 1.*

that

that Act, or habit of the understanding, by which it receiveth, acknowledgeth and embraceth any thing 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 Judgement of any thing to be true, being a generall Act of the understanding, and so applicable to other Habits thereof as well as Faith, must be specified by its proper Object, and so limited and determined to its proper act, which is the other part left to compleat the definition.

This Object of Faith is first expresst 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 compleat. 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 materiall Object, or thing believed, we have added the formall Object, or that whereby it is believed, expresst 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 'tis credible; and again, whosoever assenteth to any thing which is credible as 'tis credible, believeth something by so assenting, which is sufficient to shew the definition compleat.

Now if that which we believe be something which is credible, and the notion under which we believe be the credibility

χαὶ ἡ ἡμέτερον λόγον, πίστις ἐστὶν ἑκάστου ὡς ἡ ψυχῆς συγκατάθεσις. *Credere est cum assensu cogitare.* Aug.

* Φιλαλήθης ἡ ψυχὴ ἀδέσποτος χαὶ τὸ ψεῦδος ἀπεχομένη διαπίθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ χαὶ φαινόμενον ἀληθὲς πάντως χὰ εὐθύς. Simplic. *in* 3. Arist. *de Anima.*

dibility 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.

Now that is properly *Credible* which is not apparent of it self, nor certainly to be collected, either antecedently by its cause, or reversely by its effect, and yet, though by none of these wayes, 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 then any one part of the whole, that every thing imaginable either is, or is not. The first kinde 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 kinde propounded to the understanding, are immediately imbraced 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.

* *Apparentia non habent fidem sed agnitionem.* Greg. 4. Dial. c. 5.

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 naturall cause actually applied doth necessarily produce its own naturall effect, and every naturall effect wholly dependeth upon and absolutely presupposeth 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 wayes proceeding from principles evidently known by consequences certainly concluding, we come to the knowledge of propositions in Mathematicks, and conclusions in other Sciences; which propositions and conclusions are not said

to

to be *Credible*, but *Scientifically*, 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 externall 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 caſe whatſoever is thus apprehended, if it depend upon reall Arguments, is not yet call'd *Credible*, but *Probable*: and an Aſſent to ſuch a Truth, is not properly *Faith*, but *Opinion*.

But when any thing propounded to us is neither apparent to our ſenſe, nor evident to our underſtanding in and of it ſelf, 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 reall Arguments or relations 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 it ſelf, 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*.

Having thus defined and illuſtrated the nature of *Faith* in generall, ſo farre as it agreeth to all kinds of belief whatſoever; our method will lead us on to deſcend by way of diviſion to the ſeverall kindes thereof, till at laſt we come to the proper notion of *Faith* in the Chriſtians *Confeſſion*, the deſigne of our preſent diſquiſition. And being we have placed the formality of the Object of all belief in *Credibility*, it will clearly follow that a diverſity of *Credibility* in the Object will proportionably cauſe a diſtinction of *Aſſent* in the underſtanding, and conſequently a ſeverall kind of *Faith*, which we have ſuppoſed to be nothing elſe but ſuch an *Aſſent*.

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 our ſelves of the truth, and conſequently no other motives of our *Aſſent* in matters of *mere Belief*, then the *Teſtimony* upon which we believe; if there be any fundamentall 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 ſeverall kinds of *Teſtimonies* founded upon ſeverall *Authorities*.

The ſtrength and validity of every *Teſtimony* muſt bear proportion with the *Authority* of the *Teſtifier*: 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 ſeverall wayes 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 it ſelf is falſe, and ſo deceive himſelf and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be diſhoneſt or unfaithfull, that which he knowes 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 wayes, for want either of *Ability* or *Integrity* in the *Teſtifier*, whoſo 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 faithfull as to deliver nothing but what and as he knoweth, he, as he is not deceived,

deceived so deceiveth no man. So farre therefore as any person testifying appeareth to be knowing of the thing he testifies, & to be faithfull in the relation of what he knows, so far his testimony is acceptable, so far that which he testifieth is properly *Credible*: and thus the *Authority* of every *testifier* or relatour is grounded upon these two foundations, his *Ability* and *Integrity*.

Now there is in this case, so farre as it concerns our present designe, * a double *Testimony*: the *Testimony* of man to man, relying upon humane 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*, *Humane* and *Divine*; and consequently there is a twofold *Faith* distinguish'd by this double object, a *Humane* and a *Divine Faith*.

Humane 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 Humane 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 countrey as *Italy*, or such a city as *Constantinople*, though he never pass'd any of our four seas? Who questions now whether there were such a man as *Alexander* in the East, or *Cesar* 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 originall belief, there are no letters learnt without preceding faith.

There is no Justice executed, no commerce maintain'd, no

* *Testimoniorum quæ sunt genera? Divinum & humanum. Divinum, ut oracula, ut auspicia, ut vaticinationes, & responsa sacerdotum, aruspicum, conjectorum: Humanum, quod spectatur ex auctoritate, & ex voluntate, & ex oratione aut libera aut expressa; in quo insunt scripta, pacta, promissa, jurata, quæsita.* Cicero *Orat. Partit.*

† *Non dicant non credimus quia non vidimus, quoniam si hæc dicent, coguntur fateri incertos sibi esse parentes suos. De fide rerum invisib. amongst the works of* S. Auguſt.

‖ Ὑποδέδρα μέντοι γε κενλατὴς ἡ ὀπτὴ ἡμῖν ἡ πίστις. *S. Theodor. Therap.* 1.

* Ὡς δὲ γὰ πᾶ πρῶτα σοι χρὴ μαθεῖν

δίδν τε μὴ τὸ χαμαπετὲς πιστευκότα. *ibid.*

† πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τελούμενα, καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτελῶν τῆς ὁμηλικίας τῇ πίστει τελεῖ. *Cyril. Catech.* V. *Orig. cont. Celsum*, l. 1. *Euſ. de Præp. Evang.* l. 1. c. 5. *Arnob. adver. Gent.* l. 2.

no buſineſſe proſecuted without this; † all ſecular affairs are tranſacted, all great atchievements are attempted, all hopes, deſires, and inclinations are preſerved by this Humane Faith grounded upon the Teſtimony of man.

In which caſe we all by eaſie experience may obſerve the nature, generation, and progreſſe of *Belief*. For in any thing which belongeth to more then 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 compaſſe 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 relatour which will ſatisfie 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 deſigne 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 Relatour, and being the knowledge of all men is imperfect, and the hearts of all men are deceitfull, and ſo their integrity to be ſuſpected, there can be no infallible univerſall ground of *Humane Faith*.

But what we cannot find in the teſtimony of man, we may be ſatisfied in the teſtimony of God. *If we receive the witneſſe of man, the witneſſe of God is greater.* Yea, *let God be true*, the ground of our *Divine*, *and every man a liar*, the ground of our *Humane Faith*.

1 *Jo.* 3. 9. *Rom.* 3. 5.

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*

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 confirm'd 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*. *Num.* 23. 19. 1 *Sam.* 15. 19. *Pſal.* 18. 2.

For firſt, God is of infinite knowledge and wiſdome, 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 plurall, or rather infinite in their plurality, that the *Pſalmiſt* hath ſaid, *of his underſtanding there is no number*. 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, and not ſo onely, 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 glaſſe or through a cloud; But [a] *God is light, and in him is no darkneſſe at all*: he ſeeth without any obſcurity, and whatſoever is propounded to his Underſtanding is moſt clear and evident, [b] *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.* Wherefore being all things are within the the compaſſe 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 deceiv'd in any thing. 1 *Sam.* 2. 3. אל דעות יהוה LXX. Θεὸς γνώσεων κύριος. *Pſal.* 147. 5. *in the Heb.* לתבונתו אין מספר

Secondly, the juſtice of God is equall to his knowledge, nor is his holineſs inferiour to his wiſdome: *a God of truth*, ſaith *Moſes*, *and without iniquity, juſt and right is he.* From which internall, eſſentiall and infinite rectitude, goodneſſe and holineſſe, followeth an impoſſibility to de- *Deut.* 32. 4.

* *Cujus ſapientia ſimpliciter multiplex, & uniformiter multiformis incomprehenſibili comprehenſione omnia incomprehenſibilia comprehendit.* Auguſt. *de Civ. Dei*, l. 12. c. 18.

[a] 1 *Jo.* 1. 5.

[b] *Heb.* 4. 13.

clare or deliver that for truth, which he knoweth not to be true. For if it be againſt that finite purity and integritie which is required of man, to lie, and therefore ſinfull, then muſt we conceive it abſolutely inconſiſtent with that tranſcendent purity and infinite integrity which is eſſentiall 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, that he † cannot ſpeak that for truth which he knoweth to be otherwiſe. For the perfections of his will are as neceſſarily infinite as thoſe of his underſtanding, neither can he be unholy or unjuſt, more then he can be ignorant or unwiſe. [a] *If we believe not, yet he abideth faithfull, he cannot deny himſelf.* 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, then in contradicting his veracity. 'Tis true, that [b] *God willing more abundantly to ſhew 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 'tis as true, that all this confirmation is onely for our conſolation, otherwiſe it is as *impoſſible for God to lie* without an *oath*, as with one; for being he can [c] *ſwear by no greater, he ſweareth* onely *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, goodneſſe and holineſſe, 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 immoveable pillars ſtandeth the Authority of the *Teſtimony* of God. For ſince we cannot doubt of the witneſſe of any one, but by que-

* Δύναται ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς πάντα ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' οὐδαμῶς, τῷ θεῷ εἶναι, καὶ τῷ ἀληθῆ εἶναι, καὶ σοφὸς εἶναι οὐκ ἐξίστατο. Orig. contra Celſum.

† *Si velint invenire quod omnipotens non poteſt, habent prorſus, ego dicam, mentiri non poteſt.* S. Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 22. c. 25.

a 2 Tim. 2. 13.

b Heb. 6. 17, 18.

c Heb. 6. 13.

* *Ut ſit omnium potens, mori non poteſt, falli non poteſt, mentiri non poteſt.* Aug. de Symb. ad Catechum.

† *Deus facere fraudem neſcit, pati non poteſt.* Chryſol. Serm. 62.

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 intrinſecall * 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*, ſaith 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 materiall Object is the Doctrine which God delivereth, the formall Object is that Credibility founded on the † Authority of the deliverer. And this I conceive the true nature of *Divine Faith* in generall.

Now being the *Credibility* of all which we *believe* is founded 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 confirm'd by interpoſing the authority of God; but he is then ſaid to witneſſe 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* it ſelf, yet of the means and manner of *Aſſent*.

* *Authoritas Dei conſiſtit in intrinſeca repugnatia deceptionis ſeu falſitatis quam habet divinum judicium, & in intrinſeca repugnantia actus voluntatis imperantis teſtimonium extrinſecum non conſentiens judicio interno; quæ per terminos poſitivos actus intellectus infallibiliter veri, & actus voluntatis intrinſecè & neceſſariò recti poterit explicari.* Franciſc. de Oviedo *Tract. de Fide Contr.* 2. *punc.* 2.

‖ 1 Joh. 5. 10.

† *Divina eſt Auctoritas cui credimus, divina eſt doctrina quam ſequimur.* Leo, Ser. 7. *in Nativ.*

Wherefore it will be further 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 conveiance 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 ſeverall kinds of believers will be very obſervable for the explanation of the nature of our *Faith*.

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. [a] 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*: which †*warning of God* was a clear *Revelation* of Gods 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

* *Sicut duplex eſt auditus & locutio, ſcilicet exterior ſive corporalis, & interior ac ſpiritualis, ita duplex eſt fides, una quæ oritur in cordibus fidelium per auditum exteriorem, cum ſcil. Deus per aliquos homines aliis credenda proponit; & iſta eſt fides quæ nobis ſive communi ſtatui fidelium convenit, ex eo quod adhæremus revelationibus Prophetis & Apoſtolis factis: alia eſt quæ oritur in aliquibus per ſpiritualem locutionem, qua Deus aliquibus per internam inſpirationem credenda revelat, nullo hominis miniſterio utens, ſicut eſt fides Apoſtolorum & Prophetarum, qui ab ipſo Deo per intrinſecam illuminationem ſunt de credendis inſtructi.* Franciſc. Ferrarienſis in *Thom. cont. Gent.* c. 40. [a] *Heb.* 11. 7.

† πίστει χρηματισθεὶς, *which word comes from the originall* χρέω, *appropriated by the Greeks to an Oracle, or anſwer given by God,* ὁ μὲν Θεὸς χρᾷ, ὁ δ' ἄνθρωπος μανθάνει. *Moſchopulus.*

Noah

Noah ſo received from God, as that he knew it to be an oracle of God, and was as well aſſured of the Authour, as informed of the command. Thus the judgements hanging over Judah were revealed in the eares 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 reveal'd 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 * *eares* of *Samuel* were *revealed*, and the † word of God *revealed*, and ‖ God himſelf *revealed* to him. By all which we can underſtand no leſs, then that *Samuel* was ſo illuminated in his propheſies, 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 the Prophets believ'd thoſe truths revealed to them by ſuch a Faith as was a firm Aſſent unto an object credible upon the immediate Teſtimony of God.

Iſa. 22. 14.

1 *Sam.* 3. 21.

* יהוה גלה את אזן שמואל

κύριος ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ὠτίον Σαμουὴλ, 1 *Sam.* 9. 15.

† טרם יגלה אליו דבר יהוה

πρὶν ἢ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτῷ ῥῆμα κυρίου, 1 *Sam.* 3. 7.

‖ נגלה יהוה אל שמואל

ἀπεκαλύφθη κύριος πρὸς Σαμουὴλ, 1 *Sam.* 3. 21. *Exod.* 3. 2.

But thoſe faithfull people to whom the Prophets ſpake, believed the ſame truth, & 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 *appear'd* unto *Moſes in a flame of fire out of the midſt of a buſh*, & there immediately revealed to him firſt himſelf ſaying, *I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Iſaac, & the God of Jacob*, & 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, & was fully ſatisfied that the Iſraelites ſhould be delivered, becauſe he was aſſured it was God who promiſed their deliverance: yet notwithſtand-

ing ſtill he doubted whither 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.* 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 affirme, that it was improbable they ſhould believe, except they were aſſured it was God who promiſed, or think that God had promiſed by *Moſes*, onely becauſe *Moſes* ſaid ſo. Which rationall objection was clearly taken away when God endued *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 in ſtead of a mouth*, and *Moſes* to *Aaron in ſtead of God*, *Aaron ſpake all the words which the Lord had ſpoken unto Moſes, and did the ſignes in the ſight of the people, and the people believed.* For being perſwaded 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*: *Moſes* as the immediate propounder, God as the originall revealer: they believed *Moſes* that God had revealed it, & 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 onely in the propoſition or application of the teſtimony; *Moſes* receiving it immediately from God himſelf,

Exod. 4. 1.

Exod. 4. 16.

Exod. 4. 30, 31.

Exo. 14. 31.

ſelf, the Iſraelites mediately by the miniſtry of *Moſes*.

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 deliver'd by man. *It was he* who *ſpake by the mouth of his holy Prophets which have been ſince the world began*: the *mouth*, the inſtrument, the articulation was theirs, but the words were Gods. *The ſpirit of the Lord ſpake by me*, ſaith *David*, *and his word was in my tongue*. It was the word of the Lord, which he ſpake *by the hand of Moſes*, and *by the hand of his ſervant Ahijah the Prophet*. The *hand* the generall inſtrument of man, the *mouth* the particular inſtrument of ſpeech, both attributed to the Prophets as merely inſtrumentall in their propheſies. The words which *Balaam's* aſſe ſpake were as much the aſſes words, as thoſe which *Balaam* ſpake were his; for *the Lord opened the mouth of the aſſe*, *and the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth*; and not onely ſo, but a bridle with that word, *onely 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 S. *Peter*, *that no propheſie of the ſcripture is of any* * *private interpretation*; that is, that no Propheſie 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 propheſie: but that all propheticall revelations came from God alone, and that whoſoever firſt delivered them was antecedently inſpired by him, as it followeth, *for the propheſie 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

Luke 1. 70.

2 *Sam.* 23. 2.

1 *Kin.* 8. 53.

1 *Kin.* 14. 18.

Numb. 22. 28.

Numb. 23. 5.

Numb. 22. 35.

2 *Pet.* 1. 20.

* ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως.

therefore which they delivered as 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.

Heb. 1.1. 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 dayes 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 *onely begotten Son, who was in the boſome of the Father, the expreſſe image of his perſon*, he in whom *it pleaſed the Father that all fulneſſe ſhould dwell*, he *in whom dwelleth all the fulneſſe of the Godhead bodily*, revealed the will of God to the Apoſtles, who being aſſured that 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 received them, and have known ſurely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didſt ſend me.* Beſide 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*, and *teach them all things, and bring all things into their remembrance whatſoever Chriſt had ſaid unto them.* So clearly, ſo fully, ſo conſtantly were they furniſh'd with divine illuminations & revelations from God, upon which they grounded their own faith; that each of them might well make that profeſſion of S *Paul*, *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.

Rev. 14.12. *Joh.* 1.18. *Heb.* 1.3. *Col.* 1.19. *Col.* 2.9. *Joh.* 16.30. *Joh.* 17.8. *Joh.* 16.13. *Joh.* 14.26. 2 *Tim.* 1.12.

But

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 mouthes, who ſo evidently wrought by their hands. They which heard S. *Peter* call a lame man unto his legs, ſpeake a dead man alive, and ſtrike a living man to death with his tongue, as he did *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, might eaſily be perſwaded 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.* 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 onely it was called theirs becauſe delivered by their miniſtery, 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 S. *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.* And this was the true foundation of faith in all them which believed, that they took not

Joh. 17. 20.

1 *Joh.* 1. 1. 3.

the words which they heard from the Apoſtles to be the words of the men which ſpake them, no more then 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
*Act.*13.44. word to the ſame God ſpeaking by them. When S. *Paul* preached at *Antioch, almoſt the whole city came together to hear the word of God*; ſo they eſteemed it, though they knew him a man whom they came to hear ſpeak it. This the Apoſtle commendeth in the *Theſſalonians*, that *when*
1 *Theſ.*2.13. 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*, 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 S. *Paul*, as he ſpeaks
2 *Theſ.*1.10. himſelf, *becauſe our teſtimony among you was believed.* 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 Apoſtolicall.* Which being thus clearly ſtated, we may at laſt deſcend into our own cõdition, & ſo deſcribe the nature of our own Faith, that every one may know what it is to *believe.*

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 doore 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 & their poſterity to all generations were obliged to believe the ſame truths. Where-
Acts 7. 37. fore it is obſervable which S. *Stephen* ſaith, *he received the lively oracles to give unto them*; the Decalogue he received from

from the hand of God, *written with the finger of God*, the rest of the divine pateſactions he wrote himſelf, and ſo delivered them not a mortall word to dy with him, but *living oracles* to be in force when he was dead, and oblige λόγια ζῶντα the people to a belief, when his Rod had ceas'd to broach the Rocks, and divide the Seas. Neither did he onely ty them to a belief of what he wrote himſelf, but by foretelling & deſcribing the prophets which ſhould be rais'd in future ages, he put a further obligation upon them to believe their propheſies 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?* 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 & the Prophets.* Joh. 5. 46, 47.

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 onely begotten of the Father*, although the A- Joh. 1. 14.
poſtles firſt converted thoſe unto the faith, who heard them ſpeak with tongues they never learn'd, they never heard before, & 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 wch 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 & 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 Mediatour 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*, 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 & the word which Jeſus had ſaid*. When Chriſt was aſcended up into heaven, and the Holy Ghoſt come down, when the words which Chriſt had taught the Apoſtles, were preached by them, and many thouſand 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 compleat 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 ſumme 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 S. *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*.

Joh. 15.15.

Joh. 2.22.

John. 20.31.

Thoſe Chriſtians then which have lived ſince the Apoſtles death, and never obtain'd the wiſh of S. *Auguſtine*, to ſee either Chriſt upon earth, or S. *Paul* in the pulpit, have

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 [a]*the houſhould of God is built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets*, who are continued unto us onely in their writings, and bythem 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.*

To *believe* therefore as the word ſtands in the Front of the *Creed*, and not onely 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 deceiv'd, 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, out of whoſe writings this brief ſumme of neceſſary points of Faith was firſt † collected. And as this is properly to *believe*, which was our firſt conſideration, ſo to ſay *I believe*, is to make a Confeſſion or externall expreſſion of the Faith, which is the ſecond Conſideration propounded.

Faith is an habit of the intellectuall part of man, and therefore of it ſelf inviſible, and to *believe* is a ſpirituall act, and conſequently immanent and internall, & known to no man but him who believeth: [b] *For what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the Spirit of a man which is in him?* Wherefore Chriſt being not onely the great Apoſtle

[a] *Eph.* 2. 20. *Prophetæ & Apoſtoli ſuper quos omnium Eccleſiarum fundamenta locantur. S. Hier. in Pſal.* 17. *Super Prophetas ædificatur orbis terrarum credenti in Domino. Ruff. ib.*

* *Durand. l.* 2. *Diſt.* 24. *q.* 1. *§.* 9. *Fides eſt habitus quo aſſentimus dictis Scripturæ propter authoritatem Dei revelantis.*

† Οὐχ ὡς ἔδοξέν τισιν ἀνθρώποις συνιστάσθαι τὴν τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς τὰ κατειλεγμένα συλλεχθέντα μίαν ἐναπλῶσαι ἔξιν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν. *Cyril. Catec.* 5. *Eccleſiarum Patres de populorum ſilua ſolliciti ex diverſis voluminibus Scripturarum collegerunt teſtimonia divinis gravida Sacramentis. Euſeb. Gall. in Symb.*

[b] 1 *Cor.* 2. 11.

sent to deliver these revealed truths, and so the authour of our faith, but also the head of the Church, whose body consisteth of faithfull members, and so the authour of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of faith, he must needs be imagin'd to have appointed some externall 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 acknowledgement of the truth, and a profession of faith, without which no entrance into the Church, no admittance to Baptism. [a] *What doth hinder me to be baptiz'd?* 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. [b] *For with the heart man believeth unto righteousnesse, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* The *belief* of the *heart* is the internall habit residing in the soul, and act of faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same; the *confession* of the *mouth* is an externall signification of the inward habit or act of faith, by words expressing an acknowledgement 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, [c] *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 salvation is compleated. [d] *If thou shalt confesse 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 presum'd to have, this *confession* of the *mouth* every one is known to make, when he pronounceth these words of the *Creed*, *I believe*;

[a] *Act.* 8. 36, 37.
[b] *Rom.* 10. 10. *Habes homo unde credere debeas, corde fit confessio ad justitiam, habes unde debeas confiteri, ore confessio fit ad salutem.* Chrysol. Serm. 56.
* *Sermo creat auditum, auditus concipit fidem, credulitatem parturit fides, confessionem credulitas nutrit, confessio perpetuam dat salutem,* Chrysol. Serm. 60
[c] *Matt.* 12. 34.
† *Magnum, filioli, per hoc fidei nostræ videmus esse compendium, quando inter cor & linguam totum salutis humanæ versatur & geritur Sacramentum.* Chrysol. Serm. 56. *Quod à te & pro te reposcitur, intra te est, i.e. oris famulatus & cordis affectus.* Euseb. Gall.
[d] *Rom.* 10. 9.

believe; and if true, he may with comfort say, [a] *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*, [b] *I have believed, therefore have I ſpoken.* Thus briefly from the ſecond Conſideration concerning Confeſſion implyed in the firſt words *I believe*, we ſhall paſſe unto the third Conſideration, of the neceſſity and particular obligation to ſuch a Confeſſion.

[a] *Rom.* 10. 8. *de hoc ſine dubio legimus per prophetam, prope eſt inquit, in ore tuo, & in corde tuo.* Euſ. Gall.

[b] *Pſal.* 116. 10.

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 it ſelf, but rather to deſire the light that it might appear, this were ſufficient to move us to a *Confeſſion* of our *Faith*. But beſide 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 expreſſe command to make a *Confeſſion* of the ſame; *Be ready*, ſaith S. *Peter*, *alwayes to give an anſwer to every man that asketh you a reaſon of the hope that is in you.* Secondly, 'tis 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* [c] together with it; and we know who it is hath ſaid, *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs me before men, him will I confeſſe 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 contein ſo much purity of doctrine, perſwade ſuch holineſſe of life, deſcribe God ſo infinitely glorious, ſo tranſcendently gracious, ſo loving in himſelf, ſo mercifull in his Son, ſo wonderfull in all his works, that the ſole confeſſion of it glorifieth God; and how can we expect to enter

[1] *Pet.* 3. 14.

[c] *Rom.* 10. 10. *Matt.* 10. 32.

into

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 ackowledging that faith which we are thought to believe, is so farre from giving God that glory which is due unto him, that it dishonoureth the faith which it refuseth or neglecteth to professe, and casteth a kind of contumely upon the authour 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, [a] *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.* Such a necessity there is of Confession of Faith, in respect of God, who commanded it, and is glorifi'd in it, in respect of our selves, who shall be rewarded for it, & in respect of our brethren, who are edified and confirmed by it. Which necessity the wisedome of the Church in former ages hath thought a sufficient ground to command the recitation of the *Creed* at the * first initiation into the Church by Baptisme, (for which purpose it was taught and expounded to those which were to be baptized, immediately † before the great solemnity of Easter) and to require a particular repetition of it publickly as often as the sacrament of the ‖ Eucharist was administred, and a constant and perpetuall inculcation of the same by the * ministers to the people.

And as this necessity is great, as the practice usefull and advantageous; so is the obligation of believing and confessing particular, binding every single Christian, observable in the number and person expressed, *I believe*. As if Christ did question 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) [b] *doest thou believe on the Son of God?* every single Christian is taught to make the same answer which he made, [c] *Lord, I believe*. As if the Son of God did promise to every one of them which are gathered

[a] Luk. 9. 26.
* Ambr. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 7.
† Concil. Tol. 2. Can. 46. Concil. Agath. cap. 13. Concil. Bracar. 2. Can. 1. Concil. 6. in Trul. Can. 78. Is appears in the ancient Greek Liturgies, and the decree of the third Council of Toledo, ut omni sacrificii tempore ante communionem corporis Christi & sanguinis, juxta Orientalium partium morem unanimiter clarâ voce sacratissimum fidei recenseant Symbolum.
* Concil. Moguntin. c. 45. Symbolum quod est signaculum fidei, & Orationem Dominicam discere semper admoneant sacerdotes populum Christianum.
[b] Jo. 9. 35.
[c] 38.

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*; each one for himſelf returneth his anſwer, *Lord, I believe Lord, help my unbeliefe*. Not that it is unlawfull or unfit to uſe another number, and inſtead of I, to ſay *we believe*, for taking in of others we exclude not our ſelves, and addition of charity can be no diſparagement to confeſſion of faith. S. *Peter* anſwered for the twelve, *We believe, and are ſure that thou art that Chriſt the ſon of the living God*. For though Chriſt immediately replied that *one of them had a devil*, yet is not S. *Peter* blam'd, who knew it not. But every one is taught to expreſſe his own faith, becauſe by that he is to ſtand or fall; *the effectuall fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much* 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 effectuall 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*.

Matth.9.17. 23. 24. Joh.6.69. Jam.5.16. Gal.2.20.

Having then 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 *confeſſe*, 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 eaſie for me to deliver, and for every particular perſon to underſtand what it is he ſayes, 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 naturall 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 they were endued with miraculous power from above, & immediately inſpired with the holy Ghoſt, & conſequently what they deliver'd was not the word of man, but of God himſelf; being God is of that univerſall knowledge and infinite wiſdome that it is impoſſible he ſhould be deceiv'd, of that indefectible holineſſe and tranſcendent rectitude, that it is not imaginable he ſhould intend to deceive any man, & 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 concerningly perſwaded of them, then of any thing I ſee or know. And becauſe that God who hath revealed them, hath done it not for my benefit onely, 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 & hath promiſed an eternall 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 perſwaſion I aſſent unto them, ſo with a fixed and undaunted reſolution I will profeſſe 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, reſolvedly ſay, *I believe.*

I believe

I believe IN GOD.

HAving deliver'd 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 generall as the former, and as univerſally concern'd in every *Article*, which is *God*: for if to *believe* be to aſſent upon the teſtimony of God, as we have before declar'd, 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, & 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 agnition of our *God*. If his * name were thought fit to be expreſs'd in the front of every action even by the heathen, becauſe they thought no action proſpered but by his approbation, much more ought we to fix it before our *Confeſſion*, becauſe without him to believe is no leſſe then a contradiction.

* Θεὸς, θεὸς, Ζεὺς ἦν ὅταν καταρχονται τινες θεὸς λέγειν ἐπιφωνημαζομένους. *Heſych. Lex.*

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 alwayes implying beſide a bare act of Faith, an addition of hope, love, and affiance. An obſervation as I conceive,

peculiar to the Latine Church, grounded upon the authority of * S. *Auguſtine.*

* *for* Serm 181. *which is upon the Creed, we finde theſe words.* Non dicit Credo Deum, vel credo Deo, quamvis & hæc ſaluti neceſſaria ſint. Aliud enim eſt credere illi, aliud credere illum, aliud credere in illum. Credere illi, eſt credere vera eſſe quæ 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* S. Auguſtine *be none of 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. Nunquam aliquis Apoſtolorum dicere auderet, qui credit in me; credimus Apoſtolo, ſed non credimus in Apoſtolum. *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 intereſt utrum quis credat ipſum eſſe Chriſtum, & utrum credat in Chriſtum. Ille credit in Chriſtum qui & ſperat in Chriſtum, & diligit Chriſtum. *De verbis Dom.* Serm. 61. *And which is the ſumme of all, he puts a high value upon the prepoſition, as if by virtue of the addition of* in *the phraſe did properly ſignifie ſo great an acceſſion unto faith.* Quid eſt credere in Deum? credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, & ejus membris incorporari. *Tract.* 29. in Joh. *Which doctrine of* S. Auſtin's *being taken notice of by* Peter Lombard, *hath ſince been continued by the Schoolmen; and* Aquinas, Sum. 2. 2æ. q. 2. a. 2. ad primum, *bringing all three under one act of Faith, hath been contradicted by* Durand. in 3. Sent. diſ. 23. q. 7. §. 6. Credere in Deum non eſt præciſe actus fidei, ſed fidei & charitatis ſimul, & ſunt etiam plures, & non unus actus tantum: *by whoſe ſubtil 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.*

Whereas among the Greeks in whoſe language the New Teſtament was penn'd, I perceive no ſuch diſtinction, and in the † Hebrew language of the Old, from which the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Greeks receiv'd that phraſe of *believing in,* it hath no ſuch peculiar and accumulative ſignification. For it is ſometimes attributed to God the authour and originall 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 materiall object of our Faith.

† *for* אמן *is ſometimes joyn'd with* ל *ſometimes with* ב; *when with* ל, *it anſwers properly to* πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ *credere Deo,* ל *being nothing elſe but a ſignificator of the caſe: when with* ב *it correſponds unto* πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, *credere in Deum,* ב *being a prepoſition of the ſame nature with* εἰς *or* in.

Among

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 faithfull, even for the act of juſtifying faith, והאמן ביהוה Gen. 15. 16. *it is tranſlated by the* LXX. ᾧ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, *not* εἰς Θεὸν, *and that tranſlation warranted by* S. Paul Ro. 4. 3. Gal. 3. 6. *and* S. James 2. 23. *Beſide, the ſame phraſe is uſed in the ſame place both to God and to man, as* Exod. 14. 31. ויאמינו ביהוה ובמשה עבדו and they believed in God, and in his ſervant *Moſes. which the Chaldee Paraphraſe explaineth thus,* והימינו במימרא דיוי ובנביאותא משה, and they believed (in) the word of God, and (in) the prophesie of *Moſes* his ſervant. *and* 2 Chro. 20. 20. האמינו ביהוה אלהיכם ותאמנו האמינו בנביאיו והצליחו. Believe in the Lord your God, ſo ſhall ye be eſtabliſhed; believe (in) his prophets, ſo ſhall ye proſper. *For although the Vulgar Latin which our Tranſlation followeth, hath made that diſtinction which the Hebrew maketh not,* Credite in Domino Deo veſtro, & ſecuri eritis; credite prophetis ejus, & cuncta evenient proſpera: *yet the Septuagint acknowlegeth no neceſſity of receding from the originall phraſe* ἐπιστεύσατε κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐμπιστευθήσεσθε· ἐπιστεύσατε ἐν τοῖς προφήταις αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐοδωθήσεσθε. *Neither is this onely ſpoken of* Moſes *and the Prophets, that the Iſraelites believ'd in them, but of* David, *not as a prophet, but as a bare relatour of his own actions.* 1 Sam. 27. 12. ויאמן אכיש בדוד. καὶ ἐπίστευθη Ἀχὶς ἐν Δαυίδ. Vulg. Et credidit *Achis* in *David. To conclude, this generall phraſe of* believing in, *is originally attributed ſometimes to the ſupreme authour of our faith, as to God, ſometimes to the intervenient meſſengers, as the prophets, ſometimes to the motives of our faith,* Pſal. 78. 32. ולא האמינו בנפלאתיו. LXX. καὶ οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν ἐν τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ. and they believed not for his wondrous works. *ſometimes to the object of it, or that which is believed, as* Pſal. 119. 66. במצותיך האמנתי. I have believed (in) thy Commandments.

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 acception, by which it is attributed to the materiall 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 reſpect of them nothing but an aſſent unto them as infallible truths. Neither can we conceive that the ancient Greek Fathers of the Church could have any further 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 Catholick 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, whither we look upon the originall 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 further real importance in the Creed in respect of God who immediately follows, then to acknowledge and assert his being or existence. Nor ought this to be imagin'd 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 fundamentall in respect of other truths, this is the † foundation even of the fundamentalls.

* S. Basil. πιστεύομεν ἓν καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν ἕνα μόνον ἀληθινὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν θεόν· καὶ ἕνα τὸν μονογενῆ υἱὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἓν μόνον πνεῦμα ἅγιον.

† Arrius *and* Eusebius *in their Confession delivered to* Constantine. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα, καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τῆ μέλλουσος αἰῶνος, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν ὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῆ θεῦ. Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* S. Cyril. *Hierosol.* Κατήχησις ιη' φωτιζομένων σχεδιαθεῖσα εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Epiph. *in Anc.* εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *and in a larger Confession,* πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας, καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, εἰς Βασιλείαν ὐρανῶν, καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

‖ Greg. *Nyssen.* calls them ἐννοιῶν περὶ θεῦ ὑπολήψις. *and* Eusebius *in his Confession exhibited to the Council of Nice, concludes,* Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τύπον ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρξειν πιστεύοντες: *signifying that every particular which he had rehearsed, he believed to be, and that was all in the Confession intended. So* Tertul. *de Præscript. adv. Hæret.* Regula est fidei illa qua creditur Unum omnino Deum esse, *and adv.* Praxeam. cap. 2. *where he makes another rehersall of his Creed, he begins with* Unicum quidem Deum credimus.

* Maimonides *de Fundam. Legis.* יסוד היסודות ועמוד החכמות לידע שיש שם מצוי ראשון והוא ממציא כל נמצא. *the foundation of foundations, and pillar of wisdomes is to know that the first being is, and that it giveth existence to every thing which is.*

For

† *Non eſt amor Dei Articulus neque etiam amor proximi, quia etiamſi ſint præcepta generalia activa, tamen cum actio contineatur non oportet eum conſtituere articulum, ſed iſta ſunt fidei dogmata quæ ſunt columnæ & fundamenta legis divinæ.* Iſ. Abravanel. *de Cap. Fidei.* c. 11.

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.* Heb. 11. 6. *Primus eſt Deorum cultus, Deos credere.* Sen.

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 our ſelves of the exiſtence of ſuch a Deity, and upon what grounds we apprehend him of ſuch a tranſcendent nature that he can admit no competitour: then may we be conceived to have ſufficiently explicated the former part of the firſt Article, then may every one underſtand what he ſayes, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he profeſſeth, *I believe in God.* 1 Cor. 8. 5.

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 ſtiled [a] *God of gods, the Lord our God is god of gods, and Lord of lords.* and in the ſame reſpect is called [b] *the moſt high God*, others being but inferiour or under him, and God *over* or *above all.* And 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. [d] *Then when ye knew not God*, ſaith S. *Paul*, *ye did ſervice to them which by nature are not gods.* There is then a God by nature, and others which are

a *Deut.* 10. 17. *Pſal.* 136. 2. *Dan.* 2. 47. *and* 11. 36.

b *Gen.* 14. 18. *frequently.*

c *Rom.* 9. 5. *Epheſ.* 4. 6. *Imprimis neceſſe eſt concedatis eſſe aliquem ſublimiorem Deum & mancipem quendam diviitatis qui ex hominibus Deos feceris.* Tertul. adv. Gentes.

d *Gal.* 4. 8.

are called Gods, but by nature are not ſo; for either they have no power at all, becauſe no being, but onely in the falſe opinions of deceived men, as the Gods of the Heathen, or if they have any reall 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 *onely hath immortality*, and conſequently onely divinity, and therefore the *onely true* † *God*. So that the Notion of a Deity doth at laſt expreſſely ſignifie a being or nature of infinite perfection, independent from any other, upon which all things elſe depend, and by which all things elſe are govern'd. 'Tis 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 independent; that it is that upon which all things which are made depend; and thirdly, that it governs all things.

* *Ego dixi, Dii eſtis, ſed in eo indulti nominis ſignificatio eſt, & ubi refertur, ego dixi, loquentis eſt potius ſermo quam rei nomen. S. Hilar. de Trin. l. 7.*

† *Deus plenæ ac perfectæ divinitatis eſt nomen. Hilar. de Trin. l. 11. Deus ſubſtantiæ ipſius nomen, id eſt, divinitatis. Tertul. adv. Herm.*

As for the exiſtence of ſuch a being, how it comes to be known unto us, or by what meanes 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 connaturall 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 connaturall knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it from the beginning, but to receive the firſt apprehenſions of things by ſenſe, and by them to make all rationall collections. If then the ſoul of man be at the firſt like a fair ſmooth table without any actuall characters of knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes ſucceſſively by ſenſation, inſtruction, and rationall collection; then muſt we not referre the apprehenſion of a Deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion. Again, although others do affirm, that the exiſtence of God is a truth

truth evident of it ſelf; ſo as whoſoever hears but theſe termes once named, that *God is*, cannot chuſe but acknowledge it for a certain and infallible truth upon the firſt apprehenſion; that as no man can deny that the whole is greater then any part, who knoweth onely 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 irrationall way of inſtruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth, that he muſt believe it becauſe 'tis evident unto him, when he knowes that he therefore onely doubts of it becauſe it is not evident unto him.

Although therefore that *God is* be of it ſelf an immediate, certain, neceſſary truth, yet muſt it be * evidenced and made apparent unto us, by its connexion unto other truths, ſo that the being of the Creatour may appear unto us by his Creature, & the dependency of inferiour entities lead us to a clear acknowledgement of the ſupreme & independent being. The wiſdome of the Jews thought this method proper; [a] *for by the greatneſſe and beauty of the creatures proportionably the maker of them is ſeen:* and not onely they, but S. *Paul* hath taught us, that [b] *the inviſible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made, even his eternall power and Godhead.* For if † *Phidias* could ſo contrive a piece of his own work, as in it to preſerve the memory of himſelf never to be obliterated without the deſtruction of the work, well may we read the great Artificer of the world in the works of his own hands, & by the exiſtence of any thing demonſtrate the firſt cauſe of all things. We finde by the experience of our ſelves, that ſome things in this world have a beginning before which they were not;

* *Hæc propoſitio Deus eſt quantum in ſe eſt, per ſe nota eſt, quia prædicatum 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 per ea, quæ ſunt magis nota quoad nos, & minus nota quoad naturam, ſcilicet per effectus.* Tho. Aqui. 1ª. p. q. 2. *Art.* 1.

a *Wiſd. of Sol.* 13. 5.

b *Rom.* 1. 20.

† *in the ſhield of Pallas.* Ariſt. *de Mundo.*

the account of the years of our age sufficiently inferre 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 it self. 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 it self, 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 it self 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, by which nothing will be made, both which are equally impossible. Something then we must confesse was never made, something which never had beginning. And although these effects or dependent beings singly considered by themselves do not inferre one supreme cause and maker of them all, yet the admirable order and connexion of things shew 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 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 finall Cause is no otherwise the cause of any thing then as it moves the efficient cause to work; from whence we cannot but collect a prime efficient Cause of all things, indued with infinite wisdome, who having a full comprehension of

* Ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτι γ' ἔστιν ἀρχή τις, οὐκ ἄν τις ἀντείποι· πᾶν δὲ ὄντων ἔστ' εἰς ἐνδυνασίαν, ὅτε καὶ οὐδὲν ἦν ὅλως. Arist. Metaph. l. 2. c. 1. *and again* εἶναι μὲν γὰρ ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον, δῆλως αἴτιον οὐκ ἦν ὅτι. ἢ πόθεν ἦν ὅλως εἰ ὅλως ἐστὶ θεός; ὃν τῶν τοῦ ὄντων συστάσεώς τε καὶ διαμονῆς. Justin. *Quæst. & Resp. ad Græcos.*

of the ends of all, deſigned, produced, and diſpoſed all things to thoſe ends.

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 indued with reaſon, can thereby apprehend the goodneſſe 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 naturall agents whoſe operations flow from a bare inſtinct, can be directed in their actions by any counſell 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 naturall 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 counſell 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 wayes 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 wiſdome, then what proceeds from any thing of humane underſtanding. What then can be more clear, then that thoſe naturall agents which work conſtantly for thoſe ends which they themſelves cannot perceive, muſt be directed by ſome high and overruling Wiſdome? and who can be their directour 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 farre the imitation of nature, that if it were not in the artificer, but † in the thing it ſelf which by Art is framed, the works of Art and Nature would

* ὁν ὅσοις τέλος τί ὄντι, τύχῃ ἕνεκα προϊέναι τὸ πρόσφορον καὶ τὸ ἐφικτὸν, ἀκοῦσαι ὡς πρακτέον), ὅτῳ πέφυκε· καὶ ὡς πέφυκεν ἂν μὴ ἐμποδίζῃ, ὅτῳ πρακτέον) ἕκαστον, πρακτέον καὶ ἕνεκά του, καὶ πέφυκεν ἕκαστα τοῦτο ἕνεκα. Ariſt. phyſ. l. 2. c. 8.

† ἄτοπον τὸ μὴ οἴεσθαι ἕνεκα τοῦ γίνεσθαι, ἐὰν μὴ ἴδωσι τὸ κινοῦν βουλευόμενον· καὶ τοῖς καὶ τύχῃ ἃ βουλεύεται· καὶ δὴ εἰσὶν οὐ τῷ ξύλῳ ἡ ναυπηκὴ ὁμοίως ἂν τῇ φύσει ἔσται. Ariſt. ib.

would be the ſame. 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 forme, 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 then by nature they were made, that is the Maker of all things to all naturall 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 univerſall Commonwealth, the Generall of all the hoſts of heaven and earth. By theſe wayes as by the † teſtimony of the creature, we come to finde an eternall and independent Being, upon which all things elſe depend, and by which all things elſe are governed, and this we have before ſuppoſed to be the firſt notion of *God*.

* καθόλου ὁ μὲν ἐν νηὶ κυβερνήτης, ἐν ἅρμασι ἡνίοχος, ἐν χορῷ ὁ χορηγὸς &c., ἐν πόλει ὁ νόμος, ἐν στρατοπέδῳ ὁ ἡγεμών· τοῦτο θεὸς ἐν κόσμῳ. Ariſt. *de Mun.*

† *Habet Dominus teſtimonium totum hoc quod ſumus, & in quo ſumus.* Tertul.

Neither is this any private collection or particular ratiocination, but the publick and univerſall reaſon of the world. ‖ No age ſo diſtant, no countrey 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 Atheiſme no where, but rather by their miſcellany Deities at *Rome*, which grew together with their victories, they ſhewed 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 cuſtomes of the people be much different, and their manner of religion holds 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. So much of the *Creed* hath been the generall *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 we give

‖ ἀρχαῖός τις λόγος καὶ πάτριός ἐστι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὡς ἐκ Διὸς τὰ πάντα, καὶ Διὸς ἡμῖν σωθῆναι. Ariſt. *de Mundo.*

* *Nulla gens uſquam eſt adeo contra leges moreſque profecta, ut non aliquos Deos credat.* Sen.

of

of ſo univerſall a conſent? or how can it be imagined, that all men ſhould * conſpire to deceive themſelves and their poſterity?

* *Nec in hunc furorem omnes mortales conſenſiſſent alloquendi ſurda numina & inefficaces Deos.* Seneca.

Nor is the reaſon onely generall, and the conſent unto it univerſall, but God hath ſtill preſerved and quickened the worſhip due unto his name, by the pateſaction 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 ſeverall free cauſes to the production of an effect, we may be ſure that certain and infallible predictions are clear divine pateſactions. 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 Propheſie, 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 Gods 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 compaſſe of the power of any naturall agent, if any thing be wrought by the intervention of a body which beareth no proportion to it, or hath no naturall aptitude ſo to work, it muſt be aſcribed to a Cauſe tranſcending all naturall cauſes and diſpoſing all their operations. Thus every Miracle proves its authour, and every act of omnipotency is a ſufficient demonſtration of a Deity. And that man muſt be poſſeſſed with a ſtrange opinion of the weakneſſe of our fathers, and the teſtimony of all former

ages, who ſhall deny that ever any Miracle was wrought.

Pſal. 44. 1. *We have heard with our eares, O God, our fathers have told us what works thou didſt in their dayes, in the times*

72. 18. *of old. Bleſſed be the Lord God who onely doth wondrous works.*

Nor are we onely informed by the neceſſary dependency of all things on God, as effects upon their Univerſall cauſe, or his externall patefactions unto others, and the conſentient acknowledgement of mankind; but every particular perſon hath a particular Remembrancer in himſelf, as a ſufficient teſtimony of his Creatour, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of Conſcience in all men,

Rom. 2. 15. by which their *thoughts* are ever *accuſing or excuſing them*, they feel a comfort in thoſe vertuous actions which they finde 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 a 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 perſwaſion 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 onely 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 perſwaſions, 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 then ſuppoſeth an opinion of a Divinity, and that man which moſt peremptorily denieth Gods exiſtence, is the greateſt Argument himſelf that there is a God. Let *Caligula* profeſſe himſelf an Atheiſt, and with that profeſſion hide his head, or run under his bed, when the thunder ſtrikes his eares, and lightning flaſhes in his eyes; thoſe terrible works of nature put him

in

in mind of the power, and his own guilt of the juſtice of God, whom while in his wilfull 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. Onely 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 S. *Paul* to the philoſophers of *Athens* was, that *they might feel after him and finde him.* Some children have been ſo ungracious as to refuſe to give the honour due unto their parent, but never any ſo irrationall 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 off-ſpring.*

* *Hæc eſt ſumma delicti, nolle agnoſcere quem ignorare non poſſis.* S. Cypr. *de Idol. Van.*

Act. 17. 27, 28.

Act. 17 28.

And therefore we ſhall alwayes finde all nations of the world more prone unto Idolatry then to Atheiſme, and readier to multiply then 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 Atheiſme. Secondly *in God* excluſively, not in Gods, againſt Polytheiſme and Idolatry. And that the Unity of the Godhead is included in this Article is apparent, not onely becauſe the *Nicene* Council ſo expreſſed it by way of expoſition, but alſo becauſe this Creed in the † Churches of the Eaſt, before the Council of *Nice* had that 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 plurall, to ſuch as were more vulgar and triviall. *Unto thee it was ſhewed,* ſaith *Moſes* to Iſrael, *that thou*

† *Orientales Eccleſiæ omnes iſta tradunt. Credo in uno Deo patre omnipotenti.* Ruff. *in Symb.*

‖ Eu. in præp. Evang. *the paſſage is yet extant in the Epiſtles of* Plato.

Deut. 4. 35.

thou mightest know that the Lord he is God, there is none else beside him. & as the Law, so the Gospel teacheth us the same, *we know that an Idol is nothing in the world, and that*
1 Cor. 8. 4. *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 then 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.

For first the nature of God consists in this, that he is the prime and originall cause of all things, as an independent being upon which all things else depend, and likewise the ultimate end or finall cause of all; but in this sense two prime causes are inimaginable, & for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings then one, is a clear contradiction. This primity God requires to be attributed to himself, *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Is-*
Isa. 48. 12. *rael my called. I am he, I am the first, I also am the last.* And from this primity he challengeth his Unity; *Thus*
44. 6. *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 then 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 the divine nature, able to convince us, yet were the consideration of his supreme Dominion sufficient to perswade

perſwade us. The will of God is infinitely free, and by that freedome 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*, ſaid *Nebuchadnezzar* out of his experience; and S. *Paul* expreſſeth him as *working all things after the counſel of his own will*. If then there were more ſupreme governours of the world then one, each of them abſolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the ſame thing, then 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 then many, 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.

Dan. 4. 35.

* τὰ ὅλα ὐ ζέ-λει τὴν πολυ-κοιρανίαν· ἐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυ-κοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος. *Ariſt. Metaph.* l. 12. c. *ult.*

† *unus omnium Dominus eſt Deus: neq; enim illa ſublimitas poteſt habere conſortem, cum ſola omnem teneat poteſtatem.* S. Cypr. de Idol. Vanit.

Without this acknowledgement Religion cannot ſubſiſt, 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 the Religion 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.

Exod. 20. 3.

‖ Moſes Maimon *de Fund. legis*. 6. 3.

This is the true reaſon of that ſtrict precept by which all are commanded to give divine worſhip to *God onely*. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou ſerve*; becauſe he alone is God: him onely ſhalt thou fear, becauſe he alone hath infinite power; in him onely ſhalt thou truſt, becauſe he *onely is our rock and our ſalvation*; to him alone ſhalt thou direct thy devotions, becauſe *he onely knoweth the hearts of the children of men*. Upon this foundation the whole heart of man is intirely required of him and engaged to him. *Hear O Iſrael, the Lord our God is one God: And* (or rather *therefore*) *thou ſhalt love*

Matth. 4. 10. Pſal. 62. 2. 2 Chron. 6. 30. Deut. 6. 4, 5.

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 chuſe but challenge our love upon the ground of an infinite excellency, and tranſcendent beauty of holineſſe; and therefore if there were more ſo Gods then one, our love muſt neceſſarily be terminated unto more then one, and conſequently divided between them, and as our love, ſo alſo the proper effect thereof, our cheerfull and ready obedience, which like the child propounded to the judgement of Solomon, as ſoon as tis 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.* 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, and included in one ‖ *Article.*

* Numerus divinitatis ſummæ ratione conſtare deberet, vel quoniam & cultura ejus in anceps deduceretur. Ecce e. duos intuens Deos tam pares quam duo ſummа magna; quid facerem ſi ambos colerem? vererer ne abūdantia officii ſuperſtitio potius quam religio crederetur. quia duos tam pares & in altero ambos poſſem in uno demereri. hoc ipſo teſtimonium præſtans paritati & unitati eorum, dum alterum in altero venerarer, dum in uno mihi duo ſunt. *Tertul.* adv. *Marcion.* l. 1. c. 5. *Matth.* 6. 24.

† *When* Leo *Biſhop of* Rome *in an Epiſtle to* Flavianus *had written theſe words,* Fidelium univerſitas profiteatur credere ſe in Deum patrem omnipotentem, & in Jeſum Chriſtum filium ejus, *One of the Eutychians objected with this Queſtion,* Cur non dixerit in *unum* Deum patrem, & in *unum* Jeſum. juxta Nicæni Decretum Concilii? *to which* Vigilius *Biſhop of* Trent *gives this anſwer,* Sed Romæ & antequam Nicæna Synodus conveniret à temporibus Apoſtolorum uſque ad nunc ita fidelibus Symbolum traditur, nec præjudicant verba ubi ſenſus incolumis permanet: magis enim cum D. J. Chriſti ſententia hæc fidei profeſſio facit dicentis, *Creditis in Deum, & in me credite,* nec dixit in *unum* Deum patrem, & in *unum* meipſum. Quis enim neſciat unum eſſe Deum & unum J. Chriſtum filium ejus? *Vigil.* l. 4. *con. Eutych.*

‖ Rab. Chaſdai in Or Adonai. R. Joſeph Albo in Hikkarim.

Now God is not onely *One*, but hath an *Unity* † peculiar to himſelf, by which he is the *Onely* God; and that not onely by way of actuality, but alſo of poſſibility. Every Individuall 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;

† אלוה זה אחד הוא ואינו לא שנים ולא יותר על

שנים אלא אחד שאין כיוצרה אחר מן האחרים הנמצאים בעולם לא

so

אחד במין שהוא כוללאחדים הרבה : ולא אחד בגוף שהוא נחלק
למחלקות ולקציות אלא אחד שאין ייחוד אחד כמותו בעולם:

God is one, not two, or more then two, but onely One; whose Unity is not like to that of the Individualls of this world, neither is he one by way of Species comprehending many individualls, neither one in the manner of a body which is divisible into parts and extremes: but he is so one, as no Unity like his is to be found in the world. Moses Maim. de Fundam. Legis.

Quod autem diximus Orientis Ecclesias tradere unum Patrem Omnipotentem, & unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed universitate: verbi gratia, si quis dicat unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit, potest enim & alius homo esse, & tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus & tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri sed universitatis est nomen. Ut si exempli causa dicamus unum solem, hic unus ita dicitur ut alius vel tertius addi non possit; multo magis Deus cum unus dicitur, unus non numeri sed universitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est qui propterea unus dicatur, quod alius non sit. *Russi. in Symb.*

so as there is neither third nor second sun: 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 intrinsecall and essentiall 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 beside me: that they may know from the rising of the Sun, and from the West, that there is none beside 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 beside 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 eternall, that they might know thee the onely true God:* * as certainly *one* as *God*.

Isa. 45. 5, 6. *Deut.* 4. 35. 32, 39. *Psal.* 18. 31. *Isa.* 45. 18, 21. 22. *Isa.* 44. 8. *John* 17. 3.

* Veritas Christiana districte pronunciavit, Deus si non unus est non est: quia dignius credimus non esse, quodcunque non ita fuerit ut esse debebit: *Tertul. adv. Marcion.* l. 1. c. 2. Deus cum sum-

magnum sit, recte veritas nostra pronunciavit, Deus si non unus est, non est. Non quasi dubitemus esse Deum, dicendo, si non unus, non est Deus; sed quia quem confidimus esse, idem definiamus esse, quod si non est Deus, non est, summum scilicet magnum. Porro summum magnum unicum sit necesse est, ergo & Deus unicus erit non aliter Deus, nisi summum magnum, nec aliter summum magnum nisi parem non habens, nec aliter parem non habens nisi unicus fuerit. *ibid.*

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 cleerly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he sayes 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 *eternall power and Godhead*, and the dependency of all limited beings inferre 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 universall and overruling wisedome; being this collection is so evident, that all the Nations of the earth have made it, being God hath not onely written himself in the lively characters of his creatures, but hath also made frequent patefactions of his Deity, by most infallible predictions, and supernaturall operations; therefore I fully assent unto, freely acknowledge, and cleerly professe this truth, that *there is a God*.

Again, being a prime and independent Being supposeth all other to depend, and consequently no other to be God, being the intire 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

all actuall or poſſible multiplication of a Deity, *I believe in God.*

I believe in God the FATHER.

AFter the Confeſſion of a *Deity*, and aſſertion of the Divine *Unitie*, the next Conſideration is concerning Gods *Paternity*; for that *one God is Father of all*, and *to us there is but one God, the Father.* *Eph.4.5.* *1 Cor.8.6.*

Now, although the Chriſtian notion of the divine Paternity be ſome way peculiar to the Evangelicall pateſaction, yet * whereſoever *God* hath been acknowledged, he hath been underſtood and worſhipped as a *Father*: the very heathen † Poets ſo deſcribe their Gods, and their vulgar names did carry *father* ‖ in them, as the moſt popular and univerſall notion.

* Omnem Deum qui ab homine colitur neceſſe eſt inter ſolennes ritus & precationes *Patrem* nuncupari. Non tantum honoris gratia, ſed & rationis: & quod antiquior eſt homine, & quod vitam, ſalutem, victum præſtat ut pater. Itaque & Jupiter à precantibus Pater vocatur; & Saturnus, & Janus, & Liber, & cæteri deinceps: *Lactan. de ver. Sap.* l.4. c.3.

† *That ſo frequent in* Homer, πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, eundemque appellans dicit *Ennius*, Divumque hominumque pater rex: *Varr. de* L.L. *l.* 4. *as* Servius *obſerves of* Virgil, à Poeta pene omnibus Diis nomen paternum additur, ut fiant venerabiliores: *and before him* Lucilius. Vt nemo ſit noſtrum quin pater optimus Divûm. Ut Neptunus pater, Liber, Saturnus pater, Mars, Janus, Quirinus pater nomen dicatur ad unum. *Lactan. ib.*

‖ *as* Jupiter, *which is* Jovis pater, *or* Ζεὺς πάτωρ, *otherwiſe* Dieſpiter, *or* Διὶς πάτωρ, *and* Marſpiter, *of whom* Servius, apud Pontifices Marſpiter dicitur: *Æne.* l.3. *So* Semipater *for* Semo, *and* Σαρδοπάτωρ *for* Sardus *the proper Deity of* Sardinia: *Ptolem.*

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 ſeverall acts, of the ſame nature with Generation properly taken, or by conſequence attending on it: ſo the Title of *Father* is given unto divers perſons or things, and for ſeverall 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 *Gen.2.4.*

the heavens and the earth, saith *Moses.* So that the Creation or production of any thing by which it is, and before was not, is a kind of generation, and consequently the Creator or Producer of it a kinde 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 expressely, as the Maker, so the Father of it. and thus a *to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things*; to which the words following in the Creed may seem to have relation, *the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.* But in this Masse 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 rationall and intellectual offspring of the Deity. Of merely naturall beings, and irrationall agents he is ‖ the Creator, of rationall, as so, the Father also; they are his creatures, these his sons. Hence he is stiled the b *Father of Spirits,* and the blessed Angels, when he laid the foundations of the earth, his sons, c *When the morning starres sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy*; hence Man whom he created after his own image, is called his d *offspring,* and *Adam* the immediate work of his hands, e *the son of God*; hence may we all cry out with the Israelites taught by the Prophet so to speak, f *Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?* Thus the first and most universal notion of Gods Paternity in a borrowed or Metaphoricall sence is founded rather upon Creation then procreation.

Again

Job 38.28. * τίνος γάρ ἐστι πατὴρ ὑετὸς ὁ πηλὸς ὁ τῆς δρόσου; ἢ τίνος ὠδῖνες ἐξέβησαν κρύσταλλον; Severus in Job.

† Plutarch of Plato calling God πατέρα πάντων καὶ ποιητὴν, ἔοικεν τῇ μεταφορᾷ χρώμενος, ὥσπερ εἴωθε, τὸν αἴτιον πατέρα τῆς κόσμου κλῆσιν. Platon. Quæst. & Alcimus. πατὴρ δ' ὅτι πᾶς αἴτιος ἐστὶ πάντων.

a 1 Cor. 8.6.

‖ So Plutarch answers the Question, why Plato termes God the Maker and Father of all things. Ἡ μὲν θεῶν καὶ γενητὴν καὶ ἀνθρώπων πατέρα ὅτι ποιητὴς ἦν καὶ δημιουργὸς ἁπάντων; Father of Gods and men, Maker of things inanimate and irrationall. ἐὰν γὰρ χρῆται φησὶ Χρύσιππος πατέρα καλεῖν τὸν σπείραντα τὸ σπέρμα καὶ τὸν ἐν τῷ σπέρματος γεγονότα. Non enim agri patrem, si Chrysippo credimus, is dicitur qui eum conseyit, quanquam è semine deinde fruges nascantur: as the Latine

Translation most absurdly: for there is neither corn nor field nor any seed belonging to them in the words of Plutarch. *But* χοριον (*not* χωριον) *is the* Secunda, *the coat (or rather coats in the acception of* Chrysippus, *and the language of those times) in which the* fœtus *is involved in the mothers wombe. Though therefore both the* Secunda *and the* Fœtus *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 endued with life and reason, and the other not.* b *Heb.* 12. 9. c *Job* 38. 7. d *Acts* 17. 29. e *Luke* 3. 37. f *Malach.* 2. 10.

Again, Redemption from a ſtate of miſery, by which a people hath become worſe then nothing, unto a happy condition, is a kind of *Generation*, which joyned 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 quailes and manna, unto their milk and hony, *Is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and eſtabliſhed thee?* Well might God ſpeak unto the ſame people as to *his ſon even his firſt-born*, *Thus ſaith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the wombe, 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 wombe.* And juſt is the acknowledgement made by that people inſtructed by the Prophet, *Doubtleſſe 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.* And thus another kinde of paternall Relation of God unto the ſons of men is founded on a Reſtitution or temporall Redemption.

Deut. 32. 6. *Exod.* 4. 22. *Iſa.* 44. 24. 46. 3. *Iſa.* 63. 16.

Beſides, if to be born cauſeth a 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 mothers wombe*, nor paſſe through the ſame doore into the Scene of life again; yet we believe and are perſwaded

ded that *except a man be born again, he cannot ſee the kingdome of God.* A double birth there is, and the world conſiſts of two, the firſt and the ſecond man. And though the incorruptible ſeed be the word of God, and the diſpenſers of it in ſome ſenſe may ſay, as S. *Paul* ſpake unto the *Corinthians, I have begotten you through the Goſpel*: 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.* Thus *whoſoever believeth that Jeſus is Chriſt, is born of God*: which regeneration is as it were a ſecond creation, *for we are Gods workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works.* 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 Gods ſtead?* And if he onely openeth the wombe, who elſe can make the † ſoul to bear? Hence hath he the name of Father, and they of ſons, who are born of him; and ſo from that internall act of ſpirituall regeneration another title of Paternity redoundeth unto the Divinity.

Nor is this the onely ſecond birth, or ſole Regeneration in a Chriſtian ſenſe; the ſoul which after its naturall 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.* The Reſurrection of our bodies is a kind of coming out of the womb of the earth, and entring 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*, and then as ſons, *they become heirs, coheirs with Chriſt, receiving the promiſe and reward of eternall inheritance. Beloved, now we are the ſons of God*, ſaith S. *John*, even in this life by regeneration, *and it doth not yet appear*, or, it hath not been yet made

Joh. 3. 3.

* Totum hominum genus quodammodo ſunt homines duo, primus & ſecundus. *Proſp.*

1 *Cor.* 4. 15.

James 1. 18.

1 *John* 5. 1.

Epheſ. 2. 10.

Gen. 30. 1, 2.

† ὁ γὰρ αὐτὴ θεῶ ἐγώ εἰμι ᾧ μόνῳ δυναμένῳ τὰς ψυχὰς μήτρας ἀνοίγνυναι, καὶ κλείειν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀρχὰς, καὶ ποιεῖν ἐγκύμονας καὶ πικτώσας τὰ κρυπτά. *Philo de Allego.*

Matth. 19. 28.

Luc. 20. 35, 36.

Rom. 8. 17.

Col. 3. 24.

Heb. 9. 15.

1 *Joh.* 3. 2.

καὶ οὔπω ἐφανερώθη.

made manifeſt, *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 it ſelf 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.* Why may not then a ſecond kind of *Regeneration*, be thought a fit addition of this paternall relation? 1 Pet. 1. 3, 4.

Neither is there onely a naturall, 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, taken in the generall † ſignification. Although therefore many wayes God be a father, yet leaſt 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. Whereas God doth it not for his own, but for our ſakes; nor is the advantage his but ours.

* Cai. *Inſt.* 1. 1. §. 1. *Adoptio naturæ ſimilitudo eſt, ut aliquis filium habere poſſit, quem non generavit.* τί ὅστιν υἱοθεσία; νομίμη πρᾶξις μιμουμένη τὴν φύσιν πρὸς παίδων παρεμυθίαν ὀνομαζομένη; Theoph. *Inſt.* 1. t. 11.

† Ἡ υἱοθεσία Ῥωμαϊκῇ φωνῇ λέγεται ἀδοπτίων· αὕτη ἔστι γνησίων ὄνομα οἷς νόμοι δικαιοῦσι, οἷς ἀδροχαπόνα, ᾗ τὴν ὁμώνυμον ἀδοπτίονα. Theoph. *ibid.*

‖ Cai. *Inſt.* 1. *Tit.* 1. §. 4. *Spadones autem qui generare non poſſunt, adoptare poſſunt, & licet filios generare non poſſint, quos adoptaverunt filios habere poſſunt.* Ulp. *tit.* §. 6. *Hi qui generare non poſſunt, velut ſpado, utroque modo poſſunt adoptare. Idem juris eſt in cœlibe.* Theoph. *tit.* 11. τυχὸν ἂν ἔχοι τις παῖδας διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐλθεῖν ὁπὶ γάμων, ἢ ἐλθεῖν μὲν, μὴ παιδοποιῆσαι δὲ, ἢ παιδοποιῆσαι μὲν, ἀποβάλλεσθαι δ' τέκνα, τὸ δὲ τῆς φύσεως ἐλάττωμα ἢ τὸ ξυμβὰν ξυστύχημα βουλόμενος ἐπικουφίσαι ἔλαβεν εἰς υἱοθεσίαν τινά Leonis Novel. 27. τοῖς ἀνυχεῖσιν ἀπαιδίαν λύειν βουλόμενος τὸ ξυστύχημα νόμος υἱοθετεῖσθαι παρεσκεύασε, ᾗ γνώμη ἐκείνου κἀκεῖνος, ὃν μὴ ὑπῆρχον λαβεῖν παρὰ τῆς φύσεως.

1 *John* 3.1. *Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God.* that we the sons of disobedient and condemned *Adam* by naturall 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 [a] *unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, on whom all the* * *family of heaven and earth is named*, and be made partakers of [b] *the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the Saints.* For as in the legall adoption, the Father hath as † full and absolute power over his adopted son, as over his own issue: so in the spirituall, the adopted sons have a clear and undoubted right of inheritance. He then who hath [c] *predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself*, hath thereby another kind of paternall relation; and so we receive the [d] *Spirit of adoption, whereby we crie Abba Father.*

2 *Eph.* 3.15. * In alienam familiam transitus, *is the description in* Agellius *l.* 5.19. Cum in alienam familiam inq; liberorum locum extranei sumuntur, aut per prætorem fit, aut per populum. quod per prætorem fit, adoptio dicitur; quod per populum, arrogatio. *ib.*

b *Eph.* 1.18.

† *As appears out of the Form of Rogation yet extant in this manner.* Velitis, jubeatis, Quirites, uti *Lucius Valerius Lucio Titio* tam jure legeque Filius sibi fiet, quam si ex eo patre matreque familias ejus natus esset, utique ei vitæ necisque in eo potestas sit, uti patri endo filio est? *ib.* c *Eph.* 1.5. d *Rom.* 8.15.

The necessity of this faith *in God* as in *our Father* appeareth, first in that it is the ground of all our filiall fear, honour, & obedience due unto him upon this relation. *Honour thy Father is the first Commandement with promise*, written in tables of stone with the finger of God: &, *Children obey your parents in the Lord*, is an Evangelicall precept, but founded upon principles of reason and justice; *for this is right*, saith S. *Paul*. And if there be such a rationall and legall obligation of honour and obedience to the *fathers of our flesh*, how much more must we think our selves obliged 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 mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear, saith the*

Eph. 6.1,2.

Malach. 1.6.

Lord

Lord of hoſts? If we be heirs, we muſt be coheirs with Chriſt; if ſons, we muſt be brethren to the onely 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.* 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*; what obedience muſt be due, what ſubjection muſt be paid unto the father of the family?

Matth. 12. 50.

1 Tim. 3. 4.

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, [a] *when ye pray, ſay, Our Father.* This prevents all *vain repetitions* of our moſt earneſt deſires, and gives us full ſecurity to cut off all tautology; for [b] *our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him.* This creates a clear aſſurance of a grant without miſtake of our petitions: [c] *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?*

[a] Luke 11. 2.

[b] Matth. 6. 8.

[c] Mat. 7. 8, 9, 10. ἀιτῇ πέτρας. ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσει, μὴ ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ ὄφιν; εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν. *Zenob.* Οὐ δεῖ αἰτεῖν παῦρα σοφὸν ὄντα. *Græc. Lycophron.*

Again, this *paternity* is the proper foundation of our Chriſtian patience; ſweetning 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:* they, as an argument of

Heb. 12. 9, 10. Quod ſi à Domino nonnulla creditimus incuti, cui magis parendum quam Domino

præbeamus? Quin iosuper gratulari & gaudere nos docet dignatione divinæ castigationis. Ego, inquit, quos diligo, castigo. O servum illum beatum, cujus emendationi Dominus instar, cui dignatur irasci, quê admonendi dissimulatione non decipi! *Tertul. de Pat.*

their authority, He, as an assurance of his love: they, that we might acknowledge them to be our parents, He, that he may perswade 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, then to see in every stroak 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 impatiency even in the sharpest corrections, [a] 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 rejoyce in the midst of thy greatest sufferings, when thou knowest that he which striketh pittieth, he which afflicteth is as it were afflicted with it? [b] *for like as a father pittieth his children, so the Lord pittieth them that fear him.*

a *Deut.* 8. 5.
b *Psal.* 103. 13.

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 * generall notion of Generation but the production of the like; 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 accidentals, or the likeness in † figure or ‖ affections. [c] *Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image.* 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 onely that we bear some likeness in our actions and affections. [d] *Be ye therefore followers*, saith the Apostle, or rather imitators, *of God, as dear children.* What he hath revealed of himself, that we must expresse within our selves. Thus God spake unto the

* παῦ τὸ γεννῶν ὅμοιον ἑαυτῷ γενέσθαι. *Epiph. Hær.* 76. 6.

† τὸ ὅμοια γεννᾶν πῶς γεννήσαν τὰ ἄκρα ὕλου. *Arist. de Gen. Animal.* l. 1. c. 19.

‖ Fortes creantur fortibus & bonis. Est in juvencis, est in equis patrum Virtus, nec imbellem feroces Progenerant aquilæ columbam. *Horat. Od.* c *Gen.* 5. 3. d *Ephes.* 5. 1. μιμηταί. Filii hominum sunt quando male faciunt; quando bene, filii Dei. *Aug. in Psal.* 52.

chil-

children of *Israel*, whom he ſtiled his ſon, a *Ye ſhall be holy, for I am holy.* And the Apoſtle upon the ſame ground ſpeaketh unto us, as to *obedient children*, b *As he that hath called you is holy, ſo be ye holy in all manner of converſation.* It is part of the generall beneficence and univerſall goodneſſe of our God that c *he maketh his ſun to riſe on the evil and on the good, and ſendeth rain on the juſt and on the unjuſt.* Theſe impartial beams and undiſtinguiſhing ſhowers are but to ſhew us what we ought to do, and to make us fruitfull in the works of God; for no other reaſon Chriſt hath given us this command, *Love your enemies, bleſſe 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 upon this ground, but, d *Be ye therefore mercifull as your Father is mercifull.*

a Lev. 11. 44. and 19. 2. and 20. 7.

b 1 Pet. 1. 15.

c Mat. 5. 44, 45 vide S. Aug. in Pſalm. 100.

d Luke 6. 36. Similitudinem patris actus indicent ſobolis: ſimilitudo operis ſimili udinem indicet generis: actus nomen confirmet, ut non en genus demonſtret. Aug. de Temp. Ser. 76.

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.

But although this be very neceſſary, yet is it not the principall or moſt proper explication of Gods 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. e *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 originall 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 farre we are the ſons of God, as we

e *Joh.* 20. 17. ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν. *Had πατέρα in both places had its article, there would have ſeemed two fathers: had the article been prefixed to* πατέρα ὑμῶν, *he would have ſeemed firſt ours, then Chriſts. but being prefixed to* πατέρα μου, *it ſhews God to be principally and originally Chriſt's, and by our reference unto him, our father.* πατέρα μου μὲν κατὰ φύσιν ὸν τῇ θεότητι, καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν διὰ χάριν ὸν τῇ ὑοθεσίᾳ. *Epiphan.* Hæreſ. 69. §. 55. οὐκ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν· ἀλλὰ διελὼν οὐ καὶ εἶπεν πρῶτον τὸ οἰκεῖον, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου, ὅπερ ἦν κατὰ φύσιν· εἶτ' ἐπανάγων καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν, ὅπερ ἦν κατὰ θέσιν. S. *Cyril.* Catech. 7.

are like unto him; and our ſimilitude unto God conſiſteth in our conformity to the likeneſſe 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 joynt 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 are we no longer a *ſervants, but* now *Sons; and if Sons, then heirs of God,* but ſtill *through Chriſt.* 'Tis true indeed, b that *both he that ſanctifieth,* that is Chriſt, *and they who are ſanctified,* that is faithfull Chriſtians, are all of one, the ſame father, the ſame God; *for which cauſe he is not aſhamed to call them brethren*: yet are they * not all of him after the ſame manner, nor the c *many Sons* like the *Captain of their ſalvation.* 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 dependance on his Sonſhip, as given unto him; d *Behold I and the children which God hath given me*; as being ſo by faith in him. e *For we are all the children of God by faith in Chriſt Jeſus,* as receiving the right of ſonſhip from him. f *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 diſparitie in the filiation, we muſt make as great a difference in the coreſpondent relation. There is one degree of ſonſhip founded on Creation, and that is the loweſt, as belonging unto all, both good and bad: another degree above that there is grounded upon Regene-

Rom. 8. 29.

Heb. 1. 2.
Gal. 4. 4, 5, 6.
Hoc facit Deus ex filiis hominum filios Dei, quia ex filio Dei fecit Deus filium hominis. S. *Aug.* in *Pſal.* 52.
a *Galat.* 4. 7.
b *Heb.* 2. 11.
* Dicimur & filii Dei, ſed ille aliter filius Dei. S. *Aug.* in *Pſal.* 88. Ἐγὼ οἶδα ὁ Θεὸς πολλῶν μὲν κατὰ χάριν ποιητικῶς πατὴρ, ἑνὸς δὲ μόνου φύσει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ. S. *Cyril. Hieroſ. Catech.* 7.
c *Heb.* 2. 10.
d *Iſa.* 8. 18. *Heb.* 2. 13.
e *Gal.* 3. 26.
f *John* 1. 12.
‖ Ergo nemo in filiis Dei ſimilis erit filio Dei. Et ipſe dictus eſt filius Dei, & nos dicti ſumus filii Dei: Sed quis erit ſimilis Domino in filiis Dei? Ille unicus, nos multi. Ille unus, nos in illo unum. Ille natus, nos adoptati: Ille ab æterno filius unigenitus per naturam, nos à tempore facti per gratiam. S. *Aug. Pſa.* 88.

ration,

ration, or Adoption, belonging only to the truly faithfull 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, [a] *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 other three degrees of filiation;) and therefore hath called God after a peculiar way [b] *his own father.* And ſo at laſt we come unto the moſt ſingular and eminent paternal relation, [c] *unto the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is bleſſed for evermore*; the *Father* of him and of us, but not the Father of us as † of him. Chriſt hath taught us to ſay, *Our Father*: a *forme* 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 conjoyning us as to diſtinguiſh, though ſo diſtinguiſhing as not to ſeparate us.

1 *John* 3. 2.

* *Rom.* 8. 32. Ut magnificentia Dei dilectionis ex comparationis genere noſceretur, non peperciſſe Patrem proprio filio ſuo docuit. Nec usquam pro adoptandis adoptato, neque pro creatis creaturæ: ſed pro alienis ſuo, pro connunciparis proprio. *Hilar.* l. 6. *de Trin.*

a *Mat.* 3. 17. *and* 17. 5.

Anne tibi in eo quod dicitur, Hic eſt, non hoc ſignificare videtur: alios quidem cognominatos ab eo filios; ſed hic filius meus eſt. Donavi adoptionis pluribus nomen; ſed iſte mihi filius eſt? *id.*

b *Joh.* 5. 18. πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν. as *Rom.* 8. 32. ὃς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο. c. 1. 2 *Cor.* 11. 31. † Non ſicut Chriſti pater, ita & noſtri pater. Nunquam enim Chriſtus ita nos conjunxit, ut nullam diſtinctionem faceret inter nos & ſe. Ille enim filius æqualis patri, ille æternus cum patre, patrique coæternus. Nos autem facti per filium, adoptati per unicum. Proinde nunquam auditum eſt de ore Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, cum ad diſcipulos loqueretur, dixiſſe illum de Deo ſummo patre ſuo, Pater noſter; ſed aut Pater meus dixit, aut Pater veſter; uſque adeo ut quodam loco poneret hæc duo; *Vado ad Deum meum,* inquit, & *Deum*

indeed

vestrum. Quare non dixit Deum nostrum? & patrem meum dixit, & patrem vestrum, non dixit nostrum. Sic jungit ne distinguat, sic distinguit ut non sejungat. Unum nos vult esse in se, unum autem patrem & se. S. *August.* in *Joan. Tract.* 21.

Indeed I conceive this, as the most eminent notion of Gods Paternity, so to be the originall 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 it self, 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.* From this sacred forme of Baptisme, did the Church derive the * Rule of Faith, 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,* [a] *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.* And before that, the Samaritans, [b] *when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdome of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women.* For as in the *Acts* of the Apostles there is no more expressed then that they

Mat. 28. 18, 19.

* Atius and Euzoius, *in their Creed delivered to* Constantine: Τὴν τὴν πίστιν παρειλήφαμεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐναγχ λέων, λέγοντος τῷ κυρίῳ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς, πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. *Socrat.* l. 1. c. 26. *And upon the exhibiting this Confession of faith, they were restored to the Communion of the Church by the Synod of Jerusalem.* Sozom. l. 2. c. 27. *In the same manner* Eusebius *delivered his Creed unto the Council of* Nice, *concluding and deducing it from the same text,* καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς φησι, πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε, &c. *Socrat.* l. 1. c. 8. *Theodor.* l. 1. c. 12. *The same is also alledged by the Council of* Antioch, *under the Emperour* Constantius, *and Pope* Julius. *Socrat.* l. 2. c. 10. *Vide* S. Athanas. *in Epist. ad Ubique Orthod. Orat. contra Gregales* Sabellii, *& contra* Arianos, *ex Deo Deus. vide* Basil. *de Sp. S.*

a *Act.* 8. 36, 37. b v. 12.

baptized

baptized *in the name of Jeſus Chriſt*: ſo is no more expreſſed of the faith required in them who were to be baptized, then 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 rendred, 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 practiſe 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 expreſſe recitation, profeſſion or acknowledgement of the Creed. From whence this obſervation is properly deduceable; That in what ſenſe the name of *Father* is taken in the

Act. 2. 38. and 8. 16. and 10. 48. and 19. 5.

* ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῆ ὃν ἐαυτῷ κατέχων ὃν διὰ τῦ βαπτίσματος ἔλαβε. *Irenæus*, l. 1. c. 1.

Cum ſub tribus & teſtatio fidei & ſponſio ſalutis pignorentur, neceſſario adjicitur Eccleſiæ mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id eſt, Pater, Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Eccleſia, quæ trium corpus eſt. *Tertull.* de *Baptiſ.* In quem tingeret? in pœnitentiam? quo ergo illi præcurſorem? in peccatorum remiſſionem, quam verbo dabat? in ſemetipſum, quem humiliare celabat? in Spiritum Sanctum, qui nondum à Patre deſcenderat? in Eccleſiam, quam nondum Apoſtoli ſtruxerant? *Id.* Dehinc ter mergimur, amplius aliquid reſpondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. *Id. de Cor. Militis.* Sed & ipſa interrogatio quæ fit in Baptiſmo teſtis eſt veritatis. nim cum dicimus, *Credis in vitam æternam, & remiſſionem peccatorum per Sanctam Eccleſiam?* Intelligimus remiſſionem peccatorum non niſi in Eccleſia dari. *S. Cyprianus*, Ep. ad *Januarium*, &c. Quod ſi aliquis illud opponit, ut di-

cat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Eccleſia teneat, eodem Symbolo quo & nos baptizare, eundem noſſe Deum Patrem, eundem filium Chriſtum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propterea uſurpare eum poteſtatem baptizandi poſſe, quod videatur in interrogatione baptiſmi à nobis non diſcrepare: ſciat quiſquis hoc opponendum putat, non eſſe unam nobis & Schiſmaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remiſſionem peccatorum, & vitam æternam per Sanctam Eccleſiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant Eccleſiam. *Idem Epiſt. ad Magnum.* Mos ibi (i. e. *Romæ*) ſervatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam Baptiſmi ſuſceputi ſunt, publice, id eſt, fidelium populo audiente, Symbolum reddere *Ruffin. in Symb.* Solenne eſt in lavacro, poſt Trinitatis confeſſionem interrogare, *Credis in Sanctam Eccleſiam? credis remiſſionem peccatorum?* S. Hieron. *contra Luciferi.* Mens hæretica reliquit Doctorem à quo fidem Eccleſiæ didicerat, oblita eſt pacti Dei ſui, hoc eſt, fidei ipſius Dominicæ quæ in Symbolo continetur, quam ſe die baptiſmatis ſervaturum eſſe promiſerat. *Id. Comm. in Prov.* Interrogatus es, *Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem?* dixiſti, Credo, & merſiſti, hoc eſt, ſepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, *Credis in Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum & in crucem ejus?* dixiſti, Credo, & merſiſti, ideo & Chriſto es conſepultus. Tertio interrogatus, *Credis in Spiritum Sanctum?* dixiſti, Credo; tertio merſiſti: ut multiplicem lapſum ſuperioris ætatis abſolveret trina confeſſio. *Ambroſ. de Sacram.* l. 2. c. 7. Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καθηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν. Euſeb. *of the confeſſion of faith which he exhibited to the Council of* Nice. *Socr.* l. 1. c. 8. *Theodor.* l. 1. c. 12. Abrenuncio, inquis, Diabolo, pompis, ſpectaculis, & operibus ejus; & quid poſtea? *Credo*, inquis, *in Deum Patrem omnipotentem.* Salvianus, *de Gubern. Dei.* l. 6. *And when this Creed was enlarged by the Council of* Nice, *and after that by others,* Epiphanius *commends it to the* Catechumeni, *to be repeated at their Baptiſme;* ὅπως ἑκάστῳ τῶν καθηχυμένων τῶν μελλόντων τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ παρσιέναι, ἑνὸς μόνου ἀπαγγέλλειν ὁρίζεται τὸ πιστεύειν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν ἰδίοις ἐν κυρίῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ διδάσκειν ῥητῶς, ὡς πάντων ἡ αὐτὴ μητὴρ ὑμῶν ἡ καὶ ἡμῶν, τὸ λέγειν, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, &c. *Epiph. in Ancorato. And when he had yet further enlarged it by reaſon of ſome new emergent hereſies, he commends it,* μάλιστα τοῖς τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ προσιοῦσιν, ἵνα ἀπαγγέλλωσι καὶ λέγωσιν ὕστερος. *Ib. The firſt Council of* Conſtantinople *confirms the* Nicene *confeſſion as* προσευρέτην ἐσκυ καὶ ἀκόλουθον τῷ βαπτίσματι. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. *and the Council of* Chalcedon *of the ſame,* ἵν', ὡς κοινὸν ἐξ ἁγίων σώσημα, τοῖς μυουμένοις περὶ τὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως παρεγγυῶμεν ἀσφάλειαν. Parte tertia, *the Synod at* Hieruſalem, τὸ ἅγιον Σύμβολον εἰς ὃ ἐβαπτίσθημεν καὶ βαπτίζομεν. *the Synod at* Tyre, ἐν ἀντῷ βαπτισθέντες καὶ βαπτίζοντες. *and the Council of* Conſtantinople *under* Menna, *to which the former ſent their Synodical Letters,* τὸ ἅγιον Σύμβολον ἐν ᾧ πάντες ἐβαπτίσθημεν. *Concil.* Conſtantinop. *ſub* Agap. & Menna. *Act.* 5. Baſiliſcus & Marcus *in two ſeveral Edicts, confirmed the ſame* Nicene *Creed with theſe words,* εἰς ὃ ἡμεῖς καὶ πάντες οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πιστεύσαντες ἐβαπτίσθημεν. *Euagr.* l. 3. c. 4. & 7. *and the Edict of the Emperour* Juſtinian, *Anathematizaverunt eos qui aliam definitionem fidei, ſive Symbolum, ſive Mathema tradunt accedentibus ad ſanctum baptiſma.*

Forme

Forme of Baptiſme, in the ſame it alſo ought to be taken in this Article. And being nothing can be more clear, then 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 joyned with his; and ſo 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 explication of the firſt words of the Creed is this; *I believe in God the Father of Chriſt Jeſus.*

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 Originall, but alſo from the very letter of the Creed, which teacheth us to *believe in God the 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.

Pater cum audis, Filii intellige patrem, qui filius ſupradictæ ſit imago ſubſtantiæ. *Ruff. in Symb.*

Now as it cannot be denied that God may ſeverall wayes be ſaid to be the Father of Chriſt: Firſt, as he was begotten by the Holy Ghoſt of the Virgin Mary; Secondly, as he was ſent by him with ſpeciall authority, as the King of Iſrael; Thirdly, as he was raiſed from the dead, out of the womb of the earth unto immortall life, and made heir of all things in his fathers houſe: So muſt we not doubt but, beſide all theſe, God is the Father of

Luke 1.35. *John* 10.35, 36. *and* 1.49. *Act.* 13.32,33.

John 1. 1.

that Son in a more eminent and peculiar manner, as he is and ever was with God, and God: which ſhall be demonſtrated fully in the ſecond Article, when we come to ſhew how Chriſt is the onely-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 coæval with his eſſence: ſo that we are not to imagine one without the other; but as we profeſſe him alwayes God, ſo muſt we acknowledge him *alwaies *Father*, and that in a ſarre more † proper manner then the ſame title can be given to any Creature. Such is the fluctuant condition of humane 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 ‖ proper, becauſe fixed, the Father having never been a Son, the Son never becoming Father.

* ἅμα γὰρ ὅτι θεὸς ὁ υἱὸς ἅμα πατὴρ· οὐχ ὑστερίζουσα ἔχων τὸ εἶναι τὴν γέννησιν, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ τὸ εἶναι πατὴρ καὶ ὑφεστῶς, καὶ γούμενος. S. Cyril. *Dial. de Trin.* 2.

Πατὴρ ἀεὶ πατὴρ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν χρόνος ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ πατὴρ πατήρ. Epiph. *Hæreſ.* 62.

Sicut nunquam fuit non Deus, ita nunquam fuit non Pater, à quo filius natus. *Gennad. de Eccleſ. Dogm.* c. 1. Credimus in Deum, eundem confitemur Patrem, ut eundem ſemper habuiſſe filium nos credamus. *Chryſol. Serm.* 59. Inſit Deo pietas, eſt in Deo ſemper affectio, paternitas permanet apud illum: ſemper ergo filium fuiſſe credas, ne patrem ſemper non fuiſſe blaſphemes. *Id. Serm.* 62. Advertite, quod cum Dei Patris nomen in Confeſſione conjungit, oſtendit quod non ante Deus eſſe cœperit, & poſtea pater, ſed ſine ullo initio & Deus ſemper, & pater eſt. *Aug. de Temp. Serm.* 132. † Deus ſolus propriè verus eſt pater, qui ſine initio & ſine pater eſt; non enim aliquando cœpit eſſe quod pater eſt, ſed ſemper pater eſt, ſemper habens filium ex ſe genitum. *Fauſtinus, lib. contra Arrianos.* ὁπὶ τῆς θεότητος μόνης ὁ πατὴρ κυρίως ὁ πατήρ ἐστι, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς κυρίως υἱός ἐστι. καὶ ὁπὶ τούτων ὑ μόνων ἔσχε τὸ πατὴρ ἀεὶ πατὴρ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ υἱὸς ἀεὶ υἱὸς εἶναι. S. Athanaſ. *Diſp. contra Arr.* ‖ ἐπὶ μόνης τῆς θεότητος τὸ πατὴρ καὶ τὸ υἱὸς ἔσχηκε, καὶ ἔστιν ἀεί. Ἦν μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων οἱ πατὴρ λεγόμενοι τινες, ἀλλ' ἕτερος γέγονεν υἱός, καὶ οἱ υἱὸς λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἕτερος λέγεται πατήρ· ὥστε ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὴ σώζεσθαι κυρίως τὸ παῖδος καὶ υἱὸς ὄνομα. S. Athan. Tom. 1. πατὴρ κυρίως.

A further

ὅτι μὴ χ᾽ υἱὸς· ὥσπερ χ᾽ υἱὸς κυρίως, ὅτι μὴ χ᾽ πατήρ. τὰ γὸ ἡμέτερα ὐ κυρίως, ὅτι χ᾽ ἄμφω. Greg. N. z. Orat. 35.

A further 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 onely 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 likeneſſe being the ſimilitude of * ſubſtance, where is the neareſt identity of nature, there muſt be alſo the moſt proper generation, & 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, a *Be fruitfull, and multiply, and repleniſh the earth*, begetteth a ſon b *in his own likeneſſe, after his image*, that is, of the ſame humane nature, of the ſame ſubſtance with him (which if he did not, he ſhould not according to the benediction multiply himſelf of 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 accidentall diſparity can imaginably conſiſt with that identity?

* Etiamſi filius hominis homo in quibusdam ſimilis, in quibuſdam ſit diſſimilis patri; tamen quia ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ eſt, negari verus filius non poteſt; & quia verus eſt filius, negari ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ non poteſt. S. *Aug.* l. 3. *cont. Max.* c. 15. *vide Tho. Sum.* p. 1. q. 33. a. 2. *ad quart.*

a *Gen.* 1. 28.

b *Gen.* 5. 3.

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 above 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 priviledge or ‖ priority

* αὐτὸ τὸ ὄνομα τῦ πατρὸς μεῖζόν ἔστι Ƒ υἱῦ. Syn. *Sardic.* Theodor. l. 2. c. 8. Inſinuatur nobis in Patre auctoritas, in filio nativitas. S. *Aug.* † τὸ μὲν ἀγωνίζεσθαι παρὶ ὀικεῖον ἀξίωμα φυλαχθῆναι, μηδένα τῦ εἶναι αὐτῷ τὸν ἄπατον λέγοντας. Alexand. *apud* Theodoret. l. 1. c. 4. ‖ ἡμεῖς con-

δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸν τῆς αἰτίου παρὰ τὰ ἐξ ἀυτῆς χρήσιν, προτετάχθαι τῷ ἰῷ τὸν πατέρα φαμέν, κατὰ δὲ τῆς φύσεως διαφορὰν οὐκέτι. S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 1.

consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater then the essence or attributes of the other, for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in both: but onely 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*, that he *liveth by him*, that the *father gave him to have life in himself*, 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 then I*, 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

John 7. 29.
John 6. 57.
John 5. 26.
John 14. 28.
μείζων ἐστὶν, ὡ μεγέθει νοὶ, ὡδὲ χρόνῳ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἐξ αὐτῆ τῆ πατρὸς γέννησιν. S. Athanas. contra *Arrianos*, l. 2. Λοιπὸν τοίνυν κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον ὑποπῖπτα τὸ μεῖζον λέγεσθαι. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆ πατρὸς ἡ ἀρχὴ τῷ ἰῷ, καλὰ τῆτο μείζων ὁ πατὴρ. ὡς αὐτος φησὶν ἀρχή. διὸ καὶ κύριος εἶπεν, ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστὶ, καὶδὲ παλὴρ δηλονότι. τὸ δὲ πατὴρ τί ἄλλο ζημαίνει; ἢ ὑκὲ τὸ αἴτια εἶναι καὶ ἀρχὴ τῆ ἐξ αὐτῆ γεννηθέντος; S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 1. τὸ μεῖζον μὲν ὅτι τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἴσον τῆς φύσεως. Nazian. Orat. 36. & Orat. 40. ὃ καλὰ τὴν φύσιν τὸ μεῖζον, κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν δὲ. vide Epiph. in Ancor. c. 17. εἰ δέ λέγοι τις μείζονα εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καθὸ αἴτιον τῆ ἰῆ, ὐδὲ τῆτο ἀνθιρῶμεν. S. Chrys. Homil. in Joan. 75. Idco totum quod habet, quod potest, non tribuit sibi, sed Patri, quia non est à seipso, sed à Patre. Æqualis est enim Patri, sed hoc quoque accepit à Patre. S. Aug. Epist. 66. Necesse est quodammodo prior sit qua Pater sit. Quoniam antecedat necesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habens originem, quia nascitur. *Novatianus.* Major itaque Pater filio est, & plane major, cui tantum donat esse, quantus ipse est, cui innascibilitatis esse imaginem sacramento nativitatis impertit, quem ex se in forma sua generat. S. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 9. Non præstantem quenquam cuiquam genere substantiæ, sed subjectum alterum alteri nativitate naturæ: Patrem in eo majorem esse quod Pater est, Filium in eo non minorem esse quod filius sit. Id. de Synod. contra *Arrianos*. Quis Patrem non potiorem confitebitur ut ingenitum à genito, ut Patrem à filio, ut eum qui miserit ab eo qui missus est, ut volentem ab ipso qui obediat? & ipse nobis testis est, *Pater major me est*. Id. de Trin. l. 3. In eo quod in se sunt Dei, ex Deo divinitatem cognosce; in eo vero quod *Pater major* est, confessionem paternæ autoritatis intellige. Id. l. 11. *And before*

only

all theſe, Alexander *Biſhop of* Alexandria; τὸ δὲ ἀχώνητον τῷ παρὰ μόνου ἰδίωμα παρεῖναι δοξάζοντες, ἅτε δὴ ἐξ αὐτῆς φάσκοντες τῆς ζωῆς, ὁ πατὴρ μὲν μείζων μὲν ἐστί. Theodor. *Hiſt.* l. 1. c. 4. *Laſtly, we have the Teſtimony of* Phœbadius, *that many of the ancient Fathers ſo expounded it.* τὴν ὁ πατὴρ μὲν μείζων μέν ἐστι τῇ ἐναγγελίᾳ φωνὴν, διαφόρως ὁι πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐξηλήφασιν. ὁι μὲν γὰρ φασι τῷ αἰτίῳ μείζονα εἰρῆσθαι. *Epiſt.* 176. Æqualis Patri, ſed major Pater, quod ipſe dedit ipſi omnia, & cauſa eſt ipſi Filio ut ſit, ut iſto modo ſit. *Victor. Afer* l. 1. *Pater* inquit *major me eſt.* merito major, quia ſolus hic auctor ſine auctore eſt. *Phœbadius.*

only hath it of himſelf, and is the original of all power and eſſence in the Son. *I can of mine own ſelf do nothing,* ſaith our Saviour, because he is not of himſelf; & whoſoever receivs 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 not power of himſelf, but what the Father gave; and being he gave him all the power, as communicating his entire & 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 any thing then 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

John 5. 30, 19.

* Quicquid filius habet ut faciat, à Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet à Patre ut faciat? quia à Patre habet ut filius ſit; quia à Patre habet ut poſſit; quia à patre habet ut ſit. S. *Aug.* Tract. 20. in *Joan.*

† Non alia potentia eſt in filio, & alia ſubſtantia; ſed ipſa eſt potentia quæ ſubſtantia: ſubſtantia ut ſit, potentia ut poſſit. Ergo quia Filius de Patre eſt, ideo dixit, *non poteſt Filius à ſe facere quicquam*; quia non eſt filius à ſe, ideo non poteſt à ſe. *Ibid.* Totum quod eſt, de Patre eſt; totum quod poteſt, de Patre eſt; quoniam quod poteſt & eſt, de Patre totum eſt. *Ibid.* Non poteſt, Filius à ſe facere quicquam, niſi quod viderit Patrem facientem: quia de Patre eſt totus Filius, & tota ſubſtantia & potentia ejus ex illo eſt qui genuit eum. *Id. Tract.* 21. Et primum Filium cognoſce, cum dicitur, Non poteſt Filius à ſe facere quicquam, niſi quod viderit Patrem facientem. Habes nativitatem Filii, quæ ab ſe nihil poteſt facere niſi videat. In eo autem quod à ſe nihil poteſt, innaſcibilitatis admit errorem. Ab ſe enim non poteſt poſſe nativitas. *S. Hilar.* de *Trin.* l. 7. Dum non à ſe facit, ad id quod agit ſecundum nativitatem ſibi Pater autor eſt. *Id.* l. 11. Autorem diſcrevit, cum

the

ait, Non poteſt à ſe facere: Obedientiam ſignificat, cum addit, Niſi quod viderit Patrem facientem. *Id. de Synod.*

*Jer.*10. 10. the living. *The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlaſting King*, ſaith the Prophet *Jeremy*. and S. *Paul* putteth the *Theſſalonians* in mind, how they 1 *Theſ.* 1. 9. *turned from idols to ſerve the living and true God.* Now life is otherwiſe in God then in the creatures: in him originally, in them derivatively; in him as in the fountain of abſolute perfection, in them by way of dependance and participation: our life is in him, but his is in himſelf; and *Jo.*5.26.*Sicut habet Pater vitam in ſemetipſo, ſic dedit & filio vitam habere in ſemetipſo. ut hoc ſolum interſit inter Patrem & filium, quia* * *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 onely with this difference, the Father giveth it, and the Son receiveth it. From whence he profeſſeth of himſelf, that *the living Father ſent him, and that he liveth* ‖ *by the Father.*

Pater habet vitam in ſemetipſo quam nemo ei dedit, Filius autem habet vitam in ſemetipſo quam Pater dedit. S. *Aug. Tract.* 19. *in Job.* Incommutabilis eſt vita filii ſicut & Patris, & tamen de Patre eſt: & inſeparabilis eſt operatio patris & filii; ſed tamen ita operari Filio de illo eſt, de quo ipſe eſt, id eſt, de Patre. *Id. de Trin.* l. 2. c. 1. † Sicut habet, dedit; qualem habet, dedit; quantam habet, tantam dedit. *Id.* contra *Maxim.* l. 3. c. 14. Ergo quod dicitur *dedit filio*, tale eſt ac ſi diceretur, genuit filium, generando enim dedit. Quomodo enim dedit ut eſſet, ſic dedit ut vita eſſet, et ſic dedit ut in ſemetipſo vita eſſet. *Id. Tract.* 22. in *Job.* Tali confeſſione originis ſuæ indiſcretæ naturæ perfecta nativitas eſt. Quod enim in utroque vita eſt id in utroque ſignificatur eſſentia, & vita quæ generatur ex vita, id eſt, eſſentia quæ de eſſentia naſcitur, dum non diſſimilis naſcitur ſcilicet, quia vita ex vita eſt, tenet in ſe indiſſimilem naturam originis ſuæ, quia & natæ et gignentis eſſentiæ, id eſt, vitæ quæ habetur et data eſt ſimilitudo non diſcreper. S. *Hilar.* de *Synod.* adverſ. *Arrianos.* Quia ergo apparet vita Patris hoc eſſe quod ipſe eſt; ſicut habet vitam in ſe, ſic dedit: hic dedit Filio habere vitam, id eſt, ſic eſt eſſe Filii, ſicut eſſe Patris. *Vigil. Africanus Diſput.* In vita naturæ & eſſentiæ ſignificatio eſt, quæ ſicut habetur, ita data eſſe docetur ad habendum. S. *Hilar. ib.* ‖ Propter Patrem vivit Filius, quod ex Patre Filius eſt: propter Patrem, quod eructatum eſt verbum ex Patris corde, quod à Patre proceſſit, quod ex paterno generatus eſt utero, quod fons Pater Filii eſt, quod radix Pater Filii eſt. S. *Ambroſ. de Fide*, l. 4. c. 5.

We

We muſt not therefore ſo farre endeavour to involve our ſelves in the darkneſſe of this myſtery, as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Father; whoſe pre-eminence undeniably conſiſteth in this, that he is God not of any other, but of himſelf, and that there is no other who is God, but is God of him. 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. 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.

* Pater de nullo patre, Filius de Deo Patre. Pater quod eſt, à nullo eſt; quod autem Pater eſt, propter Filium eſt. Filius vero & quod filius eſt, propter Patrem eſt, & quod eſt, à Patre eſt. S. *Aug.* Tract. 19. in *Joh.* Filium dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem autem Deum tantum, non de Deo. Unde manifeſtum eſt quod Filius habet alium de quo ſit, & cui Filius eſt; Pater autem non filium de quo ſit habeat, ſed cui Pater ſit. Omnis enim filius de patre eſt quod eſt, & patri filius eſt: nullus autem pater de filio eſt quod eſt, ſed filio pater eſt. *Id. de Trin.* l. 2. c. 1. Filius non hoc tantum habet naſcendo ut Filius ſit, ſed omnino ut ſit. *Ib.* l. 5. c. 14. Filius non tantum ut ſit Filius, quod relative dicitur, ſed omnino ut ſit, ipſam ſubſtantiam naſcendo habet. *Ibid.* c. 15. Pater non habet patrem de quo ſit, Filius autem de Patre eſt ut ſit, atque ut illi coæternus ſit. *Ib.* l. 6. c. 10. *Ab ipſo*, inquit, *ſum*; quia filius de Patre, & quicquid eſt filius, de illo eſt cujus eſt filius. Ideo Dominum Jeſum dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo: & dicimus Dominum Jeſum lumen de lumine, Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, ſed tantum lumen: ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, *Ab ipſo ſum*. *Ib.* Tract. *in Joh.* 31. Pater non eſt ſi non habeat Filium, & 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, & Deus de Patre. *Id.* Tract. 30. *in Joh.* Hoc tamen inter Patrem & Filium intereſt, quia Pater à nullo hoc accepit, Filius autem per generationem omnia Patris accepit. *Ambr.* in Epiſt. *ad Eph.* c. 7. Eſt ergo Deus Pater omnium, inſtitutor & creator, ſolus originem neſciens. *Novat. de Trinit.* c. 31. *whereas he ſpeaks after of the Son*, Eſt ergo Deus, ſed in hoc ipſum genitus, ut eſſet Deus. Pater eſt Deus de quo Filius eſt Deus, de quo autem Pater nullus eſt Deus. S. *Aug.* 66.

Upon this preeminence (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* himſelf, as well as thoſe whom he therefore named ſo, becauſe as the *Father ſent him, ſo ſent he them:* 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, there being an *authority in that name which ſeems inconſiſtent with this miſſion. In the Parable [a] *a certain houſholder 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:* it had been inconſiſtent even with the literall ſenſe of an hiſtoricall parable, as not at all conſonant to the rational cuſtomes 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 [b] *ſpake at ſundry times and in divers manners*; but *in the laſt dayes he ſent his Son:* and it were as † incongruous and inconſiſtent with the divine generation, that the Son ſhould ſend the Father into the world. [c] *As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father*, 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. [d] *For I am from him, and he hath ſent me*, ſaith the Son: from whom I received my eſſence by communication, from

Heb. 3. 1.

Jo. 20. 21.

* Solus Pater non legitur miſſus, quia ſolus non habet authorem à quo genitus ſit, vel à quo procedat. Et ideo non propter naturæ diverſitatem, ſed propter ipſam authoritatem, ſolus Pater non dicitur miſſus: non enim ſplendor aut fervor ignem, ſed ignis mittit ſive ſplendorem ſive fervorem. *S. Aug. cont. Serm. Arrian.* c. 4.

Qui mittit, poteſtatem ſuam in eo quod mittit oſtendit.

S. Hilar. l. 8. a *Mat.* 21. 33. b *Heb.* 1. 1. † Si voluiſſet Deus Pater per ſubjectam creaturam viſibiliter apparere, abſurdiſſime tamen aut à Filio quem genuit, aut à Spiritu Sancto qui de illo procedit, miſſus diceretur. *S. Aug. de Trin.* l. 4. cap. ult. c *Jo.* 6. 57. d *Jo.* 7. 29. ‖ Filius eſt igitur à Patre miſſus, non Pater à Filio, quia Filius eſt à Patre natus, non Pater à Filio. *Fulgent.* l. 8. *cont. Fabianum, in Collect. Theodul. de S. S.* Quis autem Chriſtianus ignorat quod Pater miſerit, miſſuſq; ſit Filius? Non enim genitorem ab eo quem genuit, ſed genitum à genitore mitti

him

oportebat. *S. Aug. contra Maxim.* l. 3. c. 14. Ubi audis, *ipse me misit*, noli intelligere naturæ dissimilitudinem, sed generantis authoritatem. *Id. Tract.* 31. in *Joh.* Ἐνταῦθα ἴσον ὁ ἀποστέλλας καὶ ὁ ἀποστελλόμενον, ἵνα δείξῃ τῆς πάντως ἐγγενῶν μίαν εἶναι τὴν θεότητα, τιτίστι τὸν Πατέρα. Epiph. *Hæres.* 69. 54. *Hence the language of the Schools*, Missio importat processionem origis, *as* Thom. Aquin. 1°. q. 43. ar. 1. ad primum; *or* authoritatem principii, *as* Durand. l. 1. dist. 15. q. 1.

him also received I this commission. As therefore it is more worthy to give then to receive, to send then 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 S. *John* with this addition, a *the Father (which sent me) is greater then I.* He then is that b *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 S. *John, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.*

† Λέγουσι δὲ τὸ ῥητὸν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ κακῶς ἑρμηνεύοντες, ὅτι ὁ ἀποστείλας με πατὴρ μείζων μού ἐστι, saith Epiphanius *of the Arrians; and answering, grants in these words which follow,* καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἀποστείλας με πατὴρ φάσκει, καὶ οὐχ ὁ κτίσας με. Hær. 69. 53. *To the same purpose* Athanas. *de Hum. Nat. Suscep. &* Cyril. *Thesau.* l. 11. *read it* ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ. *and S.* Basil *makes* Eunomius *read it so, in his first book against him, and with that addition answers it. So the second Confession of the Council of* Sirmium, *both in the* Latin *original, and* Greek *Translation.* S. Hilar. *de Syn.* S. Athanas. & Socr. l. 2. c. 3. a *Jo.* 14. 28. b *Gal.* 4. 4.

Again, the dignity of the Father will further 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 S. *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 later part of which is nothing but an addition unto his constant Benediction;) 2 Cor. 13. 14.

1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6.

and in others the Holy Ghost precede 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, witnesse the forme of Baptisme *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; which order hath been perpetuated in all Confessions of Faith, and is for ever † inviolably to be observed. For that which is not instituted or invented by the will or designe 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

* παραδιδὺς ὁ κύριος τὸν Σωτήριον πίστιν τοῖς μαθητευομένοις πῶς λόγῳ, πῶς παρὰ καὶ πῶς ὑῷ Συνάπτει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. S. Basil. Epist. 80.

† Ἀκίνητον καὶ ἀπαρεγχείρητον φυλάσσειν πρόσηκεν τὴν ἀκολουθίαν. ἣν ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς κυριακῆς φωνῆς παραλάβομεν, εἰς τὸν Θ, πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα, &c. S. Basil. Epist. 78. ‖ ἔστι τάξεως εἶδος οὐκ ὂν τῆς παρ' ἡμῶν θέσεως συνισάμενον, ἀλλ' αὐτῇ τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθίᾳ συμβαῖνον, ὡς τὸ πυρὶ περὶ τὸ φῶς ἐστι τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ· ὃν τούτοις δὴ πρότερον τὸ αἴτιον λέγομεν, δεύτερον ἢ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ. πῶς ἂν εὔλογον ἀρνεῖσθαι τὴν τάξιν ἐφ' ὧν ὅτι πρότερον καὶ δεύτερον, οὐ καλὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν θέσιν, ἀλλ' ὂν τῆς καλὰ φύσιν αὐτοῖς ὑπαρχούσης ἀκολουθίας; S. Basil. adv. Eunom. l. 1. * Δευτερεύει μὲν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς τῷ αἰτίῳ· δευτερεύει ἢ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ καλὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον. S. Basil. apud Georg. Pachym. Hist. l. 7. ὡς μὲν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τάξει μὲν πατρὸς, καὶ δεύτερος τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅτι ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἡ πρόοδος καὶ προσαγωγὴ πρὸς † ἐκεῖνον παλαιὰ, φύσει ἢ ἐκείνου δεύτερος, δῆλον ἡ θεότης ὂν ἑκατέρῳ μία· ὥστε δηλονότι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰ καὶ ὑποδέδεικται τὸν υἱὸν τῇ τε τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι, ὑκέτ' ἂν εἰκότως ὡς ἀλλοτρίας ὑπάρχον φύσεως; S. Basil. cont. Eunom. l. 3. Si unum Deum singulariter nominamus excludentes vocabulum secundæ personæ, furorem ejus hæresis approbamus, quæ ipsum afferit Patrem passum. *Phœbad. cont. Arria.* Illi cui est in Filio secunda persona, est & tertia in Sp. Sancto. *Id.* Sic alius à Filio Spiritus, sicut à Patre Filius: sic tertia in Spiritu, ut in Filio secunda persona. *Ib.* Omne quod prodit ex aliquo, secundum sit ejus necesse est de quo prodit, non tamen est separatum. Secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt, & tertius ubi est, tres sunt: tertius enim est Spiritus à Deo & Filio. *Tertul. adver. Praxeam*, c. 8. Sic alium à se Paracletum,

to

quomodo & nos à Patre alium Filium; ut tertium gradum oſtenderet in Paracleto, ſicut nos ſecundum in Filio. *Ib.* c. 9. Hic interim acceptum à Patre munus effudit Spiritum Sanctum, tertium numen divinitatis, & tertium nomen majeſtatis. c. 30. Ὁ μὲν αἴτιός γε τοῦ, λύτερ & ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς καὶ δέδωκε, παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τοιόσδε εἶναι εἰληφώς. *Euseb. Dem. Evang.* l. 4. c. 3. Et quidem confeſſione communi ſecunda quidem ab autore nativitas eſt, quia ex Deo eſt; non tamen ſeparabilis ab autore, quia in quantum ſenſus noſter intelligentiam tentabit excedere, in tantum neceſſe eſt etiam generatio excedat. *S. Hilar. de Trinit.* l. 12. Tua enim res eſt, & unigenitus tuus eſt filius ex te deo patre deus verus, & à te in naturæ tuæ veritate genitus, poſt te ita confitendus, ut tecum, quia æternæ originis ſuæ es author æternus. Nam dum ex te eſt, ſecundus à te eſt. *Id. This by the Schools is called* ordo naturæ, ordo originis, ordo naturalis præſuppoſitionis.

to want a ſufficient foundation for this priority of the firſt perſon of the Trinity, if we look upon the numerous teſtimonies of the ancient Doctors of the Church, who have not ſtuck to call the Father the † origin, ‖ the cauſe,

† μικρῶν γὲ ἂν εἴη καὶ ἀναξίων ἀρχῆ, μᾶλλον ἢ μικρῶς ἢ καὶ ἀναξίως, μὴ διότητος ὢν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἀγαθότητος τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ πνεύματι διαιρεμένης. *Naz. Orat.* 1. & 29. μὴ γονικὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν ὑὸν κατανέξη τινὸς λέγοντος, ἀλλ' ἄγονον ἀρχὴν γίνωσκε & πάσης ἀρχὴ γὲ ὑὸς ἄγονος, ἀκατάληπτος. *S. Cyril. Hier. Catech.* 11. ἀρχὴ μὲν ἦν πᾶσι ὑδρία, ἀρχὴ ἢ τοῦ ὑοῦ ὁ πατήρ. *S. Baſ. cont. Eunom.* l. 2. Cum dixiſſet, quem mittet pater, addidit, in nomine meo: non tamen dixit, quem mittet Pater à me, quemadmodum dixit, quem ego mittam vobis à Patre; viz. oſtendens quod totius divinitatis, vel, ſi melius dicitur, deitatis principium Pater eſt. *S. Aug. de Trin.* l. 4. c. 20. Unum principium ad creaturam dicitur Deus, non duo vel tria principia. Ad ſe autem invicem in Trinitate, ſi gignens ad id quod gignitur principium eſt, Pater ad Filium principium eſt, quia gignit eum. *S. Aug. de Trin.* l. 5. c. 14. Pater ergo principium Deitatis. *Gennad. de Eccleſ. Dogmat.* c. 1. In this ſenſe the *Greek Fathers* uſed ἄναρχος as proper to the Father (in the ſame notion with ἀγέννητος, with relation to the *principium productionis*,) and denied it to the Son. Ὁ μὲν υἱὸς, ἐὰν μὲν ὡς αἴτιον τὸν πατέρα λαμβάνῃς, οὐκ ἄναρχος, ἀρχὴ γὲ ὑῶ ὁ πατὴρ ὡς αἴτιος· ἐὰν ἢ τὴν ἀπὸ χρόνου νοῇς ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἄναρχος. *Naz. Orat.* 29. εἴ τις ἀγέννητον καὶ ἄναρχον λέγοι τὸν υἱὸν, ὡς δύο ἄναρχα, καὶ δύο ἀγέννητα λέγων, καὶ δύο πατῶν θεούς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. *Synod. Sirm. Conf.* 12. Thus firſt tranſlated into Latine, *Si quis innaſcibilem, & ſine initio dicat filium, tanquam duo ſine principio, & duo innaſcibilia, & duo innata dicens, duos faciet deos, Anathema ſit. S.* Hilar. *de Synod.* In which ſenſe the *Platoniſts* did underſtand ἀγέννητος of God. Ὥστε οὐκ ἀγαθὸν τῇ λεγομένῃ ὕλῃ τὸ κοσμεῖσθαι, εἴπερ ἀγέννητος εἴη μὴ ἀπὸ χρόνου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ αἰτίων, καθ' ὃ ζημιοῦμεν καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀγέννητον λέγοντες. Hierocles *de Provid.* And the *Latines* attributing the terme *principium* to the Son, do it with the addition of *de*, or *ex principio*. *Pater principium non de principio, Filius principium de principio. S.* Aug. *contra* Maxim. l. 3. c. 17. *Principium ex principio & unum eſt, & initio caret.* Fauſtus Rheg. *Epiſt.* 16. *Ex ore, inquit, Altiſſimi*

prodivi. Hæc est enim nativitas perfecta Sermonis, hoc est principium sine principio, hic est ortus habens initium in nativitate, in statu non habens. Phœbad. contra Ania. *Sicut in creaturis invenitur principium primum & principium secundum; ita in personis divinis invenitur principium non de principio, quod est Pater, & principium à principio, quod est Filius.* Tho. Aquin. 1. *q.* 33 *ar.* 4. And to this all the Schoolmen writing on his Summes agree, as all upon the Sentences; 1. *dist.* 29. * αἰτία ἐστὶν ἡ τῆ θεῆ φύσις καὶ τῆ υἱῆ, καὶ τῆ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πάσης. *S. Athanas. Dissert. Orthod. & Anom.* ἀλλά τις ἐστὶ διαίτησις ἀξιωτήτως καὶ ἀνάρχως ὑφεστῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν αἰτία τῆς, ἀπάντων ὄντων αἰτίας· ὁν γὸ τὸ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς δι' ὃ τὸ πάντα. *S.* Basil. Ep. 43. *and upon that place,* this day have I begotten thee; ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν γεγέννηκα, τὴν αἰτίαν δηλοῖ ἧς ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν τὸ εἶναι σημαίνει. *Id. contra Eunom.* l. 2. πῶς ὑμῖν διαφορὰν καταλείπει, ὑδὲ τὴν ὡς αἰτίου πρὸς τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆ συνυπάρχυσ. *Id.* l. 1. Περὶς τὸ, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῦ πατρός μυ, εἰ δύναι χθῆ, ὅτι ἀρχὴν ἑαυτῦ καὶ αἰτίαν ἐπιγραφόμενος ὁ πατὴρ τῦτο λέγει. *Id. Epist.* 64. διαφορᾶς ἐν ὑποστάσεων ἐν μόναις ταῖς τειοὶν ἰδιότησι, τῇ ἀναιτίῳ καὶ πατρικῇ, καὶ παιδικῇ μικῇ, καὶ τῇ αἰτιατικῇ καὶ ἐκπορευτῇ ἐπιγνωσκομεν. *Damasc.* l. 4. c. 5. ὁ πατὴρ τῦ λόγυ καὶ τῆς σοφίας, καὶ προβολεὺς τῦ πνεύματος καὶ τῦ ἁγίυ, ὁ πρώτην αἰτίαν καὶ ἀρχὴν φαμὲν τῆς θεότητος εἶναι. *Zachar. Mitylen.* *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 terme of* causa, *but the Latines onely* principium; *yet the very Latine Fathers in the* 25. Session *of the same Council have these words,* μίαν γινώσκομεν ὁ πατέρα αἰτίαν, καὶ ῥίζαν, καὶ πηγὴν τῆς θεότητος. *and we have before cited* Victorinus Afer, *who says,* Pater causa est ipsi filio ut sit. *So S.* Hilary, Deum nasci, non est aliud quam in ea natura esse qua Deus est, quia nasci cum causam nativitatis ostendat, non diproficit tamen in genere autoris existere. *de Trin.* l. 11. Ex Spiritu enim spiritus nascens, licet de proprietate Spiritus, per quam & ipse Spiritus est, nascatur, non tamen alia ei præterquam perfectarum atque inde-mutabilium causarum ad id quod nascitur causa est. & ex causa, licet perfecta atque inde-mutabili nascens, necesse est ex causa in causæ ipsius proprietate nascatur. *Id.* l. 12. Qui ex eo qui est natus est, intelligi non potest ex eo quod non fuit natus esse, qui ejus qui est ad id quod est causa est, non etiam id quod non est origo nascendi est. *Ibid.* Deus omnium quæ sunt causa est. Quod autem rerum omnium causa est, etiam sapientiæ suæ causa est, nec unquam Deus sine sapientia sua. Igitur sempiternæ suæ sapientiæ causa est sempiterna. *S. Aug.* l. 83. quæst. 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 Bp. of* Alexandria's *Epist. before produced.*

* *We have cited* Phœbadius *speaking so before;* † the author, the ‖ root, the § head of the Son, or the whole divinity.

to which may be added: Si quis igitur adhuc & de Apostolo requirit dominicum statum, id est singularis substantiæ dualitatem quæ per naturam autori suo jungi-

jungitur. & paulo poſt, ſed cum refertur ex ipſo, certe ad Patrem, ut ad rerum omnium reſpicitur auctorem. *S.* Hilary *is known to ſpeak frequently of the authority of the Father, as of the author of the Son; and ſeverall places have been already collected, eſpecially by* Petavius, *to which theſe may be added, beſides what have been already produced.* Ipſo quod Pater dicitur, ejus quem genuit autor oſtenditur. *l.* 4. cum potius honor filii dignitas ſit paterna, & glorioſus autor ſit ex quo is, qui tali gloria ſit dignus, extiterit. *Ibid.* Aliud eſt ſine autore eſſe ſemper æternum, aliud quod patri, id eſt, autori eſt coæternum. Ubi enim pater autor, ibi & nativitas eſt. At vero ubi autor æternus eſt, ibi & nativitas æterna eſt: quia ſicut nativitas ab autore eſt, ita ab æterno autore æterna nativitas eſt. *Id.* l. 12. Quod vero ex æterno natum eſt, id ſi non æternum natum eſt, jam non erit & pater autor æternus. Si quid igitur ei qui ab æterno patre natus eſt ex æternitate defuerit, idipſum autori non eſt ambiguum defuiſſe. *Ib.* Natum non poſt aliquid, ſed ante omnia, ut nativitas tantum teſtetur autorem, non præpoſterum aliquid in ſe autore ſignificet. *Ib.* Natus autem ita, ut nihil aliud quam te ſibi ſignificet autorem. *Ib.* Ipſius tamen autor eſt Pater generando ſine initio. *Ruff. in Symb.* Si propterea Deum Patrem Deo Filio dicis autorem, quia ille genuit, genitus eſt iſte, quia iſte de illo eſt, non ille de iſto, fateor & concedo. *S. Auguſt. cont. Maximin.* l. 3. c. 14. † Nec dubitaverim Filium dicere & radicis fruticem, & fontis fluvium, & ſolis radium. *Tertull. adv. Praxeam.* c. 8. Nec frutex tamen à radice, nec fluvius à fonte, nec radius à ſole diſcernitur, ſicut nec à Deo ſermo. *Ib.* Ὡς μὲν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνενδεὴς, ῥίζα καὶ πηγὴ τῶν ὑῶν καὶ ἀκτὶς πέφυκε· *S. Baſil. Homil.* 26. Dominus Pater, quia radix eſt Filii. *S. Ambroſ. in Luc.* l. 10. c. 1. ut & *de Fide* l. 4. c. 5. ‖ ἀναρχος ὁ πατὴρ πηγὴ τῆς ἀληθείας πάλαι, τὸ μονογενὲς ὁ παῖς. *Cyril. Hieroſ. Catech.* 11. In hac ergo natura filius eſt, & in hoc originis fonte ſubſiſtens proceſſit ex ſapiente ſapientia, ex forti virtus, ex lumine ſplendor. *Vigil. Diſp.* ὡς πνεῦμα θεοῦ, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ πηγαῖος, αἴτιον αὐτὸ ἔχον, ὡς πηγὴν ἑαυτοῦ, κἀκεῖθεν πηγάζον. *Baſil. Homil.* 28. Λέγει περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡ θεία γραφὴ, κλίνε, φησὶν, ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὡς πάλαι εἰρήνης, ἀπορευόμενος ἀληθῶς ὅτι τῆς ἀληθοῦς πηγῆς τῆς ζωῆς, τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς θεότητος. *Act. Concil. Nic.* l. 2. c. 22. *And S.* Cyril. *of* Alexandria, *who often uſeth this expreſſion, gives us the full ſignification of it in theſe words, upon the* 1. *of S.* John, ἀληθείᾳ δ' ἔλεγε τὸν, ὡς ὁ πηγὴ, τὸ παρὲξ ἑαυτὸν ὑπάρχειν ἀνενδεὲς μόνον δὲ τὸ ἐξ οὗ τὸ τῆς πηγῆς ὀνόματα σημαίνει. Patrem quidem non genitum, non creatum, ſed ingenitum profitemur, ipſe enim à nullo originem ducit, ex quo & Filius nativitatem, & Spiritus Sanctus proceſſionem accepit. Fons ergo ipſe & origo eſt totius divinitatis. *Concil. Toletan.* 11. Quanto magis Dei vocem credendum eſt, & manere in æternum, & ſenſu ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tanquam rivus de fonte traduxit, *Lactant. de falſa Sap.* l. 4. c. 8. & rurſus c. 29. Cum igitur & Pater Filium faciat, & Filius Patrem, una utrique mens, unus ſpiritus, una ſubſtantia eſt; Sed ille quaſi exuberans fons eſt, hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus; ille tanquam Sol, hic tanquam radius à Sole porrectus. § Caput, quod eſt principium omnium, Filius; caput autem, quod eſt principium Chriſti, Deus. *Concil. Sirm. accepted and expounded*

ed as Orthodox by S. Hilary. Caput enim omnium Filius, sed caput Filii Deus. *S. Hilar. de Syn.* Cum ipse sit omnium caput, ipsius tamen caput est Pater. *Ruff. in Symb.* Tu capitis caput, & primi tu fontis origo. *Hilar. ad Leonem.* ὅτε δύο εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ, ἀλλὰ κεφαλὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ πατὴρ, μία ἡ ἀρχή· *Cyril. Hieros. Catech.* 11. Caput Filii Pater est, & caput Spiritus Sancti Filius, quia de ipso accepit. *S. Aug. Quæst. Vet. Test.* 9. *S.* Chrysostome *is so clearly of the opinion that the* 1 Cor. 11. *is to be understood of Christ as God, that from thence he proves him to have the same essence with God.* εἰ γὰρ κεφαλὴ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὁμοούσιος ἡ γυνὴ κεφαλὴ τῷ σώματι· κεφαλὴ ἡ τοῦ υἱοῦ ὁ θεὸς, ὁμοούσιος ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί. *Likewise* Theodoret *upon the same place;* ἡ γὰρ γυνὴ τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ὂν τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ ἀνδρός· οὕτω δὲ ὁ υἱὸς ἀεὶ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὂν τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ θεοῦ.

For by these titles it appeareth clearly, first, that they made a considerable difference between the person of the Father, *of whom are all things*, and the person of the Son, *by whom are all things*. 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 being 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. Some indeed of the Ancients may seem to have made yet a further difference between the persons of the Father and the Son, laying upon that relation tearms of greater opposition. As if, because the Son hath not his essence from himself, the * Father had; because he was not begotten of himself, the † Father had been so; because he is not the cause of himself, ‖ the Father were. Whereas if we speak properly, God the Father hath * neither his being from another, nor from himself. not from another, that were repugnant to his paternity; not from himself, that were a

* *Lactant.* l. 1. c. 8. *S. Hilar.* l. 2. *Zach. Mytilen.*

† *Lactant.* ib. *Synes. Hymn.*

‖ *S. Hieron. in cap.* 3. *ad Eph.*

* ἀναίτιος οὖν ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ γὰρ ἔσχεν ἄνωθεν, οὐκ ἔσχε παρ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ εἶναι. *S. Greg. Naz.*

ὁ ἀγέννητος οὐ γεγέννηται οὐθ' ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, οὐθ' ὑφ' ἑτέρου. *S. Athan.* Si rursum quod à semetipso sit accipias, nemo sibi ipse & munerator, & munus est. *S. Hil. de Trin.* l. 2. Qui putant Deum ejus potentiæ esse ut seipsum ipse genuerit, eo plus errant, quod non solum Deus ita non est, sed neque corporalis neque spiritualis creatura. Nulla enim omnino res est quæ seipsam gignat ut sit. Et ideo non est credendum, vel dicendum quod Deus genuit se. *S. Aug.*

con-

* *This appeareth by those expoſitions which have been given of ſuch words as ſeem to bear the affirmation;* contradiction in it ſelf. 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, not hath he any cauſe of his exiſtence.

as αὐτοβιβλος, αὐτοφυὴς, αὐτόγονος, αὐτοχυὴς, &c. Αὐτοχυὴς, αὐτογένεθλος, οὐκ ἐκ τινος γινόμενος. Heſych. *and,* Αὐτολόχευσος, θεὸς ἀγέννητος, αὐτογέννητος. Id. *and after him* Suidas; Αὐτολόχευσος, αὐτογέννητος, ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀγέννητος. *And if* αὐτογέννητος *be not* αὐτόθεν γεννητός· *no more is* αὐτόθεος *to be taken for* αὐτόθεν, *or* ἐξ ἑαυτῦ θεός. Euſebius *in his Panegyrical Oration gives this title to the Son,* οἷα τὸ καλὸν θεῦ παῖδα γνήσιον καὶ αὐτόθεον προσκυνεῖσθαι. Hiſt. l. 10. c. 4. *and in his Evangelicall Demonſtration, calls him* αὐτονῦν καὶ αὐτολόγον καὶ αὐτουσίαν, καὶ ὅτι ἡ αὐτοκαλὸν καὶ αὐτοαγαθόν. l. 4. c. 2. *and in the* 13. *chapter of the ſame book, with relation to the former words,* τῷ θεῦ λόγος αὐτοζωὴ τυγχάνων, καὶ αὐτοφῶς νοερὸν, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα προσκαθήκει. Theodoret *termes him,* αὐτοδύναμον καὶ αὐτοζωὴν καὶ αὐτουσίαν· contra Anathem. quartum *Cyrill.* S. Baſil, αὐτοζωὴν, *in* Pſal. 48. *and de* Spiritu Sancto c. 8. *and* αὐτοδιλιχαιοζωὴν, *Epiſt.* 141. S. Chryſoſtome, αὐτοαθανασίαν, αὐτομακαριότητα. S. Athanaſius *gives him them, and many more to the ſame purpoſe. And certainly in the ſame ſenſe that* αὐτὸς *is joyned with one attribute, it may be joyned with any other, and with the Godhead: becauſe all the attributes of God are really the ſame, not onely 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 enquire, leaſt it be ſo attributed to the Son, as it prove derogatory to the Father.* S. Baſil, *I confeſſe, may ſeem ſo to ſpeak, as if the Son were therefore* αὐτοζωὴ, *becauſe he hath life of himſelf, not from the Father, (and conſequently he may be termed* αὐτόθεος, *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 onely for this reaſon, that if it were ſo underſtood, he could not be called* αὐτοζωή. Εἰ διὰ τὸν πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς ζῇ, δι' ἕτερον, καὶ ὃ δι' ἑαυτὸ ζῇ· ὃ δὲ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν αὐτοζωὴ οὐκ ἂν εἴη ἡμῶν. *from whence he concludeth,* εἰς δὲ ἄνθρωπον οὐδ', καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὴν θεότητα τὸ εἰρημένον νοεῖν δεῖ. *contra* Eunom. l. 4. *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* 141. *Epiſtle, which is unqueſtionably genuine.* ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ ὄντι οὐκ αὐτὸ περιαιρετέον, ὡς οἶμαι, ζωὴν ὀνομάζει· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν αὐτοζωὴ οὐκ ἂν εἴη ἡμῶν. To which teſtimonies I anſwer firſt, that thoſe words of his, ὡς οἶμαι, (*as I think*) *ſhews 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 onely they, but* S. Baſil *himſelf in his Book* de Spiritu Sancto, c. 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 μήν τοι ἵνα μὴ ποτε ὀκ

τῶν μηλίθων ἢν ὑπερχομένων φοτισπαδῶμεν εἰς τὸ φανταδῆναι ἀναρχον εἶναι ἢ κύριον, τί φησιν ἡ αὐτοζωὴ; ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα· καὶ ἡ τῆ θεῦ δυνάμις ἡ δυνα) ὁ υἱὸς ποιῶν ἀφ' ἑαυτῦ ἀλλ' ἃ ἂν καὶ ὁ αὐτοτελὴς σοφία ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω. Christ therefore as αὐτοζωὴ, spake those words, I live by the Father, and by them shewed his origination from him, from whom he received his life, power and wisdome, 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 ὁ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν, αὐτοζωὴ εἶναι ἡ δυνατὸν, immediately followeth, ὃ γὰρ κατὰ χάριν ἅγιος αὐτοάγιος. and in the second, after πᾶν τὸ δι' ἕτερον ζῶν αὐτοζωὴ εἶναι ἡ δυνατὸν, follows likewise, ὡς ἂν τὸ ὑφ' ἑτέρου θερμανθὲν αὐτοθερμότης εἶναι. The meaning then of S. 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 αὐτοζωὴ, no more than they αὐτοάγιοι· 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 αὐτοθερμότης. And this is fully consonant to the expressions of the rest of the Ancients: as particularly Athanasius; κατὰ μετοχὴν ταῦτα ὢν, ὑπὸ ἕξιν ὀφειλομένων τύπων αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν μετέχοντας, καὶ Σοφιζομένους δι' αὐτῦ, καὶ δυνατὸς, καὶ λογικὸς ὢν αὐτῷ γινομένης· ἀλλ' αὐτοσοφία, αὐτοδύναμις ἰδία τῦ πατρός ἐστιν, αὐτοφῶς, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, αὐτοαρετή. in fine Protrept. and to the same purpose, ὅτι δὲ μεθεκτὴν ἔχει ἡ σοφία, ἀλλ' αὐτοσοφία καὶ αὐτόῤῥιζα πάντων ἐστὶ καὶ ἀγαθῶν, αὐτοζωὴ, καὶ αὐτοφῶς, καὶ αὐτοαλήθεια. in the MS. Catena in the King of France his Library, Petav. de Trin. l. 6. c. 11. All therefore which these compositions signifie, is either a negation of a derivative participation, or an affirmation of a reality and identity of substance. as yet further appears by S. Epiphanius; αὐτουσία ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ οὐκ ἑτερουσία. and Origen himself upon S. John, ἡ αὐτοδικαιοσύνη ἡ ὑσιώδης Χριστός ἐστι. as also ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια ἡ ὑσιώδης, καὶ ἵν' ἅπαξ εἴπω, ἀρχέτυπος τῆς ἐν ταῖς λογικαῖς ψυχαῖς ἀληθείας. To conclude, there is a Catholick sense in which the Son is termed αὐτόθεος, αὐτοσοφία, &c. by the Ancient Fathers; and another sense there is, in which these terms are so proper and peculiar to the Father, that they are denied to the Son. Indeed αὐτόθεος, in the highest sense, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ θεὸς, positively taken, belongeth neither to the Son nor to the Father, as implying a manifest contradiction; because nothing can have its being actually from it self, as communicated to it self, and that by it self: but in a Negative way of interpretation, by which that is said to be of it self, which is, and yet is not of or from another, αὐτόθεος belongs properly to the Father, neither generated by, nor proceeding from another; and in that sense it is denied to the Son, because he is generated by the Father, as ὁ θεὸς θεὸς, ὁ Σοφὸς Σοφία, ἐκ λογικῆς λόγος, καὶ ἐκ παῖδὸς υἱὸς, saith S. Athanasius cont. Arrian. Orat. 5. from whence he thus proceeds, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἄν τις εἴποι αὐτουσοφίαν εἶναι καὶ αὐτολόγον ἢ θεὸν, ἀλλ' εἰ τοῦτο, πῶν ἂν αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ πατὴρ καὶ υἱός. and again εἰ δ' αὐτουσοφία ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τούτου ἄτοπον ὑπῆρχε καὶ Σαβελλίῳ. Lastly in another sense, in which

αὐτὸς

αὐτὸς in compoſition is taken not in obliquo, *but* in recto, *αὐτόθεος, that is, αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς, God himſelf, and αὐτοζωὴ, αὐτὴ ἡ ζωὴ, life it ſelf: So all theſe terms are attributed to the Son as truly, really, and eſſentially as to the Father.*

Howſoever, it is moſt neceſſary 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 proceedeth is from him from whom he proceedeth, 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. 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 then one which were from none, it could not be denied, but there were more Gods then one. Wherefore this † origination in the divine *Pater*nity hath anciently been looked upon as the aſſertion of the Unity: and therefore the Son and Holy Ghoſt but one God with the Father, becauſe both from the Father who is one, and ſo the ‖ union of them.

* μὴ μοι εἴπητε δύο θεοὺς κηρύσσειν, πολυθεΐαν καταγγέλλειν· ἓν δύο θεοί, εἰ δὲ δύο πατέρες· ὁ μὲν ἀρχὰς εἰσάγων δύο, δύο κηρύττει θεούς. *S. Baſil. Homil.* 16. In duobus ingenitis diverſa divinitas invenitur, in uno autem genito ex uno ingenito naturalis unitas demonſtratur. *Fulgen. Reſp. cont. Arrian. ad Obj.* 5. Si quis innaſcibilem & ſine initio dicat Filium, tanquam duo ſine principio, & duo innaſcibilia, & duo innata dicens, duos faciat Deos, Anathema ſit. *Concil. Sirmi.* Deus utique procedens ex Deo ſecundam perſonam efficiens, ſed non eripiens illud Patri quod unus eſt Deus. Si enim natus non fuiſſet, innatus comparatus cum eo qui eſſet innatus, æquatione in utreque oſtenſa duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos. Si non genitus eſſet, collatus cum eo qui genitus non eſſet, æquales inventi duos Deos merito reddidiſſent non geniti; atque ideo duos Deos reddidiſſet Chriſtus, ſi ſine origine eſſet ut Pater inventus; & ipſe principium omnium ut Pater, duo faciens principia, duos oſtendiſſet nobis conſequenter & Deos, &c. *Novatian. de Trin.* c. 31.

† ἄλλην ἡ μία ἀρχὴ, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο εἷς θεός. *S. Athan. Orat.* 5. περὶτο μὲν οὖν ὁ ἡμῶν λόγος εἷς μὲν θεὸς, εἷς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ μία θεότης πνεύματος ἀναφερομένων. *S. Gregor. Naz. Orat.* 29. Ὅτε γὰρ μία μὲν ἡ ἀρχὴ, ἓν δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἓν μὲν τὸ ἀρχήτυπον, μία δὲ ἡ εἰκὼν, ὁ τῆς θεότητος λόγος ἐν διαθήκαις. *S. Baſil. Homil.* 26. Patri ſuo originem

ſuam debens, diſcordiam divinitatis de numero duorum Deorum facere non potuit, qui ex illo qui eſt unus Deus, originem naſcendo contraxit. *Novat.* c. 31. Confitemur non deos duos, ſed Deum unum, neque per id non & Deum Dei Filium, eſt enim ex Deo Deus. non innaſcibiles duos, quia authoritate innaſcibilitatis Deus unus eſt. S. *Hilar. de Synod. whoſe aſſertion is*, Unum Deum eſſe ex quo omnia, unam virtutem innaſcibilem, & unum hanc eſſe ſine initio poteſtatem. *which words belong unto the Father, and then it followeth of the Son*; Non enim Patri adimitur quod Deus unus eſt, quia & Filius Deus eſt. Eſt enim Deus ex Deo, unus ex uno. Ob id unus Deus, quia ex ſe Deus. Contra vero non minus per id Filius Deus, quia Pater Deus unus ſit. Eſt enim unigenitus Filius Dei non innaſcibilis, ut Patri adimat quod Deus unus ſit. *de Trin.* l. 4. ‖ φύσις ἡ παῖς ἡ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθεῖσα· ἡ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀγέννητος· ἡ δὲ τοῦ μονογενοῦς γέννησις· ἡ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀναρχία· ἡ δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπόστασις· ἡ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν σχέσις· ἡ δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὁμοιότης· ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγιότης· ἡ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἑνότης· ἡ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος θεότης. Greg. Naz. Orat. 32. *Unto which words thoſe of* Theod. Abucara *have relation*: Θεὸς ἡ ἀξιωματικῶς λεγομένη, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἕνωσις, ἤτοι ἀνάπτυξις καὶ ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῆς προσώπου ὁ πατήρ ἐστιν, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Θεολόγος. *Opuſc.* 42.

From hence it is obſerved that the name of *God*, taken abſolutely, 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*; and generally wherſoever 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 Son but of the Father. From hence he is ſtiled b *one God*, c *the true God*, d *the onely true God*, e *the* † *God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*.

* ὅθεν οἱ θεολόγοι, καὶ πᾶσα θεία γραφὴ, ἡ ἁγία χάρις, ὅταν εἴπῃ, ὁ Θεὸς, οὕτως ἁπλῶς καὶ ἀπερισταλτικῶς, καὶ ὡς ἐπὶ πᾶν ζῶν ἄρρεν, καὶ χωρὶς ἰδιώματος ὑποστατικοῦ, τὸν πατέρα δηλοῖ. *Theod. Abucara, Opuſc.* 42. a 2 *Cor.* 13, 14. b 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *Eph.* 4. 6. c 1 *Theſ.* 1. 9. d *John* 17. 3. e 2 *Cor.* 1. 3. *Eph.* 1. 3. † Unxit te Deus, Deus tuus. Id enim quod ait, tuus, ad nativitatem refertur; cæterum non perimit naturam. Et idcirco Deus ejus eſt, qui ex Deo natus in Deum eſt. Non tamen per id quod Pater Deus eſt, non & Filius Deus eſt. Unxit enim te Deus, Deus tuus; deſignata videlicet & authoris ſui & ex eo geniti ſignificatione, uno eodemque dicto utrumque illum in naturæ ejuſdem & dignitatis nuncupatione conſtituit. S. *Hilar.* l. 4. Deo enim ex quo omnia ſunt Deus nullus eſt qui ſine initio æternus eſt. Filio autem Deus Pater eſt, ex eo enim Deus natus eſt. *Id. paulo poſt.* Cum autem ex Deo Deus eſt, per id Deus Pater Deo Filio; & nativitatis ejus Deus eſt, & naturæ Pater, quia Dei nativitas & ex Deo eſt, & in ea generis eſt natura qua Deus eſt. *Id.* l. 11. So S. Cyril *of* Jeruſalem, Catech. 11. Θεὸς ὁ γνήσιος· Θεὸς ὁ γνησιοθείς. Θεὸς μὲν τῶν πάντων· Θεὸν δὲ ἑαυτῷ τὸν πατέρα ὁδηγεσθάμενος.

Having

Having thus deſcribed the true nature and notion of the divine Paternity, in all the ſeverall 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 expreſſe 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 then one: ſo I aſſure my ſelf that this one God is the *Father* of all things, ſpecially of all men and Angels, ſo far as the mere act of creation may be ſtiled generation; that he is further 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 coheirs with him, whom he crowneth with the reward of an eternal inheritance in the heavens.

But beyond and farre above all this, beſide his general offſpring, and peculiar people, *to whom he hath given power to become the ſons of God*; I believe him the Father, in a more eminent and tranſcendent manner, of one ſingular and proper Son, his own, his beloved, his onely begotten Son; whom he hath not onely begotten of the bleſſed Virgin, by the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, and the overſhadowing of his power, not onely ſent with ſpeciall authority as the King of Iſrael, not onely raiſed from the dead, and made heir of all things in his houſe; but antecedently to all this, hath begotten him by way of eternall generation in the ſame divinity and majeſty with himſelf: by which paternity, coeval to the deity, I acknowledge him alwaies Father, as much as alwaies God.

And in this relation, I profeſſe that eminency and priority, that as he is the Originall 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,

I Believe in God the Father ALMIGHTIE.

AFter the relation of God's Paternity, immediately followeth the glorious Attribute of his *Omnipotency*: 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*; that in our solemn meetings at the Church of God, with the joynt expression and concurring language of the Congregation, we might some way imitate that *voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*

Revel. 4. 8.

Revel. 19. 6.

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 then by the Greek Writers or Interpreters of the Old, especially when the Notion it self belongs unto the Gospel and the Law indifferently. Now the * word which we translate *Almighty*, the most ancient Greek Interpreters used sometimes for the title of God, *the Lord of hosts*, sometime for his name *Shaddai*, as generally in the book of *Job*: by the first they seem to signifie 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.

* παντοκράτωρ, *translated by* Tertul. *and* S. Aug. Omnitenens, *by* Prudentius, Omnipollens, *by all* Omnipotens.

The heavens and the earth were finished, saith *Moses*, *and all the host of them*: 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 all their host have I commanded.* and on this dominion or command doth he raise the title of the Lord of hosts; which though preserved in the

Gen. 2. 1.

Isa. 45. 12.

* originall

* original language both by S. *Paul*, and S. *James*, yet by S. *John* is turned into that word which we translate *Almighty*. Wherefore from the uſe of the ſacred Writers, from the † notation of the word in Greek, and from the teſtimony of the ancient ‖ Fathers, we may well aſcribe unto God the Father the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

* οἱ μὴ κύριος Σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα. *Rom.* 9. 29. the words of Iſa. 1. 9. καὶ βοᾷ τὸν θεὸν τὸν παντοκράτορα. Jam. 5. 4. which are the words of S. James, in relation to Deut. 24. 15. ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Revel. 4. 8. which were before in Iſaiah, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ. Iſa. 6. 3.

† that παντοκράτωρ ſhould have the ſignification of government in it, according to the compoſition in the Greek Language, no man can doubt, who but onely conſiders thoſe vulgar terms of their Politicks, δημοκρατία, and ὀλιγοκρατία: from whence it appears that μοναρχία might as well have been uſed as μοναρχία: and αὐτοκράτωρ is the proper title given by the Greeks to the Roman *Emperour*, not onely the later Hiſtorians, but even the Coins of Julius Cæſar. Heſych. Αὐτοκράτωρ, αὐτεξούσιος, ἢ κοσμοκράτωρ. becauſe the Roman Emperour was ruler of the known world. and the Devils or Princes of the air are termed by S. Paul κοσμοκράτορες, Eph. 6. 12. which is all one with ἄρχοντες τοῦ κόσμου. as will appear, John 12. 31. 14. 30. 16. 11. As therefore Κράτος ſignifieth of it ſelf rule and authority, Heſych. Κράτος, ἐξουσία, ἀρχή. Κράτει, ἀρχῇ, ἐξουσίᾳ. to which ſenſe Euſtathius hath obſerved Homer led the following writers by thoſe words of his,---- Ζεὺς δὲ κράτος αἶψα δίξειν, Il. Ad. M. τὸ μὲν κράτος ξυλλαμβάνει τι τοῖς ὕστερον τὴν βασιλείαν κράτος λέγουσι. whence Æſchylus calls Agamemnon and Menelaus δίδυμον κράτος Ἀχαιῶν, and Sophocles after him, δίκρατεῖς Ἀτρείδας. and as κρατεῖν to rule or govern, Κρατεῖ, κυριεύει, ἄρχει. from whence Κρατὺς, ἄρχων, ἐξουσιάζων: So alſo in compoſition, παντοκράτωρ the ruler of all. Παντοκράτωρ, ὁ θεὸς, παντῶν κρατῶν. Heſych. Παντοκρατορία, πανταρχία. Suid.

‖ Αἱρετικοὶ οὐκ οἴδασιν ἕνα παντοκράτορα θεόν. παντοκράτωρ γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πάντων κρατῶν, ὁ πάντων ἐξουσιάζων. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τὸν μὲν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς δεσπότην, † δὲ τῷ σώματι, οὐ τέλειον λέγουσιν· ὁ γὰρ ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, σώματος δὲ ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχων, πῶς παντοκράτωρ; ἢ ὁ δεσπότης σωμάτων, μὴ ἐξουσιάζων δὲ πνευμάτων, πῶς παντοκράτωρ; *S. Cyril. Catech.* 8. Unus eſt Dominus Jeſus Chriſtus per quem Deus Pater dominatum omnium tenet; unde & ſequens ſermo omnipotentem pronuntiat Dominum. Omnipotens autem ab eo dicitur, quod omnium teneat potentatum. *Ruffin. in Symb.*

This

This authority or power properly poteſtative is attributed unto God in the * ſacred Scriptures, from whence thoſe †names or titles which moſt aptly and fully expreſſe dominion, are frequently given unto him; and the rule, empire, or government of the world is acknowledged to be wholy in him, as neceſſarily following that naturall and eternall right of dominion.

* ἐξουσία. Luke 12.5. Act. 1.7. Jud. 25. Revel. 5.13.

† as יהוה, κύριος, Δεσπότης.

ἐν μὲν τὸ κυρίως ᾧ πρώτως ὂν, ὃ ὂν τῇ χρεῖ πλέον, ᾧ ὃς πάντων δεσπόζει, τὸ δὲ ζώμπαν ὕλα σά. Phot. Epiſt. 162.

What the nature of this authoritative power is, we ſhall the more clearly underſtand, if we firſt divide it into three degrees or branches of it: the firſt whereof we may conceive, a right of making and framing any thing which he willeth, in any manner as it pleaſeth him, according to the abſolute freedome 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 vertue 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 onely for the neceſſity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it. Gods actuall dominion being no otherwayes neceſſary, then 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.

But the ſecond branch, or abſolute dominion of this *Almighty*, is further to be conſidered in the Independency and Infinity of it. Firſt it is independent in a double reſpect, in reference both to the originall, 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

any commander, counſeller, 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 *onely potentate*; becauſe he alone hath all power of himſelf, and whoſoever elſe hath any, hath it from him, either by donation or permiſſion.

Deut. 10. 17. *Pſal.* 136. 3. 1 *Tim.* 6. 15. μόνος δυνάστης. *Sap. Syr.* 46. 6. ὕψιστος δυνάστης. 2 *Macch.* 15. 29. ὁ δυνάστης. 23. δυνάστης πᾶσι ἡγεμῶν. 3. 24. ὁ πάντων κύριος, καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης.

The Infinity of Gods Dominion, if we reſpect the Object, appeares 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*; under which two are comprehended all things both in heaven and earth. This Moſes taught the diſtruſting Iſraelites in the wilderneſſe. *Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lords thy God, the earth alſo with all that is therein.* With theſe words *David* glorifieth God: *The heavens are thine, the earth alſo is thine*; ſo acknowledging his dominion: *as for the world and the fulneſſe 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 ſhew 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 kingdome, O Lord,*

Dan. 5. 23. *Joſ.* 3. 11, 13. *Pſal.* 97. 5. *Mic.* 4. 13. *Zac.* 4. 14. 6. 5. *Matth.* 11. 25. *Acts* 17. 24. *Deut.* 10. 14. *Pſal.* 89. 11.

1 *Chro.* 29. 11, 12. משל בכל כי כסך והגל

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 Gods 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 propriator, and ſubject wholly to his will, as the ſole governour and diſpoſer: in reſpect of which univerſall power we muſt confeſſe him to be *Almighty.*

πάντα δὲ τὰ τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπόκεια, καὶ πάντη πάντων ἴσον οἱ θεοὶ κρατοῦσι. Xenoph. de exped. Cyri l. 2.

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 intenſion, he hath all power over every thing, as being abſolute and ſupreme. This God challenged to himſelf, when he catechized the prophet *Jeremy* in a potters houſe, ſaying, *O houſe of Iſrael, cannot I do with you as this potter, ſaith the Lord? behold, as the clay is in the potters 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 kingdome on the earth, as the potter hath over the pot he maketh, or the clay he mouldeth. Thus are we wholly at the diſpoſall 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 potſheard, (both being made of the ſame metal) then 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?

Jer. 18. 6.

Rom. 9. 21.

The duration of Gods dominion muſt likewiſe neceſſarily be eternall, if any thing which is be immortall. For being every thing 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

that ſo long as it is continued, it muſt be his, and conſequently being ſome of his creatures are immortall, his dominion muſt be eternall. Wherefore S. *Paul* expreſly calleth God [a] *the King eternall*, with reference to that of *David*, [b] *Thy kingdome is an everlaſting kingdome, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.* And *Moſes* in his Song hath told us, [c] *the Lord ſhall reigne for ever and ever*: which phraſe *for ever and ever* in the originall ſignifieth thus much, that there is no time to come aſſigneable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God ſhall reigne.

a 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων.

b *Pſal.* 145 13. מלכות כל־עלמים LXX βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων.

c *Exod.* 15. 18. לעלם ועד LXX εἰς αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι. *S.* Hier. in ſæculum & ultra. *So* Aquila, Theod. *and the Fifth Edit. in Pſal.* 21. 5. *So the* LXX. *again*, Dan. 12. 7. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ ἔτι. *and* Mich. 4. 5. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα.

The third branch of Gods authoritative or poteſtative power conſiſteth in the uſe of all things in his poſſeſſion, by vertue of his abſolute dominion. For it is the generall dictate of reaſon, that the uſe, benefit and utility of any thing redoundeth unto him whoſe it is, and to whom as to the propriator it belongeth. 'Tis 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 originall felicity, cannot receive any reall benefit and utility from the creature. [d] *Thou art my Lord*, ſaith *David, my goodneſſe extendeth not to thee.* and therefore our onely and abſolute Lord, becauſe his goodneſſe 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.

d *Pſal.* 16. 2. Ille noſtra ſervitute non indiget, nos vero dominatione illius indigemus, ut operetur & cuſtodiat nos: & ideo verus & ſolus eſt Dominus, quia non illi ad ſuam, ſed ad noſtram utilitatem ſalutemq; ſervimus. Nam ſi nobis indigeret, eo ipſo non verus & ipſe ſerviret. quare? *quoniam bonorum meorum non eges.* Ille non eget noſtri, nos egemus ipſius; ideo verus dominus eſſet, cum per nos ejus adjuvaretur neceſſitas, ſub qua S. *Aug. de Gen. ad lit.* l. 8. c. 11. *Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu,*

dominus. Nam tu non valde verus dominus servi tui; ambo homines, ambo egentes Deo. Si vero puras egere tui servum tuum, ut des panem, eges & tu servi tui, ut adjuvet labores tuos. Uterque vestrum altero vestrum indiget: itaque nullus vestrum vere dominus, & nullus vestrum vere servus. Audi verum Dominum, cujus verus es servus. *Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu.* quare tui dominus? *quoniam bonorum meorum non eges* Id. *ad Psal.* 6). * πλὴν ποιεῖται τὸ ἀναγκαῖως ἅ ἡμῖν ἀπ' ἐκείνου περιγινομένων ἀγαθῶν ὑποδοχήν. H. croc. in Aurea Carm. *and again,* ὅτις ἡμᾶς ἅ δὸν ὡς προσδεόμενον, ἅτος λέληθεν οὐδεμιᾶς ἀνάγκης τοῦ εἶναι χρήζοντα.

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 finall as the efficient cause of his operations.

Rom. 9. 36. *Heb.* 2. 11. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. The Apostle hath taught us, that not onely *of him,* and *by him,* as the first author; but also *to him,* and *for him,* as the ultimate end, *are all things.* And 'tis one of the proverbiall 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 *rejoyceth* at the effects of his wisdome, power and goodnesse, 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.

Prov. 16. 4.

Psal. 104. 31.

An explicite belief of this authoritative power and absolute dominion of the *Almighty* is necessary, first for the breeding in us an awfull 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 then 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 what-

* Ἐμοὶ πόλις ἐστὶ καὶ χώρα· ταύτην ἐγὼ νόμῳ καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ τοῦ τ' ἀδίκου πάντες χρῆς ὃ δεσπότης· πρὸς τοῦτον ἔνα δεῖ ζῆν ἐμέ. *Servus apud Menand.*

soever

ſoever 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?* Luke 6. 46.

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 any thing unwiſely or unjuſtly. *Let the potſheard ſtrive with the potſheards of the earth; ſhall the clay ſay to him that faſhioneth it, what makeſt 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?* Iſa. 45. 9. Pſal. 39. 10. 2 Sam. 16. 10.

Thirdly, the belief of Gods abſolute dominion is yet further 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 farre we ſtand obliged to him. No man can duely prize the bleſſings of heaven, but he which acknowledgeth they might juſtly have been denied him: nor can any be ſufficiently thankfull for them, except it be confeſſed that he ought him nothing, who beſtowed them.

But as the originall word for *Almighty* is not put onely 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; whoſoever is able to ſuppeditate all things to the ſufficing all, muſt have an infinite power: or whether we deduce it from the † Root denoting vaſtation or deſtruction; 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. However, the firſt notion of *Almighty* neceſſarily inferreth the ſecond, and the infinity of Gods dominion ſpeaketh him infinitely powerfull in operation. Indeed in earthly dominions, the ſtrength of the Governour is not in himſelf, but in thoſe whom he governeth: and he is a powerfull 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 ſucceſſefull: 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 boldneſſe to put a force upon him. But we muſt not imagine that the Governour of the world ruleth onely over them which are willing to obey, or that any of his creatures may diſpute his commands with ſafety, or caſt off his yoak with impunity. And if his dominion be uncontroulable, it is becauſe his power is irreſiſtible. For man is not more inclineable to obey God then man, but God is more powerfull to exact ſubiection, 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*.

* *So* R. Solomon *will have it compounded of* ש *the pronoun, and* די שיש די באלהותי לכל בריה *becauſe in God there is ſufficiency, that is, ſufficient power over every creature: from whence the* LXX *Ruth* 1. 20, 21. *Job* 21.15. 31.2. 39.32. *tranſlate it* ἱκανὸς, *as* Symm. *Job* 22.3. *and* Aquil. *with him,* Ezr. 1.24.

† שדד vaſtavit, deſtruxit, perdidit. *from whence* שדי *the deſtroyer; and becauſe utter deſtruction requireth power equivalent to production, the omnipotent: from whence the* LXX *Job* 8.3. *tranſlate it* ὁ παντοκράτωρ.

And this Etymology rather then the former ſeemeth to be confirmed by the Prophet

But

Iſai. 13. 6. Howl ye for the day of the Lord is at hand, : כשד משדי יבוא It ſhall come as a deſtruction from the Almighty (*deſtroyer*).

‖ Hoc niſi credamus, periclitatur ipſum noſtræ fidei Confeſſionis initium, qua nos in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem credere confitemur. Neque enim veraciter ob aliud vocatur Omnipotens, niſi quia quicquid vult poteſt, nec voluntate cujuſpiam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus. S. *Aug. Enchir. c. 96.*

Article 1. πιστεύω εἰς θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα. *Art.* 6. καθολικὸν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ παντοκράτορος.

But becauſe this word *Almighty* is twice repeated in the Creed, once 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 Gods power in operation, as well as authority in dominion, whereas that in the ſixth ſpeaketh onely infinity of power, without relation to authority or dominion: I ſhall therefore reſerve the explication of the later unto its proper place, deſigning to treat particularly of Gods 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 Originall word, belonging rather to Philoſophy then Divinity, though true in both. For * ſome have ſtretched this word Almighty, according to the Greek notation, to ſignifie that God holdeth, incircleth, and containeth all things. a *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? b *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? Thus then may he be called Almighty, as holding, containing, and comprehending all things.

* *As* Theophilus *Biſhop of* Antioch, *giving account of thoſe words which are attributed unto God, as* θεὸς, κύριος, ὕψιστος, *tells us he is called* παντοκράτωρ, ὅτι αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα χρατεῖ καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐμπεριέχει. τὰ γὰρ ὕδατα πῆχει ἀγρῶν, καὶ τὰ βάθη πῆχει ἀνδρὸς, καὶ τὰς οἰκουμένας ὁ τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ὄντας. *Ad Autol. l. 1.* a *Prov. 30. 4.* b *Iſa. 40. 12.*

* Others

* as Greg. Nyssen. ἐκεῖν ὅταν τῆς Παντοκράτωρ φωνῆς ἀκούσωμεν, τοῦτο γοῦν μεν, τὸ παῦλα ἢ θεὸν ὄν τῷ εἶναι ζωτικὸν; Neither, saies he, would God be termed παντοκράτωρ, εἰ μὴ πᾶσι ἡ κλίσις τῆ περιεκτικοῦ τῶν ὅλων, ἢ ὄν τῷ εἶναι ζωπροιῶτικὸν ἐλέγετο. contra Eunom. l. 1. Creatoris Omnipotentia, & omnipotentis atque omnitenentis virtus, est causa subsistendi omni creaturæ. Quæ virtus ab eis quæ creata sunt regendis si aliquando cessaret, simul & illorum cessaret species, omnisque natura concideret. S. Aug. in Genes. l. 4. c. 12.

Others extend it further yet, beyond that of containing or comprehension, to a more immediate influence of sustaining or preservation. For the same power which first gave being unto all things, continueth the same being unto all. a *God giveth to all, life, and breath, and all things. In him we live, move and have our being*, saith the strangest Philosopher that ever entred *Athens*, the first expositor of that blind inscription, *To the unknown God.* b *How could any thing have endured, if it had not been thy will? or been preserved, if not called by thee?* as the wisedome of the Jews confesseth. Thus did the Levites stand and bless, c *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.* Where the continuall conservation of the creature is in an equall 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.

a *Act.* 17. 25, 28. b *Wisd.* 11. 25. c *Neh.* 9. 6.

From whence we may at last declare, what is couched under this attribute of God, how farre this Omnipotency extends it self, and what every Christian is thought to professe, when he addeth this part of the first Article of his Creed, *I believe in God the Father* ALMIGHTIE.

As I am perswaded of an infinite and independent essence which I term a God, and of the mystery of an eternall generation by which that God is a Father: So I assure my self that Father is not subject to infirmities of age,

age, nor is there any weakneſſe attending on the *Ancient of dayes*; but on the contrary, I believe omnipotency to be an eſſentiall attribute of his Deity, and that not onely in reſpect of operative and active power, (concerning which I ſhall have occaſion to expreſſe my faith hereafter) but alſo in regard of power authoritative, in which I muſt acknowledge his antecedent and eternall 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 Originall, and the Uſe or exerciſe thereof: this I acknowledge Infinite for amplitude or extenſion, as being a power over all things without exception; for plenitude or perfection, as being all power over every thing without limitation; for continuance or duration, as being eternall, without end or concluſion. Thus *I believe in God the Father Almighty.*

MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH.

ALthough this laſt part of the Firſt Article were not expreſſed in the * ancient Creeds, yet the ſenſe thereof was delivered in the † firſt Rules of Faith, and at laſt theſe particular words inſerted both in the Greek and Latine Confeſſions. And indeed the work of Creation

* *For we finde it not mentioned by* S. Auguſtine de Fide & Symbolo; *neither hath* Ruffinus *expounded it in the* Aquileian, *or noted it to be found in the Roman or Orientall Creeds.* Leo *reciting the three firſt Articles in his Epiſtle to* Flavianus, *maketh no mention of it.* Epiſt. 10. Maximus Taurinenſis *hath it not in* Traditione Symboli, *nor* Petrus Chryſologus *in his Sermons, amongſt ſix ſeverall expoſitions, no not in the Homilies of* Euſebius Gallicanus, *or the Expoſition of* Venantius Fortunatus. Marcellus *Biſhop of* Ancyra *left it not at* Rome *with* Julius. *Nor did* Arrius *in his Catholick Confeſſion unto* Conſtantine *acknowledge it. Neither are the words to be found in the* Latine *or* Greek *Copy of the* Creed *written about the beginning of the eighth* Century, *and publiſhed out of the MSS. by the moſt Reverend and Learned Archbiſhop of* Armach: *or in that which* Etherius *and* Beatus *produced againſt* Elipandus *Archbiſhop of* Toledo, *toward the end of the ſeventh*

Centur. † *As in that delivered by* Irenæus, εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν ποιητὴν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. *Adv. Hær.* l. 1. c. 2. *and that by* Tertul. Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit. *de Præscr. adv. Hær.* c. 13. Eusebius *delivered the first Article thus in his Confession to the* Nicene Council, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν. *and that Council expressed the same without alteration in their Creed. But after the* Nicene Council, *we finde added* ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, *by* S. Cyril *of* Jerusalem *in his Catechisme, and* 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 cœli & terræ.

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 confesse 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 termes of *heaven and earth*; secondly, to expresse 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.

For the first, I suppose it cannot be denied as the sense of the *Creed*, that under the termes of *heaven and earth* are comprehended all things; because the first Rules of Faith did so expresse 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 termes of immediate contradiction, must consequently be of universall comprehension, nor is there any thing imaginable which is not visible or invisible. Being then these were the words of the *Nicene* Creed; being the addition of *heaven & earth* in the *Constantinopolitane* could be no diminution to the former, which they still retained together with them, saying, *I believe in one God the Father Almigh-*

ty, *maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible*; it followeth that they which in the Latine Church made use onely of this last addition, could not chuse but take it in the full latitude of the first expression.

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 dayes,* saith *Moses, the Lord made heaven and earth*: in the same time, saith God himself, *the Lord made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.* 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 generall rendezvous, and make up an universall Auditory, the Prophet cries out, *Hear O Heavens, and give eare O Earth.* When he would expresse the full splendour of his majesty, and utmost extent of his actuall dominion, *Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my foot-stool.* When he would challenge unto himself those glorious attributes of Immensity and Omnipresence, *Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord.* These two then taken together signifie the Universe, or that which is called the World. S. *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.* 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 arme; we must confesse that *heaven and earth* are of as large extent and ample signification, as the *world and all things therein.*

Exod. 31. 17. *Exod.* 20. 11. *Isa.* 1. 2. *Isa.* 66. 1. *Jer.* 23. 24. *Act.* 17. 24.

Where it is yet further observable that the Apostle hath conjoyned the speech of both Testaments together.

For the ancient *Hebrews* ſeem to have had no word in uſe amongſt them which ſingly of it ſelf did ſignifie the world, as the *Greeks* had, in whoſe language S. *Paul* did ſpeak; and therefore they uſed in conjunction the *heaven and earth*, as the * grand extremities within which all things are conteined. Nay, if we take the expoſitions of the later writers in that language, thoſe two words will not onely 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 inferiour, ſuperiour, and the middle world, the lower is wholly contained in the name of *earth*, the other two under the name of *heaven*. Not do the *Hebrews* onely uſe this manner of expreſſion, but even the *Greeks* themſelves; and that not onely before, but ‖ after * *Pythagoras* had accuſtomed them to one name. As therefore under the ſingle name of † World or Univerſe, ſo alſo under the conjunctive expreſſion of *heaven and earth*, are contained all things materiall and immateriall, viſible and inviſible.

* Καλῶς ἡ πᾶσας ἁρδὸν ἐξεδέξαντο τοῖς ἄκροις, οὐρανῷ τε καὶ γῇ, τὰ μέσα συμπεριλαμβάνειν στοιχεῖα. πῶς ἡ ἀκρότης φημί; ὅτι γῆ μὲν τὸ κάτοπτρον παντὸς ἐμπεριείληφε· καὶ ἔστι κάτωθεν μὲν ἀρχὴ πάντων ἡ γῆ, πέρας ἡ τούτων ὁ πάντα περιέχων οὐρανός. τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἡ ἄνωθεν, ἀρχὴ μὲν ὁ οὐρανός, πέρας ἡ πάντων ἡ γῆ. μετὰ ἡ οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν τὰ λοιπὰ τέλεια περιείληπται στοιχεῖα. *Jo. Philop. de Mundi Creat. l. 1. c. 5.* Τῷ μὲν οὐρανίῳ σώματι (ἡ φύσις) τὸ περιέχειν τὰ πάντα ἀπένειμε, τῷ ἡ περιεχομένῳ τὸ κέντρον· ὃν ἡ σφαῖρα. ἄλλως μὲν τὸ κάτοπτρον ἀρχὴ, ἄλλως ἡ ὁ τὰ ὅλα περιέχων τῷ περιέχοντι ἐρῶ. *Hieroc. in Aur. Carm.*

† For the Rabbins uſually divide the whole frame of things into שלש עולמות three worlds; the firſt עולם השפל the inferiour, or עולם התחתון the inferiour, the depreſſed and loweſt world; הוא זה עולם that is this world, ſay they, to wit, this globe of earth on which we live. This they divide into three parts; ים the ſea, lakes and rivers, מדבר the deſert, ſolitary and inhabitable places, רחוק מן הישוב farre from the habitations of men, and ישוב ✻ נתיישב, the earth inhabited. The ſecond is called עולם התיכון the middle or inmoſt world, הוא עולם הגלגלים, this is the world of the ſpheares, containing the aerial region, and the ſtarry heavens. The third is עולם העליון the ſuperiour world, הוא עולם המלאכים, this is the world of Angels, of God, אלהים of ſoules, נפשות of ſpiritual world. Now being theſe three comprehend all things imaginable; being the firſt is ſufficiently expreſſed in ארץ the earth, and the two laſt in שמים the heavens; it followeth that in the ſenſe of the Hebrews, heaven and earth ſignifie all things.

‖ Ἐς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, ὡς ὅστις θεὸς, Ὃς οὐρανὸν τέτυχε καὶ γαῖαν μακράν. * Πυθα-

But

γὰρ πρῶτος ὠνόμασε τὴν ὅλων σύνοδον κόσμον, ὀνομάσας τὸν αὐτὸν τάξεως. Plut. de Plac. Philoſoph. l. 2. c. 1. † Si Mundum dixeris, illic erit & cœlum, & quæ in eo, ſol, & luna, & ſidera, & aſtra, & terra, & freta, & omnis cenſus elementorum. Omnia dixeris, cum id dixeris quod ex omnibus conſtat. Tertul. de Virg. Veland. c. 4. Φασὶ δὲ οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους καὶ κοινωνίαν συνέχειν, καὶ φιλίαν, καὶ κοσμιότητα, καὶ σωφροσύνην, καὶ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο διὰ ταῦτα κόσμον καλεῖσθαι. Iambl. Protrept. but the words are Plato's in Gorgia.

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*: So when we ſay, all things were 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 S. *John* concerning the *Word*, *that the world was made by him*; and in more plain and expreſſe words before, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*. Which is yet further illuſtrated by S. *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.* 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. 1 *Cor.* 15. 27. *John* 1. 10. 3. *Col.* 1. 16.

This then is the unqueſtionable doctrine of the Chriſtian faith, that the vaſt capacious frame of the World, and every thing any way contained and exiſting in it, hath not its eſſence from, or of it ſelf, 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*; for we ſee the Earth bear no ſuch creature of it ſelf; ſtones do not grow into a wall, or firſt hew, and ſquare, Heb. 3. 4.

then unite and faſten themſelves together in their generation, trees ſprout not croſſe like dry and ſapleſſe beams, nor do ſparres and tiles ſpring with a naturall uniformity into a roof, and that out of ſtone and morter: 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 it ſelf be but an * houſe, if the earth [a] *which hangeth upon nothing*, be the foundation, and the glorious ſpheres of heaven the roof, if this be the habitation of an infinite intelligence, the † temple of God; then muſt we acknowledge the world was built by him, and conſequently, *that he which built all things is God.*

* ὁ αἰθηπὸς ὅπου κόσμος ἢ δὲν ἀρα ἄλλο ἔστιν ἢ οἶκος θεῦ. *Philo de Inſom.* Κόσμος συμπαὰς καὶ ἔτοιμος, αἰθητὸς οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ. *Id. de Plant.* Noe. Θεῖόν τι μέγεθος ὁ κόσμος, καὶ οἶκος θεῦ αἰθητός. *Id. de Mundi Incorr.* a *Job* 26. 7.

† Lucretius *calls the Heavens* mundi magnum & verſatile templum. l. 5. τὸ ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερὸν θεῦ νομίζειν ξύμπαντα καὶ κόσμον εἶναι. *Philo de Monarch.*

From hence appears the truth of that diſtinction, Whatſoever 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 eternall and neceſſary exiſtence, all other indifferent, in reſpect of actuall exiſting, either to be or not to be, and that indifferency determined only by the free & voluntary act of the firſt cauſe.

Now becauſe to be thus made includes ſome imperfection, and among the parts of the world ſome are more glorious then others; if thoſe which are moſt perfect preſuppoſe a maker, then can we not doubt of a creation where we find farre leſſe perfection. This houſe of God, though uniforme, yet is not all of the ſame materialls, the footſtool and the throne are not of the ſame mould; there is a vaſt difference between the heavenly expanſions. This firſt aeriall heaven, where God ſetteth up his pavi-

pavilion, where *he maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind*, is not ſo farre inferiour in place, as it is in glory to the next, the ſeat of the Sun and Moon, the two great lights, and ſtarres innumerable, farre greater then the one of them. And yet that ſecond heaven is not ſo farre above the firſt, as beneath the *third*, into which S. *Paul* was caught. The brightneſſe of the Sun doth not ſo farre ſurpaſs the blackneſſe of a wandring 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 farre 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 ſtarres* 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 wayes doubt of the production of all other creatures ſo much inferiour unto them.

Pſal. 104.3.

2 *Cor.* 12.2.

Ἴδιον οἰκητήριον. *Jud.* v. 6.

Job 38.7.

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 onely-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 expreſſe the nature of the wind and lightning; yet being the

Pſal. 104.4.

Author-

Authour of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* hath applied the ſame to the Angels propetly ſo called, we cannot but conclude upon his Authority, that the ſame God who *created the wind*, and *made a way for the lightening 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 immaterial and immortall eſſence.

Amos 4. 12. *Job* 28. 26.

If then the Angels and their proper habitation, the farre moſt eminent and illuſtrious parts of the World were made; if to be onely made be one character of imperfection; much more muſt we acknowledge all things of inferiour nature to have dependance on their univerſall 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 eternall, and, what will follow from it, even God himſelf. 'Tis 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.

† Mundum, & hoc quod nomine alio cœlum appellare libuit, cujus circumflexu teguntur cuncta, numen eſſe credi par eſt æternum, immenſum, neque genitum, neque interiturum unquam. *Plin. Natural. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 1.

* γενόμενον μὲν τὸν ἅπαντες εἶναί φασιν, *ſaies* Ariſtotle *de Cœlo* l. 1. c. 10. *confeſſing it the generall opinion, that the World was made. Which was ſo ancient a Tradition of all the firſt Philoſophers, that from* Linus, Muſæus, Orpheus, Homer, Heſiod *and the reſt, they all mentioned the Originall of the world, entitling their books* Κοσμογονία, *or,* Θεογονία, *or the like.* Εἰσὶ γάρ τινες οἳ φασιν οὐδὲν ἀγένητον εἶναι τῶν πραγμάτων, ἀλλὰ πάντα γίγνεσθαι· γενόμενα δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄφθαρτα διαμένειν, τὰ δὲ πάλιν φθείρεσθαι· μάλιστα μὲν οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἡσίοδον, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἄλλων οἱ πρῶτοι φυσιολογήσαντες, *ſayes* Ariſtotle *de Cœlo* l. 3. c. 1. *In which words he manifeſtly attributes the doctrine of the Creation of the world not onely to Heſiod, but to all the firſt naturall Philoſophers; which learning beginning with* Prometheus *the firſt Profeſſor of that Science, continued in that family amongſt the* Atlantiadæ, *who all ſucceſſively delivered that truth. After them the* Ionian *Philoſophy did acknowledge it, and the* Italian *received it by* Pythagoras, *whoſe Scholars*

When

all maintained it beſide Ocellus Lucanus, *the firſt of them that fancied the world not made, whom* Plato *though he much eſteemed, yet followed not; for there is nothing more evident then that he held the world was made.* Λέγωμεν δὴ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν γίνεσιν τὸ πᾶν τόδε ὁ ξωιτὰς ξωιήσησεν, ἀγαθὸς ἦν. *in which words he delivers not onely the generation of the Universe, but alſo the true cauſe thereof, which is the goodneſſe of God. For he which aſks this plain and clear queſtion,* πότερον ἦν ἀεὶ γένεσιος ἀρχὴν ἔχων ἢ ἔξωθεν, ἢ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τινος καὶ ἀρξάμενος; *and anſwers the queſtion briefly with a* γέγονεν: *He which gives this generall rule upon it,* πᾶσ δ' αὖ γενομένῳ φαμὲν ὑπ' αἰτίᾳ τινὸς ἀνάγκην εἶναι γενέσθαι· *and then immediately concludes,* τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον, καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδυνάτον λέγειν· *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 Τιμαίῳ, *from whence I cited the precedent words,* ἐκεῖ γάρ φησι τὸν οὐρανὸν (*where by the way obſerve that in* Plato's Timæus οὐρανὸς *and* κόσμος *are made Synonymous*) γενέσθαι μὲν, ὑ μὲν φθαρτόν.

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 onely in the manner of expreſſing it; thoſe which in after-ages firſt denied it, made 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 axiome 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 generall 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 ſeverall parts of the world, they conclude that it was never generated, nor had any cauſe or originall 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

Ocellus Lucanus, περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως, *which book* Ariſtotle *hath made uſe of, and tranſcribed in many parts.*

same time one thing may begin to be, and last but for an hour, another continue for a thousand yeares, 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 universall 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 eternitie; 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 it self, and so have been the cause of it self as of the effect, and the effect of it self 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 alwaies understood to except him who made all things, neither can we by that name be supposed to comprehend more then the frame of heaven and earth, and all things contained in them; and so † he which first devised this argument hath himself acknowledged.

Farre more grosse was that third conceit, that if the world were ever made, it must be after the vulgar way in ordinary naturall generations; in which ‖ two mutations are observable, the first from lesse to greater, or from

* τὸ πᾶν γινόμενον ζωὴ πᾶσι γίνεται· καὶ τὸ φθειρόμενον ζωὴ πᾶσι φθείρεται· καὶ τοῦτό γε ἀδύναπον· ἄναρχον οὖν καὶ ἀτελεύτητον τὸ πᾶν. Ocellus.

† Τὸ δὲ λέγειν ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὀνομάζω † σύμπαντα κόσμον, διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ τῆς περιστροφῆς ἔτυχεν ὁπὸ πάντων δὴ κοσμηθείς. Ocellus.

‖ Παῦ τὸ γενέσεως ἀρχὴν εἰληφὸς καὶ διαλύσεως ὀφεῖλον κοινωνῆσαι δύο ὅπι δέχεται μεταβολάς· μίαν μὲν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μείονος ὁπὶ τὸ μεῖζον, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χείρονος ὁπὶ τὸ βέλπιον· δευτέραν δὲ † ἀπὸ τοῦ μείζονος ὁπὶ τὸ μεῖον, καὶ † ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίονος ὁπὶ τὸ χεῖρον. Ἐαὰν οὖν καὶ τὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν γνωπτὸν δὲι καὶ φθαρτὸν, γνώμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ μείονος ὁπὶ τὸ μεῖζον μεταβαλὸ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ χείρονος ὁπὶ τὸ βέλπιον. Ocellus.

worse

worſe to better; the ſecond from greater to leſſe, 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 concludeth in corruption or diſſolution. * But none hath ever yet obſerved that this frame of the world did ever grow up from leſſe to greater, or improve it ſelf from worſe to better: nor can we now perceive that it becomes worſe or leſſe then it was, by which decretion we might gueſſe at a former encreaſe, and from a tendency to corruption collect its originall generation. For certainly this Argument proves nothing at all, but onely 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 certainly 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 inferre, nor can any other prove it.

* Τὸ δὲ γε ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀδὲν ἡμῖν ἔξ αὐτῆς παρίχε) ἐκμήριον τοιοῦτον· ὅτε γὰρ γενόμενον αὖ τὸ εἴδομεν, ὅτε μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ ϐέλτιον καὶ τὸ μεῖζον μεταϐάλλον, ὅτε χεῖρόν ποτε ἢ μεῖον γενόμενον· ἀλλ' ἀεὶ κατὰ ταὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως διατελεῖ, καὶ ἴσον καὶ ὅμοιον αὑτὸ ἑαυτῷ. Ocellus.

The next Foundation upon which they caſt off the conſtant doctrine of their Predeceſſours, was that generall Aſſertion, That it is † impoſſible for any thing 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 alwaies been, and muſt alwaies be. The clear refutation of which difficulty requires an explication of the manner how the world was made: the ſecond part before propounded for the expoſition of this Article.

† ἀμήχανον καὶ τὸ ὂν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος, ἢ εἰς τὸ μὴ ὂν ἀναλυθῆναι. ἄφθαρτον ἄρα καὶ ἀνώλεθρον τὸ πᾶν. Ocel.

Now that the true nature and manner of this Action may be ſo farre underſtood as to declare the Chriſtian Faith, and refute the errours of all oppoſers, it will be neceſſary to conſider it firſt with reference to the Object or Effect, ſecondly, in relation to the Cauſe or Agent, thirdly, with reſpect unto the Time or Origination of it.

The Action by which the heaven and earth were

made, considered in reference to the effect, I conceive to be the production of their totall being; so that whatsoever entity they had when made, had no reall existence before they were so made. and this manner of production we usually terme Creation, as excluding all concurrence of any materiall cause, and all dependence of any kind of subject, as presupposing no privation, as including no motion, as signifying a production out of nothing, * that is by which something is made, and not any thing out of which 'tis made. This is the proper and peculiar sense of the word Creation: not that it signifies so much by vertue of its origination or vulgar use in the † Latine tongue, nor that the Hebrew word used by *Moses*, *In the beginning God* created *the heaven and the earth*, hath of it self any such peculiar acception. For it is often used ‖ synony-

* *So I conceive it best expressed by* Anselme *Archbishop of* Canterbury. Dicitur aliquid esse factum de nihilo, cum intelligimus esse quidem factum, sed non esse aliquid unde sit factum. *Monologii.* c. 8.

† Creatio apud nos generatio vel nativitas dicitur, apud Græces vero sub nomine creationis verbum facturæ & conditionis accipitur. *S. Hieron. ad Eph.* 4.

‖ ברא *is promiscuously used with* עשה, *which is of the greatest latitude, denoting any kind of effection, and with* יצר, *which rather implies a formation out of something, from whence* יוצר *a potter. For the first, we read* Genes. 2. 3. *that* God rested from all his work, אשר ברא אלהים לעשות. *not that on the sixth day he did the work of two daies, that he might rest on the seventh, as* Rabbi Solomon; *not that in six daies he made the roots of things, that they might afterward produce the like, as* Aben Ezra; *not these or any other fancies of the* Rabbines; *as if* ברא *signified one work and* עשה *another, for they both expresse the production, as appears clearly in the following verse,* These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, בהבראם when they were created, ביום עשות in the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth. *So Isa.* 45. 12. I have made the earth, and created man upon it; *where the first expresseth the proper, the second the improper creation. which indifferent acception appeareth in collating* Psal. 115. 16. 121. 2. *with* Isa. 42. 5. 45. 18. *as also* Isa. 17. 7. *with* Eccl 12. 1. *From whence the Septuagint translate* ברא *indifferently* ποιεῖν *or* κτίζειν. *For the second,* יצר *is usually rendred by the Targum* ברא, *and by the* LXX, *though generally* πλάσσειν, *yet sometimes* κτίζειν. *and that it hath the same signification will appear by conferring* Gen. 2. 7. *with* Isa. 45. 12. *and not onely so, but by that single verse* Isa. 43. 1. Now thus saith the Lord בראך that created thee, O Jacob, ויצרך and he that formed thee, O Israel. *Lastly, all these are jointly used in the same validity of expression,* Isai. 43. 7. Every one that is called by my name, for בראתיו I have created him for my glory, יצרתיו I have formed him, yea עשיתיו *I have made him.*

mously

mouſly with words which ſignifie any kind of production, or formation, and by it ſelf it ſeldome denotes a production out of nothing, or proper creation, but moſt frequently, the making of one ſubſtance out of another preexiſting, as the *a* fiſhes of the water, and *b* man of the duſt of the earth; the *c* renovating or reſtoring any thing to its former perfection, for want of Hebrew words in compoſition; or laſtly, the doing ſome new or wonderfull work, the producing ſome ſtrange and admirable effect, as the *d* opening the mouth of the earth, and the ſignall * judgements on the people of Iſrael.

a as *Gen.*1.21.
b *Gen.*1.27. 2.7.
c *Pſal.*51.12. *Iſa.*65.17.
d *Numb.*16.30
* *Iſa.*45.7.

Creatio atque conditio nunquã niſi in magnis operibus nominantur: Verbi cauſa, mundus creatus eſt, urbs condita eſt, domus vero quamvis magna ſit, ædificata potius dicitur, quam condita vel creata. In magnis enim operibus atque facturis verbum creationis aſſumitur. S. *Hieron. ad Eph. c.*4.

We muſt not therefore weakly collect the true nature of Creation from the force of any word which by ſome may be thought to expreſſe ſo much, but we muſt collect it from the teſtimony of God the Creatour 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 Canonicall, we ſhall therefore evince it by the undoubted teſtimony of S. *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 Scriptures is to be, *Behold what manner of love the Father hath beſtowed upon us, that we ſhould be called the ſons of God*, ſaith S. *John* in his Epiſtle, who in his Goſpel told us *he had given us power to*

2 *Macc.*7.28.

1 *John* 3.1.

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 originall may be thought to ſpeak no more then this, *thou haſt called this evill 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 perſwaſive 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 ſubtile body, which we ſee not; nor as if thoſe *things which are ſeen*, were in equall 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.

Jer. 32. 23. ותקרא

Heb. 11. 3.

† *For I take* μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων *in this place to be equivalent unto* οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων *in the* Maccabees, *and that of the ſame ſenſe with* ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, *as the* Syriac *Tranſlation.* מן אילין דלא מתחזין ex iis quæ non conſpiciuntur. *Which manner of ſpeech may be obſerved even in the beſt* Greek *Authors, as in* Ariſtotle, μεταβάλλοι ἂν τὸ μεταξύ τοῦ μᾶλλον τοῦ ἧττον· ἢ γὰρ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκείμενον, ἢ οὐκ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς οὐκ ὑποκείμενον, ἢ μὴ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς ὑποκείμενον, ἢ ἐξ ὑποκειμένου εἰς μὴ ὑποκείμενον.

Vain therefore was that opinion of a reall matter coevall with God, as neceſſary for production of the world by way of ſubject, as the eternall and Almighty God by way of efficient. For if ſome reall and materiall 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 alledged, why he ſhould be dependent in his operation, who is confeſſed independent in his being.

And

And as this coeternity of matter oppoſeth Gods Independency, the proper notion of the Diety, 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 p oduce any thing; then muſt he * want ſomething externall: and whoſoever wanteth any thing is not all-ſufficient. And certainly he muſt have a low opinion and poor conception of the infinite and eternall God, who thinks he is no otherwiſe known to be Omnipotent then 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 materiall concurrence, the making of them left a mark of impotency rather then omnipotency.

* Nemo enim non eget eo de cujus utitur; nemo non ſubjicitur ei cujus eget ut poſſit uti. Sic & nemo de alieno utendo, non minor eſt eo de cujus utitur; & nemo qui præſtat de ſuo uti, non in hoc ſuperior eſt eo cui præſtat uti. *Tertul. adv. Hermog. c. 8.*

† *Grande revera beneficium contulit, ut haberet hodie per quem Deus cognoſceretur & omnipotens vocaretur: niſi & jam non omnipotens, ſi non & hoc potens, ex nihilo omnia proferre. Ibidem.* Quomodo ab homine divina illa vis differet, ſi, ut homo, ſic etiam Deus ope indigeat aliena. Indiget autem ſi nihil moliri poteſt, niſi ab altero illi materia miniſtretur. *Lactan* l. 2. c. 9.

The ſuppoſition then of an eternall 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, ſomething acquainted with the truth which we profeſſe, though rejecting Chriſtianity, have reproved thoſe of the ſchool of *Plato* who delivered as the doctrine of their Maſter, an eternall Companion, ſo injurious to the Father and Maker of all things.

‡ as Hierocles, Καὶ τί κωλύω ζοι τύτους, ὅπερ γε καὶ τῶν Πλατωνικῶν τινες ὐκ ὀρθῶν τ περὶ τῦ δημιυργοῦ θεῦ διασώζουσιν ἐννοιαν;

ὐδ ἱκανὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι φήθησαν αὐτοτελῶς ἑαυτῷ πᾶσαν δυνάμεις κόσμου εἰκεία δυνάμει καὶ ζοφίᾳ ἐξ ἀϊδίᾳ ἐνεργῦντα· ἀλλ' ἀγεννήτυ ὕλης ζωηρείᾳ, καὶ τῇ μὴ παρ' αὐτῦ ἑαυτῇ φύσει καταχώμενον, μόγις δημιργεῖν δυνάδες. *De Provid. & Fato.*

Wherefore

Wherefore to give an anſwer unto that general poſition, That out of nothing nothing can be produced, which * *Ariſtotle* pretends to be the opinion of all natural Philoſophers, I muſt firſt obſerve, that this Univerſall Propoſition was firſt framed out of particular conſiderations of the works of art and nature. For if we look upon all kindes of † artificers, we finde they cannot give any ſpecimen of their art without materialls. Being then the beauty and uniformity of the world ſhews it to be a piece of art moſt exquiſite, hence they concluded that the maker of it was the moſt exact ‖ Artificer, 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 preexiſtent, nor is there any mutation wrought but in a ſubject, and with a preſuppoſed capability of alteration. 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 preexiſting.

* πᾶν τὸ γινόμενον ἀνάγκη γίνεσθαι ἢ ἐξ ὄντων, ἢ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων· τούτων δὲ τὸ μὴ ὂν μὴ ὄντων γίνεσθαι ἀδύνατον· περὶ οὗ καὶ ταύτης ὁμολογουμένως τῆς δόξης ἅπαντες οἱ περὶ φύσεως. *Phyſic.* l. 4. c. 1.

† Ut igitur Faber eum quid ædificaturus eſt non ipſe facit materiã, ſed ea utitur quæ ſit parata, fictorq; item cera : ſic iſti providentiæ divinæ materiam præſto eſſe oportuit, non quam ipſe faceret, ſed quam haberet paratam. *Cicero de Nat. Deorum.* Ἀπεικαζέον τῷ μὲν Διῒ ὡς τεχνίτῃ, ὡς δὲ ἀνδριάντα τὸν κόσμον. *Methodius* περὶ ἀθῳωσ. ‖ So Hierocles calls him κοσμοποιὸν καὶ δεισότεχνον Θεὸν, *in Aur. Carm.*

* Ὅτι δὲ αἱ ὑσίαι, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἁπλῶς ὄντα ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινὸς γίνεται, δῆλον σκοποῦντι γένοιτ' ἂν φανερόν· ἀεὶ γάρ ἐστί τι ὃ ὑπόκειται, ἐξ οὗ γίνεται τὸ γιγνόμενον, οἷον τὰ φυτὰ καὶ τὰ ζῶα ὁπὸ σπέρματος. *Arift. Phyſ.* l. 1. c. 7.

Now what can be more irrational, then from the weakneſs of ſome creature to inferre the ſame imbecillity in the creatour, 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 wiſdome, preſcience, and preconception, that order and beauty of operation which is required in an Artiſt, is moſt eminently

ly contained in him, who hath *ordered all things in meaſure, and number, and weight*; but if the moſt abſolute Idea in the Artificers underſtanding be not ſufficient to produce his deſigne, without hands to work, and materials to make uſe of, it will follow no more that God is neceſſarily tied unto preexiſting matter, then that he is really compounded of corporeal parts. *wiſd. 11. 10.*

Again, 'tis 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 then that this manner of generation cannot poſſibly have been the firſt production even of thoſe things which are now generated. We ſee 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 preexiſting plant. We ſee from ſpawn the fiſhes, and from eggs the fowls receive now the originall of their being: but this could not at firſt be ſo, becauſe both ſpawn and egge 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 it ſelf a power of germination; becauſe the ſpawn and egge are ſejungeable from the fiſh and fowl, and yet ſtill retain the prolifick power of generation; therefore ſome might poſſibly conceive that theſe ſeminall bodies might be originally ſcattered on the earth, out of which the firſt of all thoſe creatures ſhould ariſe. But in viviparous Animals, whoſe offſpring is generated within themſelves, whoſe ſeed by ſeparation from them loſeth all its ſeminall or prolifick power, this is not onely improbable, but inconceivable. And therefore being the * Philoſophers themſelves confeſſe, that whereas now all

* *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.* Ὅσοι δ' ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, ὥσπερ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Σπεύσιππος, τὸ ἄριστον καὶ κάλλιστον μὴ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἶναι, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ φυτῷ καὶ τῇ ζώων τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰτίας μὲν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ καλὸν καὶ τὸ τέλειον ἐν τοῖς ἐκ τούτων, οὐκ ὀρθῶς εἴρηκε. τὸ γὰρ σπέρμα ἐξ ἑτέρων ἐστὶ πρότερον τελείων· καὶ τὸ πρῶτον οὐ σπέρμα ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τέλειον· οἷον πρότερον ἂν ἄνθρωπον ἄν

annualls

φαίη τις εἶναι τῦ σπέρματος, ὑ ἢ ὂν τύλη γινώμενον, ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἐξ ὃ τὸ σπέρμα. *By which words* Aristotle *hath sufficiently destroyed his own Argument, which we produced before out of the first of the Physicks, and is excellently urged in that Philosophicall piece attributed unto* Just. Martyr: Εἰ πρῶτόν ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον σπέρμα, ϗ ὕστερον τὸ ὂν σπέρμα ϗ γινόμενον, ϗ γίνονται ἀμφότερα, τῇ μὲν γίνεσι τὸ κινῆνν ὂν σπέρμα ϗ γινομένη ὑπάρχει· τὸ σπέρμα· τῇ δ γίνεσι τῦ πρώτε ὑπαρχῆς τὸ σπέρμα ὑ δυνατόν. ὧν ἄρα ἀεὶ τὰ ζῶα ϗ τὰ φυτὰ ἐκ σπέρματος. *Arist. Dogm. Everſ.*

animalls are generated by the means of ſeed, and that the animalls 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 univerſall maxime, that *nothing can be made of nothing*, is merely calculated for the meridian of naturall cauſes, raiſed ſolely out 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.

Now when we thus deſcribe the nature of Creation, and under the name of *Heaven and Earth* comprehend all things contained in them, we muſt diſtinguiſh between things created. For ſome were made immediately out of nothing, by a proper, ſome onely mediately, as out of ſomething formerly made out of nothing, by an improper kind of Creation. By the firſt were made all immateriall ſubſtances, all the orders of Angels, and the ſouls of men, the heavens, and the ſimple or elementall bodies, as the earth, the water, and the aire. *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*; ſo *in the beginning*, as without any preexiſting or antecedent matter: this earth, when ſo *in the beginning* made, was *without forme and void*, covered with waters likewiſe made not out of it, but with it, the ſame which, *when the waters were gathered together*

Gen. 1. 1.
2.
9.

ther unto one place, appeared as dry land. By the ſecond, all the *hoſts of the earth*, the fowls of the air, and the fiſhes of the ſea. *Let the earth*, ſaid God, *bring forth graſſe the herb yielding ſeed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may flie above the earth.* and more expreſly yet; *Out of the ground God formed every beaſt of the field, and every fowl of the air.* And well may we grant theſe plants and animalls to have their origination from ſuch principles, when we read, *God formed man of the duſt of the ground*; and ſaid unto him whom he created in his own image, *Duſt thou art.*

11. 20. Gen. 2. 7. 3. 19.

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 freedome, and ſo performing of that action: In the firſt we may ſee his goodneſſe, in the ſecond his will, in the third his power.

I do not here introduce any externall impulſive cauſe, as moving God unto the Creation of the world; for I have preſuppoſed all things diſtinct from him to have been produced out of nothing by him, and conſequently to be poſteriour not onely to the motion but the actuation of his will. Being then nothing can be antecedent to the creature beſide God himſelf, neither can any thing be a cauſe of any of his actions but what is in him; we muſt not look for any thing extrinſecall unto him, but wholly acquieſce in his infinite goodneſſe, as the onely moving and impelling cauſe. [a] *There is none good but one, that is God*, ſaith our Saviour; none originally, eſſentially, infinitely, independently good, but he. Whatſoever goodneſſe is found in any creature is but by way of emanation from that fountain, whoſe very being is diffuſive, whoſe

a *Mat.* 19. 17. Ἄλλο γὰρ τὸ ἀόριστον ἀγαθὸν, ἄλλο τὸ καθ' ἕξιν ἀγαθὸν, ἄλλο τὸ πρώτως ἀγαθόν. *Proclus in Timæum.* τὸ δὲ αὐτοαγαθὸν πρώτως ἀγαθόν. *Ib.*

nature consists in the communication of it self. In the end of the sixth day *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good*: which shews the end of creation of all things thus good, was the communication of that by which they were, and appeared, so.

Gen. 1. 31.

The ancient heathens have acknowledged this * truth, but with such disadvantage, that from thence they gathered an undoubted errour. For from the goodnesse of God, which they did not unfitly conceive necessary, infinite and eternall, † they collected that whatsoever dependeth of it must be as necessary and eternall, even as light must be as ancient as the Sun, and a shadow as an opacous body in that light. If then there be no instant imaginable before which God was not infinitely good, then can there likewise be none conceivable before which the world was not made. And thus they thought the goodnesse of the Creatour must stand or fall with the eternity of the creature.

* As Plato, Λέγωμεν δὴ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πᾶν τόνδε ὁ ξυνιστὰς ξυνέστησεν, ἀγαθὸς ἦν· ἀγαθῷ δ' οὐδεὶς περὶ οὐδενὸς οὐδέποτε ἐγγίνεται φθόνος· τούτου δ' ἐκτὸς ὢν, πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα ἐβουλήθη γενέσθαι παραπλήσια αὑτῷ. ταύτην τὴν γενέσεως κόσμου μάλιστ' ἄν τις ἀρχὴν κυριωτάτην παρ' ἀνδρῶν φρονίμων ὑποδεχόμενος, ὀρθότατα ἀποδέχοιτ' ἄν. *in Timæo.* Αἰτία γὰρ τῆς τοῦ πάντων ποιήσεως ἀγαθότης ἄλλη περισσὴν εὔλογος, πλὴν τῆς καλῶν οὐσιῶν ἀγαθότητος. *Hierocl. in Aur. Carm.* Αἱ γὰρ παρὰ τὴν ἀγαθότητα λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι τῆς δημιουργίας τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς, ἀνθρωπίναις μᾶλλον περιεστᾶσιν ἢ τῷ θεῷ πρέπουσιν. *Ib.*

† Ἀνάγκη διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθότητα ὄντος τοῦ κόσμου, ἀεί τε ἢ θεὸν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἢ κόσμον ὑπάρχειν ἄπειρον ἥλιόν μὲν καὶ πυρὶ ζωογόνῳ καὶ φῶς, σώματι δὲ σκιά. *Salustius, de Dis & mundo, c. 7.* εἰ γὰρ ἄμεινον μὴ ποιεῖν, πῶς οἷς τὸ ποιεῖν μεταβάλλει; εἰ δὲ τὸ ποιεῖν, τί μὴ ἐξ αἰδίου ἔπραττεν; *Hierocles de Fato & Provid. Neither doth he mean any lesse, when in his sense he thus describes the First Cause of all things;* ὃς ἂν (so I read it, not ὃς, ἂν as the Printed Copies, or ὡς ἂν as Curterius) ἢ τὸ φῶτον αὐτοῦ αἴτιον ἀμεταβλήτον σιωπῇ καὶ ἀπερισκέπτου, καὶ ἢ οὐσίαν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ ἢ αὐτὴ κεκτημένον, καὶ τὴν ἀγαθότητα ἐκ ἐπικλινῆ ἔχον, ἀλλ' ἀσυμμέτρως καθ' αὑτὸ, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὸ εἶναι προάγον, so I read it, not πάντων πρὸς τὸ εὖ εἶναι, as the printed. Hierocl. in Aur. Carm. Συνέρτηκε ἄρα τῇ μὲν ἀγαθότητι τὴν παντὸς ἡ τῆς προνοίας ἐκλάμψεις. ταύτῃ δὲ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ διαιωνίου ποίησις· ταύτῃ δὲ τοῦ παντὸς καλὰ ἢ ἄπαυστον χρόνον αἰδιότης. καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ταύτην τε ἀναιρεῖ, καὶ τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ ποιήσαντος. Proclus 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*

For

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* S. Hierom *hath ſufficiently aſſured us that he lived and died in the Chriſtian Faith. The reaſon of my conjecture is no more then this.* Proclus *acknowledgeth that* Plutarch *and others, though with* Plato *they maintained the goodneſſe of God to be the cauſe of the world, yet withall 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 judgement if it were not elſewhere apparent, is ſufficiently known by the Fragment of* Methodius, Περὶ γενητῆς, *preſerved in* Photius. Ὁ δὲ Ὠριγένης, ὃν κἀγὼ μέγα καλῶ, ἔλεγε Χωρὶς ἀϊδίου ὕλης μήτε σοφῶ τινὶ ἀπεργάσασθαι θεὸν μήτε πᾶν. *Being then* Porphyrius *and* Iamblichus *cited by* Proclus, *being* Heroclis, Proclus *and* Siluſius *were all either* ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς γενεᾶς, *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 they might receive it from his mouth, eſpecially conſidering that even* Origen *a Chriſtian confirmed the ſame.*

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 externall 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 alwaies 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 inferiour 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 onely be neceſſitated in their actions by a greater power, but alſo as neceſſarily be determined by the propoſall of an infinite good: whereas neither of theſe neceſſities can be acknowledged in God's actions, without ſuppoſing a power beſide and *Pſal. 94. 9, 10.*

above Omnipotency, or a reall happineſſe 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 counſell of his own will,* ſaith the Apoſtle: and whereſoever counſell is, there is election, or elſe 'tis vain; where a will, there muſt be freedome, or elſe 'tis weak. We cannot imagine that the all-wiſe God ſhould act or produce any thing 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 it ſelf, 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 any thing without himſelf as determining his will to the deſire, and neceſſitating to the production of it. If then we conſider Gods goodneſſe, 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.

Eph. 1. 11.

Wherefore that ancient conceit of a neceſſary emanation of God's goodneſſe in the eternall creation of the world will now eaſily be refuted, if we make a diſtinction in the equivocall notion of Goodneſſe. For if we take it as it ſignifieth a rectitude and excellency of all vertue and holineſſe, with a negation of all things morally evil, vitious, 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 communicativeneſſe of ſome good to others; then God is not neceſſarily, but freely good, that is to ſay, profitable and beneficiall. For he had not been in the leaſt degree

gree 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 any thing beſide himſelf. Every proprietary therefore being accounted maſter of his own, and thought freely to beſtow what ere he gives: much more muſt that one eternall & independent being be wholly free in the communicating his own perfections without any neceſſity or obligation: we muſt then look no further then the determination of God's will in the creation of the World.

For this is the admirable power of God, that with him to will is to effect, to determine is to performe. 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 reſiſtence in the object, where no need of preparation, application, or inſtrumentall advantage in the agent, there the actuall 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's the creation. Which two are ſo intimately and immediately the ſame, that though in our and ‖ other tranſlations thoſe words *let there be*, which expreſſe the command of God, differ from the other, *there was* which denote the preſent exiſtence of the creature; yet in the Originall there is no difference at all, neither in point nor letter. And yet even in the diverſity of the Tranſlation the phraſe ſeems ſo expreſſive of Gods infinite power, and immediate efficacy of his will, that it hath raiſed ſome admiration of *Moſes* in the * enemies of the

Revel. 4. 11.

* *So* Clemens Alexandrinus *ſpeaks of God.* Ψιλῷ τῷ βέλεσθαι δημιουργεῖ, καὶ τῷ μόνον ἐθελῆσαι αὐτὸ ἔπεσθαι τὸ γενόμενον. *Protrept.*

† γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα ἔργον ἦν. *S. Baſil.* ὅταν ὁ φωνὴν θεῖ, καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ πρόσταγμα λέγωμεν, τὸ

ὂν τῷ θελήματι ῥᾳδίην ἡγούμεθα ὂν εἶδος παραδείγματος χωρὶς γίνεσθαι. Id. in Hexaëm. ‖ *as* γενηθήτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς. Fiat lux, & facta eſt lux. *or* Aquila, γενέσθω, καὶ ἐγένετο. *as* Symmachus, ἔστω, καὶ ἐγένετο. *all with a difference: whereas in the* Hebrew *it is a moſt expreſſive and ſignificant tautology,* יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי אוֹר

* *As* Dionyſius Longinus, περὶ ὕψους *Sect.* 7. Ταῦτ' οὖν καὶ ὁ νομοθέτης τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης,

religion

ὕχ ὁ τυχὼν ἀνὴρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τῦ θεῦ δωάμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐγνώκει καὶ ἐφύνων, εὐθὺς ὲν τῇ πίσει λαβὼν γεγένας ἦν νόμων, ἅπερ ὁ θεὸς, φησί· τί; γῆν ἐποίησα φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο· γῆν ἐποίησα γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο. where obſerve Longinus made uſe of the Tranſlation of Aquila.

* Πάντα ὅσα ἠθέλησεν ἐποίησεν ὲν τῷ ὐρανῷ καὶ ὲν τῇ γῇ. ὁρᾷς ὅτι καὶ τῇς ἐ μικρᾶς ἦν ὲν τῇ γῇ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇς τῦ ὅλε κτίσιν ἦν ἄνω δωάμεων ἤρκασεν ἡ θέλησις αὐτῦ μόνη. S. Chryſ. 1. περὶ τῦ ἀκατα λήπτε.

religion both of the Jews and Chriſtians. * *God is in the heavens, he hath done whatſoever he pleaſed*, ſaith *David*; yea in the making of the heavens, he therefore created them becauſe *he pleaſed*; nay more, he thereby created them, even by willing their creation.

Now although ſome may conceive the Creature might have been produced from all eternity by the free determination of Gods will, and it is ſo farre 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 eternall. *Heb.* 11. 3. *Through faith we underſtand the worlds were framed by the word of God.* and by that faith we are aſſured, that whatſoever poſſibility of an eternall exiſtence of the creature may be imagined, actually it had a temporall beginning; and therefore all the arguments for this world's eternity are nothing but ſo many erroneous miſconceptions. *Prov.* 8. 22, 23. *The Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old*, ſaith Wiſedome. *I was ſet up from everlaſting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.* And the ſame Wiſedome of God being made man reflecteth upon the ſame priority, ſaying *John* 17. 5. *Now, O Father, gloriſie thou me with thine own ſelf, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Yea in the ſame Chriſt are we *bleſſed with all ſpirituall bleſſings, according as he hath choſen us in him before the foundation of the world.* The impoſſibility of the origination of a circular motion, which we are ſure is either in the heaven or earth,

earth, and the impropriety of the beginning of time, are ſo poor exceptions, that they deſerve not the leaſt labour of refutation. The actuall eternity of this world is ſo farre from being neceſſary, that it is of it ſelf moſt improbable, and without the infallible certainty of Faith there is no ſingle perſon carries more evidences of his youth, then the world of its * novelty.

* as even Lucretius confeſſeth, and that out of the

Principles of Epicurus.

Verum, ut opinor, habet novitatem ſumma, recensque
Natura eſt mundi, neque pridem exordia cepit.

'Tis true indeed, ſome ancient accounts there are which would perſwade us to imagine a ſtrange antiquity of the world, farre beyond the annalls of *Moſes*, and account of the ſame ſpirit which made it. The † *Egyptian* Prieſts pretended an exact Chronology for ſome myriads of years, and the *Chaldeans* or ‖ *Aſſyrians* farre out-reckon them, in which they delivered not onely a Catalogue of their Kings, but alſo a table of the * Eclipſes of the Sun and Moon.

† Plato *tells us of an account which an* Egyptian *Prieſt gave to* Solon, *in which the* Athenians *were* 9000 *years old, and thoſe of* Sais 8000. περὶ τέσσαρα μὲν τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν ἔτεσι χιλίοις ὀν γῆς ἐκ τῆς Ἡφαίστου τὸ σπέρμα περιλαβόντων ὑμῶν· τήνδε ὑστέραν τῆς ἐνθάδε διακοσμήσεως παρ' ἡμῖν ὀν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν ὀκτακισχιλίων ἔτῶν ἀριθμὸς γέγραπται. In Timæo. Pomponius Mela *makes a larger account out of* Herodotus. Ipſi vetuſtiſſimi (ut prædicant) hominum trecentos & triginta reges ante *Amaſim*, & ſupra trecentum millium annorum ætates certis Annalibus; *where, as the* Egyptians *much ſtretch the truth, ſo doth* Mela *ſtretch the relation of* Herodotus, *who makes it not* 13000, *but* 11340 *years*. Diodorus Siculus *tells us of* 23000 *years from the reign of the firſt King of* Egypt *to the expedition of* Alexander, *and* Diogenes Laertius *out of other Authours more then doubles that account*. Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν δὴ Νείλου φάσκοντες παῖδα Ἥφαιστον δὴ ἄρξαι φιλοσοφίας, ὧν τοὺς περιέχοντας ἱερέας εἶναι καὶ προφήτας ἀπὸ τότε εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον † Μακεδόνα ἔτη εἶναι μυριάδας τέσσαρας καὶ ὀκτακισχίλια ὀκτακόσια ἔτη ἑξήκοντα τρία. ‖ Ἀσύριοι δὲ φησιν Ἰάμβλιχος, ὧν ἐπὶ καὶ εἴκοσι μυριάδας ἔτῶν μόνας ἐτήρησε, ὡς φησιν Ἵππαρχος· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλως ἀποκαταστάσεις καὶ περιόδους τῆς ἐπὶ κοσμοκράτορων μήνιν παρέδοσε. Proclus in Timæum. * ὧν οἷς ἡλίου μὲν ἐκλείψεις γινομένας τεσσαράκοντα τρεῖς, σελήνης δὲ ὀκτακοσίας τεσσαράκοντα δύο. Diog. Laert.

But for their number of years nothing is more certain then 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* entred *Egypt* with his victorious army, the Priests could shew him out of their sacred Histories an account of the *Persian* Empire, which he had gained by conquest, and the *Macedonian*, which he received by birth, of each for * 8000 years. whereas nothing can be more certain out of the best Historicall account, then 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 which 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 Countrey. Beside, their Catalogues must needs be ridiculously incredible, when the *Egyptians* make their first Kings reigns above † 1200 years a piece, and the *Assyrians* theirs above 30000; which forced after-ages to take their yeares for moneths, and these for daies.

* *This fallacy appeareth by an Epistle which* Alexander *wrote to his mother* Olympias, *mentioned by* Athenagoras, Minutius Felix, S. Cyprian, *and* S. Augustine. *Persarum autem & Macedonum imperium usq; ad ipsum Alexandrum cui loquebatur, plusquam octo millium annorum ille constituit; cum apud Græcos Macedonum* usque ad mortem *Alexandri* quadringenti octoginta quinque reperiantur anni, *Persarum* vero, donec ipsius *Alexandri* victoria finiretur, ducenti & triginta tres computentur. *S. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 12. c. 10.*

† *as* Diodorus Siculus *takes notice of the* Egyptians, *and* Abydenus *of the* Chaldeans, *whose ten first Kings reigned* 120 *Sari.* ὡς τὲς πρώτας εἶναι βασιλεῖς δέκα· ὧν ὁ χρόνος τῆς βασιλείας ζωῆξι ζάρος ἐκατὸν εἶχον. *Now this word* ζάρος *was proper to the* Babylonian *or* Chaldean *account.* Hesyc. Σάρος, ἀριθμός τις παρὰ Βαβυλωνίοις. *but what this number was he tells us not. In the Fragment of* Abydenus *preserved by* Eusebius, Σάρος Ν ὃν ἐξακόσια καὶ χιλιάδια ἦν, *every* Σάρος *is* 3600 *years. and consequently the* 120 σάροι *belonging to the reign of the ten Kings* 432000 *years. Neither was this the account onely of* Abydenus, *but also of* Berosus; *neither was the interpretation onely of* Eusebius, *but also of* Alexander

And

Polybiſtor, *who likewiſe expreſſeth* ἡ χρόνον τῆς Χασλαίας αὐτῆς Σάρος ἐκάλουν, ἤτοι ἐνιαυτοὺς μυριάδας τετρακοντα τρεῖς καὶ δύο χιλιάδας. *This ſeemed ſo highly incredible, that two ancient Monks,* Anianus *and* Panodorus, *interpreted thoſe* Chaldean *years to be but daies, ſo that every* Σάρος *ſhould conſiſt of* 3600 *daies, that is* 9 *yeares* 10 *moneths and a half, and the whole* 120 Σάροι *for the* 10 *Kings* 1183 *years* 6 *moneths and odd dayes. This is all which* Joſ. Scaliger *or* Jacobus Goar *of late cou'd find concerning this* Chaldean *Computation: and the firſt of theſe complains that none but* Heſychius *makes mention of this account. I ſhall therefore ſupply them not onely with another Author, but alſo with a diverſe and diſtinct interpretation.* Σάροι μέτρον, καὶ ἀριθμὸς παρὰ Χαλδαίοις. οἱ δὲ ρκ' Σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτὸὺς βσκ', οἱ γίνονται ιη' ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἓξ. *that is, according to the Tranſlation of* Portus, *Sari apud Chaldæos eſt menſura & numerus. Nam* 120 *Sari faciunt anno* 2222, *qui ſunt anni* 18 *& ſex menſes. well might he fix his* N L. *or non liquet 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 δὲ ρκ' Σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτὸὺς βσκ' κατὰ τὴν Χαλδαίων λῆψον, ἐστὶν ὁ Σάρος ποιεῖ μῆνας Σεληνιακῶν σκβ', ἤτοι γίνονται ιη' ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἓξ. *And ſo the ſenſe is clear.* Σάρος *according to the* Chaldee *account comprehends* 222 *moneths, which come to* 18 *years and ſix moneths; therefore* 120 σάροι *make* 2220 *years, and therefore for* βσκβ', *I read, leaving out the laſt* β, Σσκ'.

And 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 tacite 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 reall obſervation, when they might be as well deſcribed out of prolepticall ſuppoſition.

Beſide, the motions of the Sun, which they mention together and with authority equall 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 celestiall 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 in the East.

* Ἐν τοίνυν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τρὶς ἔλεγον ἐξ ἑῴων ἀνατεῖλαι ἥλιον καὶ δὶς καταδῦναι, ὀνθαῦτα δὶς ἑῴους γενέσθαι. Herod. Euterpe. Mandatumque literis servant, dum Ægyptii sunt, quater cursus suos vertisse sidera, ac solem bis jam occidisse ubi nunc oritur. Mela l. 1. c. 9.

What then are these feigned observations and fabulous descriptions for the worlds antiquity, in respect not onely of the infallible Annals of the Spirit of God, but even of the constant testimonies of more sober men, and the reall apparences and face of things, which speak them of a farre 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 eternall, or as old as the *Egyptians* and the *Chaldees* fancy it; how should it come to passe that the Poeticall inventions should find no actions worthy their Heroick verse before the *Trojan* or the *Theban* warre, 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.

† *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* Lucretius, l. 5.

Præterea, si nulla fuit genitalis origo
Terrarum & cœli, semperque æterna fuere;
Cur supra bellum *Thebanum* & funera *Trojæ*,
Non alias alii quoque res cecinere *Poetæ*?
Quo tot facta virûm toties cecidere? neque usquam
Æternis famæ monumentis insita florent?

If

If we * conſider the neceſſaries of life, the wayes of freedome 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. And the firſt beginnings were then ſo known and acknowledged by all, that the inventers and authours of them were reckoned amongſt their Gods, and worſhipped by thoſe to whom they had been ſo highly beneficiall. 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.

* *Pliny gives a large account of theſe,* l. 7. c. 56. *and* Lucretius *makes uſe of this Argument,* l. 5.

Quare etiam quædam nunc artes expoliuntur,

Nunc etiam augeſcunt, nunc addita navigiis ſunt

Multa, modo organici melicos peperere ſonores:
Denique natura hæc rerum, ratioque reperta eſt
Nuper, & hanc primus comprimis ipſe repertus
Nunc ego ſum in patrias qui poſſim vertere voces.

If we ſearch into the Nations themſelves, we ſhall ſee none without ſome originall: and were thoſe † Authours extant 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 waies 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 *Caeſars*, occupying ſo great a ſpace, as to take up a journey of ‖ 60 dayes, were thought even then * coevall with the world. We read without any ſhew of con-

† *I mean, not onely ſuch as wrote the building of particular Cities, as* Apollonius Rhodius Καίνης κτίσιν, Xenophanes Σελαμῖνος κτίσιν, Crito Συρακουσῶν κτίσιν, *and* Philochoros Σελαμῖνος κτίσιν: *but thoſe more generall, as* Polemo Κτίσεις πόλεων ἐν Φωκίδι, Charon Πόλεων κτίσεις, Callimachus Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων, Hellanicus Κτίσεις ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων, *and the Indefinite* Κτίσεις *written by* Dercyllus, Dionyſius, Hippys, Triſimachus, *and others.*

‖ Sylvarum, Hercynia dierum ſexaginta iter occupans, ut major aliis, ita & notior. *Mela* l. 3. c. 3. * Hercyniæ ſylvæ roborum vaſtitas intacta ævis & congenita mundo, prope immortali ſorte miracula excedit. *Plin.* l. 16. c. 2.

tradiction, 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 alwaies ſeemed ſo clear and undeniable, that they have put not onely thoſe who make the world eternall, but them alſo who confeſſe it made, but farre more ancient then we believe it, to a ſtrange anſwer, to themſelves uncertain, to us irrationall.

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 authour of Hiſtory (as* Nigarola *in his Annotations miſtakes* Ocellus) Διὸ καὶ τοῖς λέγουσι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Ἰναχου εἶναι τὸν Ἀργεῖον, προσκλῆσον ὅτως. οὐχ ὡς ἀπὸ πρώτης ἀρχῆς ταύτης, ἀλλὰ τῆς γνωσθείσης μεταβολῆς κατ' αὐτήν. *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*

For to this they replyed, That this World hath ſuffered many alterations, by the utter deſtructions of nations and depopulations of Countries, by which all monuments of antiquity were defaced, all arts and ſciences utterly loſt, all fair and ſtately fabricks 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 ſeverall 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 mankinde, the air muſt ſweep away whole Empires at once, with infectious plagues, and Earthquakes ſwallow up all ancient cities, and bury even the very ruines of them. By which anſwer of theirs they plainly afford two great advantages to the Chriſtian Faith. Firſt, becauſe they manifeſtly ſhew that they had an univerſall tradition of Noahs floud, and the overthrow of the old world: Secondly, becauſe it was evident to them that there was no

way

of all their actions, Πολλάκις γὰρ ἡ γῆ γέγονε καὶ ἔσται βάρβαρος ἡ Ἑλλὰς, οὐχ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων μόνον γινομένη μετάστασιν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἢ μείζονες ἢ μείονες καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γινομένης, ἀλλὰ καὶ νεωτέρας ἢ παρὰ ἡμᾶς ἀρχὴν λαμβάνουσας. Ocellus *de Universo*, c. 3. *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 boies, 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.* πολλαὶ γὰρ κατὰ πολλὰ φθοραὶ γεγόνασιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἔσονται, πυρὶ μὲν καὶ ὕδατι μέγισται, μυρίοις δ' ἄλλοις ἕτεραι βεβαιότεραι. in Timæo. *And* Lucretius *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 perswaded; thinks this Answer of theirs so farre from being a refutation of the former, that he admits it as a confirmation of the later part of his opinion.* De rerum natura *l.* 5.

Quod si forte fuisse antehac eadem omnia credis,
Sed periisse hominum torrenti fœcla vapore,
Aut cecidisse urbis magno vexamine mundi,
Aut ex imbribus assiduis exisse rapaces
Per terras amnes atque oppida cooperuisse:
Tanto quippe magis victus fateare necesse est,
Exitium quoque terrarum cœlique futurum.

way to salve 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; serve onely for a confirmation of *Noah*'s Floud so many ages past, and the surer expectation of S. *Peter*'s fire, we know not how soon to come.

* *So that* Egyptian *Priest in* Plato's *Timæus tells* Solon, *that the Fable of* Phaethon *did signify a reall conflagration of the world; but so as all they which lived in mountains or drie parts of the earth were scorched and consumed, but of those which lived near the seas or rivers, in the valleys, some were preserved.* ἡμῖν δ', saith he, ὁ Νεῖλος εἰς τἆλλα σωτὴρ, καὶ τότε ὃν τῆσδε τῆς ἀνάγκης λύει καὶ σῴζει ῥυόμενος. *Thus the* Egyptians *pretend* Nilus *saved them from the flames of* Phaethon. *Nor were they onely safe from conflagrations, but from inundations also. For when in* Greece, *or other parts a deluge happens, then*

It

all their cities were swept away into the Sea: κατὰ ἢ τότε ἢ χάσεαν, saies the Priest ὅτε τότε, ὅτε ἄλλοτε ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρούρας ὕδωρ ὄμβριον· τόν δ' ἐναντίον κάτωθεν ἐπανιέναι πέφυκεν· ὅθεν καὶ δι' ἃς αἰτίας ταῦθάδε σωζόμενα λέγεται 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 universall Flood,* all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened, *Gen.*7.11.

It remaineth then that we stedfastly believe, not onely that the *heavens and earth and all the host of them* were made, and so acknowledge a Creation, or an actuall 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 novity, or no long existence of the Creature.

Neither will the novity of the world appear more plainly unto our conceptions, then if we look upon our own successions. The vulgar accounts, which exhibite 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 daies younger then the being; not so many, then 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 chuse but think himself so near the originall fountain of mankind, as not to conceive any great antiquity of the world. For though the ancient heathens did imagine * innumerable ages and

* *So* Cicero *indeed speaks,* innumerabilia *secula, 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*

powerfull, do it merely ὡσ' ἀπαιδεύτως, ὁ δυνάμενον εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἀεὶ βλέπειν, καὶ λογίζεσθαι, ὅτι πάντων ἢ μυρίους μυριάδας ἔκαστον γεγόνασιν ἀναρίθμητοι, ὁμοίως πλούσιοι καὶ πένητες, καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ δοῦλοι, βάρβαροί τε καὶ Ἕλληνες πολλάκις μυρίοις γεγόνασιν ὁτιοῦν. as if every person were equally honourable, having innumerable ancestours rich and poor, servants and kings, learned and barbarous.

genera-

generations of men paſt, though * *Origen* did fondly ſeem to collect ſo much by ſome misinterpretations of the Scriptures; yet if we take a ſober view, and make but rationall collections from the Chronology of the ſacred writ, we ſhall find no mans pedegree very exorbitant, or in his line of generation deſcent of many ſcore.

* Origen *did not only collect the eternitie of the world from the coexiſtence of all Gods attributes, as becauſe he is* παντοκράτωρ, *and* δημιουργὸς, *therefore he was alwaies ſo,* (*for how could he be* δημιουργὸς ἄνευ δημιουργημάτων, *or* παντοκράτωρ ἄνευ τῶν κρατουμένων?) *but alſo from the* 90 *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* Eccleſiaſticus; Who can number the ſand of the ſea, and the drops of the rain, and the daies of eternity? *But* Methodius, *Biſhop and Martyr, hath well concluded that diſputation.* Ταῦτα φησὶν ὁ Ὠριγένης σπουδάζων, καὶ ὄφελε οὕτω παίζειν.

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 the beſt account. From the Floud, brought at that time upon the earth for the ſins of men which polluted it, there have not paſſed for certain 4000 years. Now by the experience of our families which for their honour and greatneſſe 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 judgement of former ages, three † generations uſually take up a hundred years. If then it be not yet 4000 years ſince the univerſall deluge, as certainly it is not, if all men which are or have been ſince have deſcended from *Noah*, as undoubtedly they have, if he were but the tenth from *Adam*, as *Moſes* hath aſſured us; then is it not probable that any perſon now alive is above a hundred and thirty generations removed from *Adam*. Thus having expreſſed at laſt the time, ſo farre as it is neceſſary to be known, I ſhall conclude this ſecond Conſideration of the nature and notion of Creation.

† *by the* Greeks called γενεαὶ, *which are ſucceſſions of generations from father to ſon; as in* S. Mat. 1.17. *Indeed ſometimes they take it for other ſpaces of time, as* Artemidorus *obſerves for* 7 *years.* Κατ' ἐνίους μὲν ἐτῶν ζ'. ὅθεν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ ἰατρικοὶ, τῶν Νο γενεῶν (*not* πρὸ ϝ, *as* Wolphius *and* Portus *would correct it*) μηΝνα (*not* μὴ δεῖν, *as* Suidas) φλεβοτομῶν, ἢ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ (*not* τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτου, *as* Suidas

transcribing him negligently) λέγοντες. Sometimes they interpret it 20. 25. or 30 years, as appears by Hesychius. And by that last account they reckoned the years of Nestor, κατ' ἐνίους ἦ λ'. ὅθεν καὶ ἡ Νέσσα βάλον) εἰς ἐνενήκοντα ἔτη γεγονέναι. so Artemidorus and the Grammarians. Although I cannot imagine that to be the sense of Homer Ἰλ'. α.

Τῷδ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
Ἐφθίαθ' οἳ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ' ἐγένοντο.

And I conceive that glosse in Hesychius, ἐπὶ διασήματος χρόνου ἢ μὴ κατ' αὐτὸ βεβαιοῦσθαι, to be farre more properly applicable to that place. But in the sense of which now we speak it is taken for the third part ordinarily of an hundred years. as Herodotus mentioning the Egyptian fained genealogies: καίτοι τριηκόσιαι μὲν ἀνδρῶν γενεαὶ δώδεκα μέν εἰσι ἔτεα, 300 generations equalize 10000 years, γενεαὶ γὰρ τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκατὸν ἔτεά ἐστι. And after him Clemens Alex. Strom. l. 2. εἰς τὰ ἑκατὸν ἔτη τρεῖς καταλέγουσι) γενεάς.

Now being under the termes 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 it self, and so confessed by all men, that none did ever assert the world was made, but withall affirmed that it was God who made it. There remaineth therefore nothing more in this particular, then to assert God so the Creatour 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 shew that we believe some others 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

The first of these deserves no explication of it self, 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 senslesse, but some kind of hereticks have imbraced, and may be yet taken up in times of which we have no reason to presume better then 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 inferre a diversity of makers of them, nor is the least or worst of creatures in their originall any way derogatory to the Creatour. *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good,* and consequently like to come from the fountain of all goodnesse, and fit alwayes to be ascribed to the same. Whatsoever is evil, is not so by the Creatours action, but by the creatures defection. *Gen.* 1. 31.

In vain then did the Hereticks of old, to remove a seeming inconvenience, renounce a certain truth, and whilst they * fear'd to make their own God evil, they made him partiall, or but half the Deity, and even 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 originall of the other. And this strange Heresie began upon the first † spreading of the Gospel; as if the greatest light could not appear without a shadow.

* Inde *Manichæus*, ut Deum à conditione malorum liberet, alterum mali inducit autorem. S. *Hieron. in Nahum. c.* 3.

† *For we must not look upon* Manes *as the first author of the Heresy, though they which followed him were called from him* Manichæans. *Nor must we be satisfied with the relation of* Socrates, *who allots the beginning of that Heresy* μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν Κωνσταντίνου χρόνων *a little before* Constantine, *being* Epiphanius *asserts the first Author of it,* σέλλιδος τὴν πορείαν ἐπὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα περὶ τοὺς χρόνους τῶν Ἀποστόλων, *to have gone to* Jerusalem *even in the A-*

ſoules times. Manes then, formerly called Cubricus, not Urbicus, as S. Aug. who diſſeminated this Hereſy in the dayes of Aurelianus or Probus the Emperour, about the year 277. had a Predeceſſor, though not a Maſter, call'd firſt Terebinthus, after Buddas. For this Buddas left his books and eſtate to a widow, who, ſaith Epiphanius, ἔμεινε πολλῷ τῷ χρόνῳ ἕτως, 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. Ἦν δὲ μεθ' ὅτον (Μάνης) ἄλλος τις τῆς κακίας διδάσκαλος τάυτης, Ζαράνης ὀνόματι, ἐμφερων ἀυτῷ ὑπάρχων. If then we inſert this Zaranes into the Manichæan Pedegree, and conſider the time of the widow between Buddas and Cubricus, and the age of Cubricus, who was then but ſeven yeares 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 in the Apoſtolicall times. Nor need we any of the abatements in the Animadverſions of Petavius, much leſſe that vedargution of Epiphanius, who cites Origen as an aſſertour of the Chriſtian Faith againſt this Hereſy: For though he certainly died before Manes ſpread his doctrine, yet it was written in ſeverall books before him, not only in the time of Buddas, to whom Socrates and Suidas attribute them, but of Scythianus, whom S. Cyril and Epiphanius make the author of them. Neither can it be objected that they were not Manichæans 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 generall title of Heretick in the Syriac tongue. For I am loath to think that Theodoret or the Author in Suidas were ſo farre 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 then a name, from the Hebrew מִין or מִינָאי ſignifying a Heretick. And although ſome of the Rabbins derive their מִין from Manes, yet others make it more ancient then he was, referring it to Tzadok and Bajethos call'd רֹאשׁ הַמִּינִים the firſt or chief Hereticks, who lived 100 yeares before Chriſt. Wherefore it is farre more rationall to aſſert, that he which began the Hereſy of the Manichees was called מִין as an Heretick in the Orientall tongues, and from thence Μάνης by the Greeks, to comply with μανία or madneſſe in their language; then that Μάνης was firſt the name of a man counted an Heretick by the Chriſtians, and then made the generall name for all Hereticks, and particularly for the Chriſtians by the Jewes. Which being granted, both Scythianus and Cubricus might well at firſt have the name of Manes, that is Heretick. However the antiquity of that Hereſy will appear in the Marcionites, who differed not in this particular from the Manichees. Duos Ponticus Deos aſſert tanquam duas Symplegadas naufragii ſui: quem negare non potuit, id eſt creatorem, id eſt noſtrum; & quem probare non potuit, id eſt ſuum. Paſſus infelix hujus præſumptionis inſtinctum de ſimplici capitulo Dominicæ pronunciationis, in hominibus non in Deos diſponentis exempla illa bonæ & malæ arboris, quod neque bona malos neque mala bonos proferat fructus. *Tertul.* l. 1. c. 2. *This* Marcion *liv'd in the dayes of* Antoninus Pius, *and as* Euſebius *teſtifieth*, Juſtine Martyr *wrote a-*

gainſt

gainſt him. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 11. Irenæus *relates how he ſpake with* Polycarpus *Biſhop of* Smyrna, *who was taught by the Apoſtles, and converſed with divers which ſaw our Saviour.* l. 3. c. 3. *Neither was* Marcion *the firſt which taught it at* Rome, *for he received it from* Cerdon. Habuit & Cerdonem quendam informatorem ſcandali hujus quo facilius duos Deos cæci exiſtimaverunt. *This* Cerdon *ſucceeded* Heracleon, *and ſo at laſt may be reduced to the* Gnoſticks.

Whereas there is no nature originally ſinfull, no ſubſtance in it ſelf evil, and therefore no being which may not come from the ſame fountain of goodneſſe. *I form the light, and create darkneſſe, I make peace, and create evil,* Iſa. 45. 5. 7. *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 beſides me.* Vain then is that conceit which fram'd two Gods, one of them called light, the other darkneſſe, 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 further ſhew 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 anoimed, both Herod and* Pontius Pilate *with the Gentiles and the people of Iſrael were gathered together.* Jeſus then was the childe of that God which made the heaven and the earth, and conſequently the Father of Chriſt is the Creatour 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 Creatour of the world, by the Prophets expreſſe prediction: For, *thus ſaith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and ſtretched them out, he which ſpread forth the earth,* Iſa. 42. 5, 6. *and that which cometh out of it; I the Lord have called thee in righteouſneſſe, 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 produc'd, 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 render'd 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 Creatour of the world, distinguish'd from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. An errour so destructive to the Christian religion, that it raceth even the foundations of the Gospel, which referres it self wholly to the promises in the law, and pretends to no other God, but that God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac*, and of *Jacob*, acknowledgeth no other speaker by the Son, then him that spake by the Prophets; and therefore whom *Moses* and the Prophets call Lord of heaven and earth, of him our blessed Saviour signifies himself to be the Son, rejoycing in spirit, and saying, a *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.* Secondly, in respect of the Paternall priority in the Deity, by reason whereof 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, b *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 alwayes professe to believe in God the Father * Creatour of heaven and earth.

a Luke 10. 21.
b 1 Cor. 8. 6.
* Stabat fides semper in Creatore & Christo ejus. Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. 1. Non alia agnoscenda erit traditio Apostolorum, quam quæ hodie apud ipsorum ecclesias editur. Nullam autem Apostolici census Ecclesiam invenias quæ non in Creatore Christianizet. ib.

The

The great neceſſity of profeſſing our faith in this particular appeareth ſeverall wayes, as indiſpenſably tending to the illuſtration of Gods 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 eternall power and Godhead.* For *he hath made the earth by his power, he hath eſtabliſhed the world by his wiſdome, and hath ſtretched out the heavens by his diſcretion.* After a long enumeration of the wonderfull works of the creation, the Pſalmiſt breaketh forth into this pious meditation, *O Lord how manifold are thy works! in wiſdome haſt thou made them all.* If then the glory of God be made apparent by the creation, if he have *made all things for himſelf*, that is for the manifeſtation of his glorious attributes, if the *Lord rejoyceth in his works*, becauſe *his glory ſhall endure for ever*; then is it abſolutely neceſſary we ſhould confeſſe him *Maker of heaven and earth*, that we may ſufficiently praiſe and glorifie 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.* Thus did the Levites teach the children of Iſrael to glorifie God. *Stand up, and bleſſe 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.* And the ſame hath S. *Paul* taught us. *For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever, Amen.* Furthermore, that we may be aſſured that he which made both heaven and earth, will be glorified in both, the

Rom. 1. 20.

Iſa. 10. 12. 51. 15.

Pſal. 104. 24.

Prov. 16. 4.

Pſal. 104. 31.

Pſal. 148. 13.

Neh. 9. 5, 6.

Rom. 11. 36.

the Prophet calls upon all thoſe celeſtiall hoſts to bear their part in this hymne. *Praiſe ye him all his Angels, praiſe ye him all his hoſts. Praiſe ye him Sun and Moon, praiſe him all ye Starres 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.* And the 24 *Elders* in the Revelation of S. *John, fall down before him that ſitteth on the throne, and worſhip him that liveth for ever and ever, and caſt their Crowns*, the emblemes of their borrowed and derived glories, *before the* Throne, the ſeat of infinite and eternall 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.* Wherefore being *the heavens declare the glory of* God. and *all his works praiſe him*, then *ſhall his Saints bleſſe him, they ſhall ſpeak of the glory of his kingdome, and talk of his power.* 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.*

Pſal. 148. 2, 3, 4, 5.

Rev. 4. 10, 11.

Pſal. 19. 1.

Pſal. 145. 10, 11.

Jer. 27. 5.

Secondly the doctrine of the worlds Creation is moſt properly effectuall towards mans humiliation. As there is nothing more deſtructive to humanity then pride, and yet not any thing to which we are more prone then that; ſo nothing can be more properly applied to abate the ſwelling of our proud conceptions, then a due conſideration of the other works of God, with a ſober reflexion upon our own originall. *When I conſider the heavens the work of thy fingers, the moon and the ſtars which thou haſt ordained*; when I view thoſe glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by the advantage of a glaſſe 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

Pſal. 8. 3.

template thoſe farre 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 mindfull 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 ſhouldeſt look down from heaven the place of thy dwelling, and take care or notice of him? But if our originall ought ſo farre to humble us, how ſhould our fall abaſe us? That of all the creatures which God made, we ſhould comply with him who firſt oppoſed his maker, and would be equall unto him from whom he new received his being. All other works of God, which we think inferiour 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 entred upon the greateſt happineſſe 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 onely companions of thoſe *Angels which left their own habitations*, and are *delivered into chains of darkneſſe, to be reſerved unto judgement*. How ſhould a ſerious apprehenſion of our own corruption mingled with the thoughts of our creation, humble us in 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 originall of humanity, *It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart*?

Jude 6.
2 *Pet.* 2. 4.
Gen. 6. 6.

Thirdly, this Doctrine is properly efficacious and productive

ductive of moſt chearfull and univerſall 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.* By vertue of our firſt production, God hath undeniably abſolute dominion over us, and conſequently there muſt be due unto him the moſt exact and compleat 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 Gods goodneſſe, 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 ſpann'd the heavens, when I call unto them they ſtand up together.* The moſt loyall 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 attend upon the will of their Creatour. *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 greatneſſe of his might, for that he is ſtrong in power, not one faileth,* but every one maketh his appearance, ready preſt to obſerve the deſigns of their Commander in chief. Thus the Lord commanded, and *they fought from heaven, the ſtarres in their courſes fought againſt* Siſera. *He commanded the Ravens to feed* Elias, *and they brought him bread and fleſh in the morning, and bread and fleſh in the evening*, and ſo one Prophet lived merely upon the obedience of the fouls of the air. He ſpake to the devouring Whale, *and it vomited out* Jonah *upon the dry land.* 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 haile, ſnow and vapour, ſtormy wind fulfilling his word?* Shall there be a greater coldneſſe in man then in the ſnow? more vanity in

Pſal. 119. 73.

Iſa. 48. 13.

Iſa. 40. 26.

Jud. 5. 20.

1 *King.* 17. 4, 6.

Jonah 2. 10.

Pſal. 148. 8.

in us then in a vapour? more inconſtancy then in the wind? If the univerſall obedience of the creature to the will of the Creatour cannot move us to the ſame affection and deſire to ſerve and pleaſe him; they will all conſpire to teſtifie 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 rebell'd againſt me.* Iſa. 1. 2.

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.* This happineſſe conſiſteth partly in a full aſſurance of his power to ſecure us, his ability to ſatisfie us. *The earth is the Lords, and the fulneſſe thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the ſeas, and eſtabliſhed it upon the flouds.* By vertue of the firſt production he hath a perpetuall right unto, and power to diſpoſe of all things: and he which can order and diſpoſe of all muſt neceſſarily be eſteemed able to ſecure and ſatisfie any Creature. *Haſt thou not known? haſt thou not heard that the everlaſting God, the Lord, the Creatour of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?* There is no externall reſiſtance or oppoſition where omnipotency worketh, no internall weakneſſe or defection of power where the Almighty is the Agent; and conſequently there remaineth a full and firm perſwaſion of his ability in all conditions to preſerve us. Again this happineſſe 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 bleſſe 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 Pſal. 146. 5, 6. Pſal. 24. 1, 2. Iſa. 40. 28. Pſal. 121. 2, 3. Job 10. 3.

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.*

Iſa. 54, 16, 17.

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 profeſſe, that I really believe, and am fully perſwaded, 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 alledged, no motive aſſigned, but his goodneſſe; 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 much leſſe then ſix thouſand yeares. I acknowledge this God Creatour 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.*

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 expreſs'd by a conſtant conjunction in our Chriſtian *Confeſſion*. And that upon no leſſe authority then of the *Authour 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.* 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.* According therefore to the Sons preſcription, the Fathers injunction, and the Sacramentall inſtitution, as we are baptized, ſo do we believe in the name of the Father, and the Son. *John* 14. 1. 1 *Joh.* 3. 23.

Our bleſſed Saviour is here repreſented under a threefold deſcription; firſt by his Nomination, as *Jeſus Chriſt*; ſecondly by his Generation, as the *onely Son* of God; thirdly by his Dominion, as *our Lord.*

But when I referre *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 either 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 wombe*; *who is alſo called Chriſt*, not by * name, but by office and title. Which obſerva- *Luke* 2. 21. *Matt.* 1. 16.

* Si tamen nomen eſt Chriſtus, & non appellatio potius; Unctus enim ſignificatur. Unctus autem non magis nomen eſt quam veſtitus, quam calceatus, accidens nomini res. *Tertull. adv.*

Prax. c. 28. Quorum nominum alterum eſt proprium, quod ab Angelo impoſitum eſt, alterum accidens, quod ab unctione convenit. Ib. Chriſtus commune dignitatis eſt nomen, Jeſus proprium vocabulum Salvatoris. *S. Hieron.* in *Mat.* 16. 20. Jeſus inter homines nominatur, nam Chriſtus non proprium nomen eſt, ſed nuncupatio poteſtatis & regni. *Lactan. de Falſa Sap.* lib. 4. c. 7. Dum dicitur Chriſtus, commune nomen dignitatis eſt, dum Jeſus Chriſtus, proprium vocabulum Salvatoris eſt. *Iſidor. Orig.* l. 7. c. 2. Ἰησοῦς καλεῖται ἑρμηνεύμενος. *S. Cyr. Catech.* 10.

tion, ſeemingly triviall, is neceſſary for the full explication of this part of the Article; for by this diſtinction we are led unto a double notion, & ſo reſolve our faith into theſe two propoſitions. 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 Jewes.

For the firſt, it is undoubtedly the proper name of our Saviour given unto him, according to the cuſtome of the Jewes, at his circumciſion: and as the Baptiſt was called *John*, even ſo the Chriſt was called *Jeſus*. Beſides, as the impoſition was after the vulgar manner, ſo was the name it ſelf of ordinary uſe. We read in the Scriptures of *Jeſus which was called Juſtus, a fellow-worker* with S. *Paul*, and of a *certain ſorcerer, a Jew, whoſe name was Barjeſus*, 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 *Damnæus*, of *Gamaliel*, of *Onias*, of *Phabes*, and of *Thebuth*. *Eccleſiaſticus* is call'd the Wiſedome of *Jeſus* the ſon of *Sirach*, and that *Sirach* the ſon of another *Jeſus*. * S. *Steven* ſpeaks of the *Tabernacle of witneſſe brought in with Jeſus into the poſſeſſion of the Gentiles*: and the Apoſtle in his explication of thoſe words of *David*, *To day if ye will hear his voice*, obſerveth, that *if Jeſus had given them reſt, then would he not afterward have ſpoken of another day*. Which two Scri-

Col. 4. 11. *Act.* 13. 6.

Habuit & *Judæa* quoſdam *Jeſus*, quorum vacuis gloriatur vocabulis. Illa enim nec lucent, nec paſcunt, nec medentur. *Bernard.* in *Cant. Serm.* 15.

* *Act.* 7. 45.

Heb. 4. 8.

ptures

ptures 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 *Jehoſhua* in proceſſe of time contracted to *Jeſhuah*, by the omiſſion of the laſt letter (ſtrange and difficult to other languages) and the addition of the Greek termination, became *Jeſus*.

† *Firſt* יהושע *as generally in the books of* Moſes, *in* Joſhua, Judges, Samuel, *the* Kings, *yea even in* Haggai *and* Zachariah: *then contracted into* ישוע, *as in the* 1 Chron. 24. 11. 2 Chron. 31. 15. *and conſtantly in* Ezra *and* Nehemiah. *Next the laſt letter* ע *was but lightly pronounced, as appears by the Greek tranſlation* 1 Chro. 7. 27. *where* יהושע *is rendred in the Roman Copy* Ἰησυὲ, *in the* Aldus *and* Complutenſian *Editions* Ἰωσυὲ, *and by* Euſebius, *who expreſſeth it truer then thoſe Copies*, Ἰωσυέ. *At laſt* ע *was totally left out both in the pronunciation and the writing, and the whole name of* Joſhuah *contracted to* ישו.

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 ſucceſſour of *Moſes*, and ſo nam'd by him, as it is written, *And Moſes called Oſhea the ſon of Nun Jehoſhua.* *Numb.* 13. 16. His firſt name then impoſed at his circumciſion was *Oſhea* or *Hoſeah*, the ſame with the name of the *ſon of Azazziah, ruler of Ephraim*, of the *ſon of Elah, king of Iſrael*, of the *ſon of Beeri, the* Prophet; and the interpretation of this firſt name * *Hoſeah* is *Saviour*. Now we muſt not imagine this to be † no mutation, neither muſt we look upon it as a ‖ totall alteration, but obſerve it as a change not triviall or * inconſiderable. And being *Hoſeah* was a name afterwards uſed by ſome, and *Jehoſhua*, as diſtinct,

1 *Chro.* 27. 20.

2 *King.* 17. 1.

Hoſ. 1. 1.

* *Oſee* in lingua noſtra Salvatorem ſonat, quod nomen habuit etiam *Joſue* filius *Nun*, antequam ei à Deo vocabulum mutaretur. *S. Hieron.* in *Oſee c.* 1. *v.* 1. & *lib.* 1. *adv. Jovinianum. I read indeed of other interpretations among the Greeks, no good expoſitours of the Hebrew names: as in an ancient* MS. *of the* LXX *Tranſlation of the Prophets, now in the Library of Cardinall* Barberini, *at the beginning of* Hoſeah, Ὡσηὲ, λυτρώμενος: *and again*, Ὡσηὲ, σωσιμένος, ἢ σωτηριάζων. *Of which the firſt and laſt are farre from the Originall, and the middle agreeable with the root, not with the conjugation, as being deduc'd from* ישע *not in* Niphal, *but in* Hiphil. † *As the* Samaritan Pentateuch *makes it the ſame name which he was*

by

firſt named, and which he had afterwards; as if Moſes *had only called* Oſhea, Oſhea. ‖ So Juſtine Martyr *ſpeaks of* Hoſeah *as* μεταονομασθέντος τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὀνόματι. *And comparing it with that alteration of* Jacobs *name:* τὸ ἐπώνυμον Ἰακὼβ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπικληθέντι ἀνδρὶ, καὶ τὸ Αὐσῆ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦς ἐπικληθῆ. *where, to paſſe by his miſtake in ſuppoſing him firſt named* Iſrael, *and after called* Jacob, *he makes the alteration of* Hoſeah *to* Joſhua, *equall to that of* Jacob *to* Iſrael. *The reaſon whereof was the Greek verſion of the name, who for* Hoſeah *tranſlated it* Αὐσῆς. Dum *Moyſi* ſucceſſor deſtinaretur *Auſes* filius *Nave*, transfertur certe de priſtino nomine, & incipit vocari *Jeſus*. *Tertul. adv. Jud. & adv. Marcion.* lib. 3. §. 16. *and was farther eſtranged yet by thoſe which frequently called him* Ναυσῆς, *as* Euſeb. Demonſt. Ev. *l.* 4. *c.* 17. *thrice.* * *This* Juſtine Martyr *charges upon the Jewes 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. Αὐσῆν καλούμενον Ἰησοῦν Μωσῆς ἐκάλεσεν. τοῦτο οὐ κ ζητεῖς δ' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἀπορεῖς, ἀλλὰ φιλοπυσεῖς. τοιγαροῦν λέληθέ σε ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἀναγιγνώσκων κ ζωπεῖς. *And whereas they ſpake much of the change made in the names of* Abram and Sarai, *which were but of a letter, they took no notice of this totall alteration of the name. ſo he.* Διὰ τί μὲν ἓν ἄλφα πρῶτον προσετέθη τῷ Αβραὰμ ὀνόματι θεολογεῖς, καὶ διὰ τί ἓν ῥῶ τῷ Σάρρας ὀνόματι, ὁμοίως κομπολογεῖς· διὰ τί δὲ τὸ παρ' ὅλον ὄνομα τοῦ Αὐσῆ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ναυῆ ὅλον μεταονόμασαι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κ ζητεῖς. *where, to paſſe by the vulgar miſtake of the Greeks, who generally deliver the addition of* α *in the name of* Abraham, *and* ρ *in the name of* Sarah, *when the firſt was an addition of* ה, *the ſecond a change of* ש *into* ר, *he would make that of* Hoſea *into* Ieſus *a farre more conſiderable alteration, then that of* Abraham *or of* Sarah.

by others, it will neceſſarily follow, there was ſome difference between theſe two names; and it will be fit to enquire what was the addition, and in what the force of the alteration doth conſiſt.

הושע
יהושע

Firſt therefore, we obſerve that all the originall letters in the name *Hoſeah* are preſerved in that of *Joſhua*: from whence 'tis evident that this alteration was not made by a verball mutation, as when *Jacob* was called *Iſrael*, nor by any literall change, as when *Sarai* was named *Sarah*, nor yet by diminution or mutilation; but by addition, when *Abram* was called *Abraham*. Secondly, it muſt be confeſs'd, that there is but one literall 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

Canaan was, and that unto a name already known, and after uſed; it cannot be thought to give any leſſe then 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 vertually 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 abſorp't; tis poſſible another of the ſame might be by *Moſes* intended, and one of them ſuppreſs'd. If then unto the name *Hoſeah* we joyn one of the titles of God, which is *Jah*, there will reſult from both, by the cuſtome of that Hebrew tongue, *Jehoſhuah*; and ſo not onely the * inſtrumentall, but alſo the originall cauſe of the Jewes

† *For it may well be thought that* י *is added to make the name* יהושע *the ſame with the third perſon of the future in* Hiphil, יהושיע. *For although* ה *the characteriſticall letter of the conjugation* Hiphil, *be excluded in the future tenſe, and ſo the regular word be* יושיע *frequently in uſe; yet ſometimes it is expreſs'd, as it is uſed* 1 Sam. 17. 47. לא בחרב ובחנית יהושיע יהוה *and all the aſſembly ſhall know that the Lord ſaveth (or will ſave) not with ſword and ſpear: and* Pſal. 116. 6. דלותי ולי יהושיע. *I was brought low, and he helped me. And although there be another* י *in the future, then in the name, yet being it is alſo found ſometimes with the leſſer* Chiric, *and ſo without the later* י, *or without any* Chiric *at all, as frequently with the addition of* ו, ויושע, *there is no reaſon but* יהושע *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* י *added to the Future, as formative thereof, ſtands in the place of* י *(for the avoiding of confuſion with* י *conjunctive) which is nothing elſe then the abbreviation of* יהוא, *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 leſſe then he ſhall ſave, in which the* יהוא *or* י *is a peculiar deſignation of the perſon, and the* ſh *all or Tenſe, a certainty of the futurition. 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 examination; and this only by changing the Imperative into the Future.* יהושע ſerva, *the expectation of the people,* יהושע ſervabit, *the ratification of* Moſes.

* *So did the Ancients underſtand it: to the Greeks* Jeſus *is* σωτηρ Θεοῦ, *to the Latines,* Salvator Dei. *So* Euſeb. Demonſtr. Ev. *l.* 4. *ad finem.* Ἑρμὴ δὲ σωτηρ Θεοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν τὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μεταληφθὲν ὄνομα σημαίνει. Ἰζυὲ μὲν γὰρ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ζωὴ ἐστι, υἱὸς δὲ Ναυῆ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς Ἰωσυὲ ὀνομάζεται· Ἰωσυὲ δὲ ἐστιν Ἰαὼ ζωηρία, τοῦτ' ἔστι Θεοῦ σωτηρ. *Where nothing can be more certain then*

that Ἰαὼ *is taken for the name of God, and* Ἰαὼ Σωτηρία *together the ſalvation of God. And yet* Theophylact *has ſtrangely miſtaken it.* Mat. 1. 1. Τὸ Ἰησοῦς ὄνομα οὐχ Ἑλληνικόν ἐστιν ἀλλ' Ἑβραϊκόν, ἑρμηνεύεται δὲ σωτὴρ, Ἰαὼ γὰρ ἡ Σωτηρία παρ' Ἑβραίοις λέγεται. *which words ſeem plainly to ſignifie that* Jeſus *is interpreted Saviour, becauſe* Ἰαὼ *in the Hebrew tongue ſignifieth ſalvation. I confeſſe 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* Moſchopulus, περὶ χεδῶν. Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰαὼ γίνεται, ὃ δηλοῖ παρ' Ἑβραίοις τὸ Σωτηρίαν. *Whereas* Ἰαὼ *in* Euſebius *is certainly no other then* יהוה, *and* Ἰησοῦς *then* ישועה, *and ſo* Ἰαὼ Σωὲ, *contracted of* Ἰαὼ Ἰσωὲ, *the ſalvation of God. Nor is this only the opinion of* Euſebius, *but of S.* Hierome, *a man much better acquainted with the Hebrew language; who on the firſt Chapter of* Hoſeah, *ſhewing that* Ioſuah *had firſt the ſame name with that of the Prophet, ſaith,* Non enim (ut male in Gracis codicibus legitur & Latinis) *Auſe dictus eſt, quod nihil omnino intelligitur; ſed Oſee, id eſt,* Salvator: & additum eſt ejus nomini Dominus, ut Salvator Domini diceretur. *What then was it but* יה *the* Dominus *added to his name? For as in the name of* Eſaias *S.* Hierome *acknowledgeth the addition of the name of God,* Interpretatur autem *Eſaias* Salvator Domini; *in the ſame manner did he conceive it in the name of* Ioſhua, *onely with this difference, that in the one it begins, in the other concludes the name.*

deliverance will 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, & 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

gel *Gabriel* told the bleſſed Virgin, ſhe ſhould *conceive in her wombe, and bring forth a ſon*, and ſhould *call his name Jeſus*. In the dream of *Joſeph* the Angel of the Lord informed him not onely of the nomination, but of the interpretation or * Etymologie; *Thou ſhalt call his name Jeſus, for he ſhall ſave his people from their ſins.* In which words is clearly expreſs'd 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 Originall 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 expreſly obſerveth, *All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken of the Lord by the Prophet ſaying, Behold, a Virgin ſhall be with childe, and ſhall bring forth a ſon, and they ſhall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is, God with us.* Severall wayes have been invented to ſhew the fulfilling of that propheſy, notwithſtanding our Saviour was not call'd *Emmanuel*; but none can certainly appear more proper, then that the ſenſe of *Emmanuel* ſhould be comprehended in the name of *Jeſus*; and what elſe is *God with us*, then *God our Saviour*? Well therefore hath the Evangeliſt conjoyned * the Prophet and the Angel, aſſerting Chriſt was therefore named

Luke 1. 31.

* *Jeſus* Hebræo ſe nomine, Salvator dicitur. Etymologiam ergo nominis ejus Evangeliſta ſignavit, dicens, Vocabis nomen ejus Jeſum, quia ipſe ſalvum faciet populum ſuum *S. Hieron.*

* αὐτὸς, ipſe.

Mat. 1. 22, 23.

* βλέπεις ὅπως εἰθισμένος Εὐαγγελιστὴς καὶ προφήτου ῥήσεις; μεθερμηνευόμενον γὰρ τὸ μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς, ὃ ἐστι σωτηρία τοῦ λαοῦ, τὸ μετὰ πάλαι δεσπότην ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν. Andreas Cretenſis in Circumc.

Jesus, because it was foretold he should be called *Emmanuel*, the Angelicall *God the Saviour*, being in the highest propriety the Propheticall *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.* So S. *Paul* to the Jewes and Gentil-Proselytes at *Antioch*: *Of this man's seed hath God according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour Jesus.* Which explication of this sacred name was not more new or strange unto the world, then was the name it self so often us'd before. For the ancient *Grecians* usually gave it at first as a title to their † Gods, whom after any remarkable preservations they stiled *Saviours*, and under that notion built temples,

Luke 2. 11.

Act. 13. 22.

† Jupiter *the chief of them was most usually worshipp'd under this title.* Euripides *makes* Amphictyo, *setting by his Altar, which* Hercules *had built,* Βωμὸν τῷ Διὶ τόνδε Σωτῆρι Διὸς, *and* Aristophanes *introduces* Bacchus *swearing,* Νὴ τὸν Δία τὸν Σωτῆρα. *as if it were the familiar oath among the* Athenians, *as well it might be, who had his temple in their* Piræum, *as* Strabo *testifieth,* l. 9. *where* Demosthenes *by vertue of a Decree was to build him an Altar,* Plut. *in Vita* Dem. *and his Porch in the City, which was call'd indeed vulgarly,* τοῦ Ἐλευθερίου Διὸς στοά· *yet was it also named* τοῦ Σωτῆρος, *as* Harpocration *and* Hesychius *have observed.* Ὅτι δὲ ἐπιλέγεσθαι μὲν Σωτὴρ, ὀνομάζεται δὲ καὶ Ἐλευθέριος, δηλοῖ καὶ Μέναν δρος. *so the first.* Τῶν Μήδων ἐκφυγόντος ἱδρύσαντο τὸν Ἐλευθέριον Δία, τοῦτον δὲ ἔνιοι καὶ Σωτῆρα φασι. *so the later. As in their oaths, so in their feasts they mentioned him always at the third cup.* Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου καὶ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἔλεγον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον ἡρώων, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σωτῆρος, sub. Διὸς. *which is omitted in* Hesychius, *as appears out of* Athenæus. l. 2. & 11. *and especially that of* Alexis *the Comedian* Ἀλλ' ἔγχεον Αὐτῷ Διὸς μὲν πάνυ Σωτῆρος. θεῶν θνητοῖς ἁπάντων χρησιμώτατος καὶ πολύ Ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ Σωτήρ. Pausanias *in* Corinthiacis, Messenicis, Laconicis & Arcadicis, *mentions severall Statues and Temples anciently dedicated to* Jupiter ἐπίκλησιν Σωτῆρι. *And though this Title was so generally given to* Jupiter, *as that* Hesychius *expounds* Σωτὴρ ὁ Ζεύς, *yet was it likewise attributed to the other Gods: as* Herodotus *relates how the* Grecians *in their Navall warre against the* Persians, *made their vowes* Ποσειδέωνι Σωτῆρι, *and that they preserved the Title to* Neptune *in his dayes.* l. 7. *And* Artemidorus *takes notice that* Castor *and* Pollux *are taken for the* θεοὶ Σωτῆρες, *whom the Poem bearing the name of* Orpheus *to* Musæus *calls* μεγάλους Σωτῆρας ὁμῶ Διὸς ἀφθίτα τέκνα. *as the Hymne of* Homer, Σωτῆρας

and

τίκτε παῖδας ἐπιχθονίων ἀνδράπων, Ὠκυπόρων τε νεῶν.---- *and* Theocritus *in the* Idyllion *on them,* Ἀνδρώπων σωτῆρας ἐπ' ξυρῦ ἤδη ἰόντων. *Hence* Lucian *in* Alexandro *uſeth it as their conſtant title,* ἀλεξίκακε Ἡράκλεις, ᾧ Ζεῦ ἀπατρόπαι, ᾧ Διόσκυροι Σωτῆρες. *Neither have we mention of the the Title onely, but of the Originall, 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,* μετὰ ταῦτα πρῶτος ὁ Μενεσθεὺς ἄνακτάς τε καὶ Σωτῆρας ὠνόμασε. Ælian. Var. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 5. *Beſide theſe, we read in the ancient inſcriptions,* Ἀσκληπιῷ Θεῷ Σωτῆρι. *and again,* Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ Ὑγιείᾳ Σωτῆρσι. *For as they had their Female Deities, ſo did they attribute this title to their Goddeſſes. As to* Venus, Ἀφροδίτῃ Θεᾷ Παναχάδῳ καὶ Σωτῆρι. *to* Diana, Ἀρτέμιδι Σωτῆρι, *as the ſame collection of inſcriptions hath it. Thus the* Epigram *extant in* Suidas, Φωσφόρος, ὃν Σώτειρα, ἐπὶ Παλλάδος ἴσχει κλήρων, Ἄρτεμις.---- *The* Bœnſes *an ancient people in* Peloponneſus, Ἄρτεμιν νομίζουσι Σώτειραν. Paſ. *in* Laconicis. *Her temple and ſtatue in the City* Troezen, *was built and nam'd by* Theſeus *at his ſafe return from* Crete. Τὸν Megarenſes *preſerved by her from the* Perſians, ἐπὶ τούτῳ Σωτείρας ἄγαλμα ἐποιήσαντο Ἀρτέμιδος. *and upon the ſame occaſion another of the ſame bigneſſe ſet up at* Pagæ. Id. *But this title eſpecially was given to* Minerva. Σώτειρα, ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Heſych. Ἔστι δὲ Ἀθήνησι Σώτειρα λεγομένη, ᾗ καὶ θύουσι. Schol. Ariſtoph. *in* Ranis. Ariſtotle *in his will oblig'd* Nicanor *to a dedication,* Διὶ Σωτῆρι καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ Σωτείρᾳ. Laert. *in Vit.* Ariſt.

and conſecrated altars to them. Nor did they reſt with their miſtaken piety, but made it ſtoop unto their baſer flattery, calling thoſe men their † *Saviours*, for whom they ſeem'd to have as great reſpect and honour as for their Gods.

† *This was the conſtant title of the firſt* Ptolemy, *the ſon of* Lagus, *given to him by the* Rhodians. Ὀνόμασα μὲν δὴ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ Πτολεμαῖοι Χῖοι, ἄλλη δ' ἐπίκλησις ἄλλῳ· καὶ γὰρ Φιλομήτορα καλοῦσι, καὶ Φιλάδελφον ὕστερον, τὸν δὲ τοῦ Λάγου Σωτῆρα, παραδόντων Ῥοδίων τὸ ὄνομα. Paſ. 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 τὸν Σελεύκου υἱὸν Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Λάγου Σωτῆρα ποτὲ χρηματίζοντα, τὰ ἐναντία παθὼν αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐπικλήσει. *This was ſo familiar, that* Tertul. *uſeth the Title inſtead of the name.* Poſt eum, (ſc. *Alexandrum*) regnavit illic in *Alexandria Soter* annis 35. *Thus* Antigonus *was firſt call'd by the* Greeks *their* Εὐεργέτης *or benefactour, then* Σωτὴρ *or Saviour.* ὃ μόνον ἐφίδρυσε πᾶσι τοῖς καιρὸν Εὐεργέτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεταλλάξας, Σωτὴρ. Polyb. l. 5. *Thus we read of* Demetrius *who reſtored the* Athenians *to their liberty.* ἀνεκάλουν, καὶ Σωτῆρας ἐκάλουν ἀπὸ Calyone τὸν Δημήτριον, Σωτῆρα καὶ Εὐεργέτην ἀναγορεύοντες. Plut. in vita. *And not only ſo, but numbred* Demetrius *and* Antigonus *among their* Dii Soteres; *and inſtead of their annuall* Archon, *whoſe name they uſed in their*

d ſtinction of years, they created a Prieſt of theſe Dii Soteres, as the ſame Author teſtifieth. μόνοι δὲ Σωτῆρας ἀνήγορευσαν θεούς, καὶ τὸν ἐπώνυμον καὶ πάσχιον ἄρχοντα καλοῦσι πάντες, ἱερέα Σωτήρων ἐχειροτόνησαν καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν. *Appian relates of Demetrius, that he received this title from the Babylonians.* Τίμαρχον ἐπανιστάμενον ἀνεῖλεν, καὶ τἆλλα πυνθανόμενον τῆς Βαβυλῶνος ἡγάσθη, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ Σωτὴρ ἀρξαμένων τῶν Βαβυλωνίων ὠνομάσθη. De Bell. Syriac. *Lucian's miſtake in his Salutation tells us of* Ἀντίοχος ὁ Σωτήρ, *and Appian gives us the reaſon of the Gauls as the cauſe of that title:* ὃς καὶ Σωτὴρ ἐπεκλήθη Γαλάτας ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐμβαλόντας ἐξελάσας. *Ibid. And in proceſſe of time this title grew ſo cuſtomary and familiar, that the Sicilians beſtowed it upon Verres their oppreſſour.* Itaque illum non ſolum Patronum iſtius inſulæ, ſed etiam Soteram inſcriptum vidi Syracuſis; *ſayes Cicero, Verrin. 2.*

Nor does it alwayes ſignifie ſo much as that it may not be attributed to man, for even in the Scriptures the Judges of *Iſrael* were called no leſſe then their *Saviours*. *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.* 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 Originall they are plainly termed † *Saviours*.

Judg. 3. 9.

3. 15.

† Heb. ויקם יהוה מושיע לבני ישראל ויושיעם.

So the LXX *clearly.* καὶ ἤγειρε κύριος Σωτῆρα τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔζωσεν αὐτὸν, τὸν Γοθονιὴλ υἱὸν Κενέζ· Qui ſuſcitavit eis Salvatorem & liberavit eos, *Othoniel. Again,* καὶ ἤγειρε κύριος ἀυτοῖς Σωτῆρα τὸν Ἀωὸδ υἱὸν Γηρᾶ· Qui ſuſcitavit eis Salvatorem vocabulo *Aioth* filium *Gera. Vet. Tranſl. Upon which place S. Aug. notes,* Animadvertendum eſt autem quod Salvatorem dicat etiam hominem, per quem Deus ſalvos facit. Quæſt. l. 7. c. 18.

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 *Latines* thought the *Greek* word

* *So* Cicero *in the place before recited, having ſaid he ſaw* Verres *inſcrib'd* Sotera, *goes on,* Hoc quantum eſt? ita magnum, ut Latino uno verbo exprimi non poſſit. *But though in* Cicero's *time there was no Latine word uſed in that ſenſe, yet not long after it was familiar. For as in the Greek inſcriptions we read often Dedications* Διὶ Σωτῆρι: *ſo in the Latine we find often* Jovi Servatori, *or* Conſervatori, *ſometimes* Jovi Salvatori *or* Salutari.

All which are nothing else but the Latine expressions of the Greek inscriptions. And without question Σωτὴρ *might have been rendred* Sospitator, *and even* Sospes *as it was used in the dayes of* Ennius. Sospes, salvus: *Ennius* tamen sospitem proservatore posuit. Festus. *Neither indeed could the* Sicilians *mean any more of* Verres, *by the word* Soter, *then* Tully *spake of himself, when he stil'd himself* Servatorem reipub. *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 præmiis dictatus Conservatoris sibi nomen, Græco ejus rei vocabulo assumpsit. *Annal.* l. 15. *He took to himself the name of Conservator, in a Greek word which signifies so much, and without question that must be* Σωτὴρ. *However, the first Christians of the Latine Church were some time in doubt what word to use, as the constant interpretation of* Σωτὴρ *so frequent and essential to Christianity.* Tertullian *useth* Salutificator, *or, as some books read it,* Salvificator. Ego jam non unus Deus, nec unus Salutificator, si duo salutis artifices, & utique alter altero indigens. *de Carne Christi, c.* 14. *and shews it was so translated in the* Philippians 3. 20. Et quidem de terra in cœlum, ubi nostrum municipatum *Philippenses* quoque ab Apostolo discunt; unde & Salutificatorem nostrum expectamus Jesum Christum. *de Resur. Carnis, c.* 47. *S.* Hilary *thought* Salutaris *a sufficient interpretation.* Est autem Salutaris ipso illo nomine quo *Jesus* nuncupatur. *Jesus* enim secundum Hebraicam linguam Salutaris est. *in Psal.* 118. *S.* Auguſt. *indifferent between that and* Salvator: Deus salvos faciendi Dominus est Jesus, quod interpretatur Salvator, sive Salutaris, *and so* Lactant. *At last they generally us'd the word* Salvator. *First* Tertullian. Christus in illo significabatur, taurus ob utramque dispositionem; aliis ferus, ut judex, aliis mansuetus, ut Salvator. *adv. Marcion. l.* 3. 18. *Which word of his was rather followed by his imitatour S.* Cyprian, *after whom* Arnobius *us'd it, after him his disciple* Lactantius: *and from thence it continued the constant language of the Church, till the late innovatours thrust it out of the Latine Translation.*

word so pregnant and comprehensive, that the Latine tongue had no single word able to expresse it.

But whatsoever notion the Heathen had of their Gods or men which they stiled 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.* Act. 4. 12.

It remaineth therefore that we should explain how, and for what reasons Christ truely is, and properly is call'd 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 onely true way for the obtaining eternall

nall ſalvation, and by ſuch pateſaction can deſerve no leſſe then 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 farre more eminent and excellent manner muſt he be ſaid to ſave them, who firſt revealed all thoſe truths unto them. S. *Paul provok'd to emulation them which were his fleſh, that he might ſave ſome of them; and was made all things to all men, that he might by all means ſave ſome.* 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.* And S. *James* ſpeaks in more generall termes. *Brethren, if any of you do erre from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he which converteth a ſinner from the errour of his way, ſhall ſave a ſoul from death.* Now if theſe are ſo expreſly 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 afarre off, and to them that were nigh.* The Will of God concerning the ſalvation of man was reveal'd by him. *No man hath ſeen God at any time: the onely begotten Son, which is in the boſome of the Father, he hath declared him.* Being then *the Goſpel of Chriſt is the power of God unto ſalvation to every one that believeth*, being they which preach it at the command of Chriſt are ſaid to ſave the ſoules of ſuch as believe their word, being it was Chriſt alone *who brought life and immortality to light through the goſpel*; therefore he muſt in a moſt eminent and ſingular manner be acknowledged to ſave, and conſequently muſt not be denied, even in this firſt reſpect the title of *Saviour*.

Rom. 11. 14.
1 Cor. 9. 22.
2 Tim. 4. 16.
Jam. 5. 20.
Eph. 2. 17.
Joh. 1. 18.
Rom. 1. 16.
2 Tim. 1. 10.

Secondly, this *Jeſus* hath not only revealed, but alſo procured

procured the way of ſalvation, not onely 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.* We were all concluded under ſin, and being the wages of ſin is death, we were obliged to eternall 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 bloud is no remiſſion.* It was *therefore neceſſary that Chriſt ſhould appear to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf.* And ſo he did, for he *ſhed his bloud for many, for the remiſſion of ſins,* as himſelf profeſſeth in the Sacramentall inſtitution: he *bare our ſins in his own body on the tree,* as S. Peter ſpeaks. and ſo in him *we have redemption through his bloud, even the forgiveneſſe of ſins.* And if *while we were yet ſinners, Chriſt died for us: much more then being now juſtified by his bloud, we ſhall be ſaved from wrath by him.* 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 our ſelves unto our Maſter?* 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.* And as under the Law *the bloud of the ſin offering was brought into the tabernacle of the Congregation to reconcile withall in the holy place;* ſo it pleaſed the Father, *having made peace by the bloud of his croſſe, by him to reconcile all things unto himſelf.* And thus it comes to paſſe, that *us who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his fleſh through death.* 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.* Furthermore, we were all at firſt en-

Joh. 3. 17.

Heb. 9. 22, 23, 26.

Mat. 26. 28.

1 Pet. 2. 24.

Col. 1. 14.

Rom. 5. 8, 9.

1 Sam. 29 4.

2 Cor. 5. 19.

Col. 1. 20, 21, 22.

Rom. 5. 10.

ſlav'd 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*: 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 redeem'd again, one of his brethren might redeem him.* 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 ſatisfie 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 onely excepted, which could work this redemption for us. And what he onely could, that he freely did perform. *For the Son of man came to give his life a ranſome for many*: and as he came to give, ſo he *gave himſelf a ranſome for all.* So that in him *we have redemption through his bloud, the forgiveneſſe of ſins.* For we are *bought with a price*, for we are *redeemed, not with corruptible things, as ſilver and gold; but with the precious bloud of Chriſt, as of a lambe without blemiſh and without ſpot.* He then which hath obtained for us remiſſion of ſins, he who through himſelf hath reconciled us unto God, he who hath given himſelf as a ranſome to redeem us, he who hath thus wrought out the way of ſalvation for us, muſt neceſſarily have a ſecond and a farre higher right unto the name of *Jeſus*, unto the title of our *Saviour.*

Lev. 25. 49.

Lev. 25. 48.

Mat. 20. 28.

1 Tim. 2. 6.

Eph. 1. 7.

1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

Thirdly, beſide the promulging and procuring, there is yet a further act, which is conferring of ſalvation on us. All which we mentioned before, was wrought by vertue 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*

Heb. 8. 25.

to

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 conferre ſalvation upon thoſe which believe in him. For the Father gave the Son *this power over all ſleſh, that he ſhould give eternall 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 mortall 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 S. 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 actuall giving of ſalvation to us, is the ultimate and concluſive ground of the title *Saviour.* Thus by the vertue of his precious bloud 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*, S. Paul *the captain and authour of eternall ſalvation*, S. Peter *a Prince & a Saviour* 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

Joh. 17. 2. *Phil.* 3. 20, 21. *Heb.* 9. 28. 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. *Act.* 5. 31. *Mat.* 1. 21. *Luk.* 1. 69. 2. 30. *Heb.* 5, 9. 2, 10. *Act.* 5. 31.

Saviours. In the time of their trouble, say the Levites, *when*
Neh. 9. 27. *they cried unto thee, thou heardest them from heaven, and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them Saviours, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.*

The correspondency of *Jesus* unto those temporall *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*
Eccles. 46. 1. *the son of Nave was valiant in the warres, and was the successour of Moses in prophesies, who according to his name was made great for the saving of the elect of God.* Although therefore *Moses* was truly and really *a ruler*
Act. 7. 35. *and deliverer*, which is the * same with *Saviour*, although the rest of the Judges were also by their office Rulers and Deliverers, and therefore stiled *Saviours*, as expressly *Othniel* and *Ehud* are; yet *Josuah* farre more particularly and exactly then the rest, is represented as a Type of our *Jesus*, and that typicall singularity manifested in his † name. For first, He it was alone of all which passed out of *Egypt*, who was design'd to lead the children of *Israel* into *Canaan*, the land of promise, flowing with milk and hony. Which land as it was a type of the heaven of heavens, the inheritance of the Saints, and eternall joyes flowing from the right hand of God; so is the Person which brought the *Israelites* into that place of rest, ‖ a Type of him who onely 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. Beside it is further observable, not onely 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

* Hesych. Ῥῦσις, σωτὴρ, λυτρωτής. and again, Σωτὴρ, ὁ Ζεὺς, ὁ ἐλευθέριος, ἢ λυτρωτής.

† Quantum attinet ad propheticum apparatum, nec geri nec dici aliquid possit insignius, quandoquidem res perducta est usque nominis expressionem, S. Aug. contra Faustum, 16. 19.

‖ Οὐ πρόπου ἐκεῖνος εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν γῆν τὸν λαὸν, ἀλλὰ Μωσῆς· οὐδ' ὡς ἐκεῖνος ὃν κληρῳ διένειμεν αὐτὴν τοῖς εἰσελθοῦσι μετ' αὐτοῦ· ὅτω καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν διαπορεύσιν τῷ λαῷ ἐποιήσατο καὶ διαμεμέρικε τὴν ἁγαθὴν γῆν ἑαυτῷ. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph.

them

them in *Canaan*. *Joſuah* the ſucceſſour onely could effect that in which *Moſes* failed. Now nothing is more frequent in the phraſe of the Holy Ghoſt, then to take *Moſes* for the doctrine deliver'd, or the books written by him, that is the * Law; from whence it followeth, that the death of *Moſes* and the ſucceſſion of *Joſuah* prefignified the continuance of the law till *Jeſus* came, [a] *by whom all that believe are juſtified from all things, from which we could not be juſtified by the law of Moſes.*

* As *Luk.* 16, 29, 31. 24, 27. *Joh.* 5. 45, 46. *Act.* 6. 11. collated with the 13. verſe. *Act.* 15, 21. 21, 21.

2 *Cor.* 3. 15. Μωσέα νοητέον τὸν νόμον, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ὁμώνυμον ἐκείνῳ ζωπυρεῖ. ὥσπερ τοίνυν κατὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν Μωσῆ τετελεσπικότος, Ἰησοῦς τὸν λαὸν εἰς τὴν ἐπηγγελμένην εἰσήγαγε γῆν· ἕτω μετὰ τὸ τὸν νόμου τέλος ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐμφανὴς Ἰησοῦς ἀνέῳξε πᾶ εὐπειθεῖ λαῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. *Theodoret. in Joſ. Præam.* Cum ſucceſſor *Moyſi* deſtinaretur *Auſis* filius *Nave*, transfertur certe de priſtino nomine, & incipit vocari *Jeſus*. Certe, inquis. Hanc prius dicimus figuram futuri fuiſſe. Nam quia Jeſus Chriſtus ſecundum populum quod ſumus nos nationes in ſeculi deſerto commorantes antea, introducturus eſſet in terram repromiſſionis melle & lacte manantem, id eſt, in vitæ æternæ poſſeſſionem, qua nihil dulcius, idque non per *Moyſen*, id eſt, non per legis diſciplinam, ſed per *Jeſum*, id eſt, per novæ legis gratiam provenire habebat, circumciſis nobis petrina acie, id eſt, Chriſti præceptis, (petra enim Chriſtus multis modis & figuris prædicatus eſt;) ideo is vir qui in hujus Sacramenti imagine parabatur, etiam nominis Dominici inauguratus eſt figura, ut *Jeſus* nominaretur. *Tertul. adv. Judæos, c.* 9. & *adv. Marcion. l.* 3. *c.* 16. Idcirco *Moyſi* etiam ſucceſſit, ut oſtenderet novam legem per Jeſum Chriſtum datam, veteri legi ſucceſſuram, quæ data per *Moyſen* fuit. *Lact. de Vera Sap. l.* 4. *c.* 17. In cujus comparatione (*Moyſes*) improbatus eſt, ut non ipſe introduceret populum in terram promiſſionis; ne videlicet lex per *Moyſen*, non ad ſalvandum ſed ad convincendum peccatorem data, in regnum cœlorum introducere putaretur, ſed gratia & veritas per Jeſum Chriſtum facta. *S. Aug.* contra *Fauſtum, l.* 16. *c.* 19. *Jeſus* dux qui populum eduxerat de *Ægypto*, *Jeſus* qui interpretatur Salvator, *Moſe* mortuo & ſepulto in *Moab*, hoc eſt, Lege mortua, in Evangelium cupit inducere populum ſuum. *S. Hieron. in Pſal.* 86. [a] *Act.* 13. 39.

The Law and the Prophets were untill John, ſince that the kingdome 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 righteouſneſſe of God without the law is manifeſted, even the righteouſneſſe of God, which is by faith of* Luk. 16. 16. Rom. 3. 20, 21, 22.

Jeſus Chriſt unto all & 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 wiſdome and knowledge*, there is no looking into the ſecrets of heaven, no approching to the preſence of God. The command of circumciſion was not given unto *Moſes*, but to *Joſuah*; nor were the *Iſraelites* circumciſed in the wilderneſſe, under the conduct of *Moſes* and *Aaron*, but in the land of *Canaan*, under their Succeſſour. a *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 authour of another circumciſion, then that of the fleſh commanded by the law, b *even the circumciſion of the heart in the ſpirit, and not in the letter*; that which c *is made without hands, in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh*, which is therefore called the *circumciſion of Chriſt*.

Exod. 24. 13.

† *Moyſes* in nubem intravit, ut operta & occulta cognoſceret, adhæc ente ſibi ſecio Jeſu, quia nemo ſine vero Jeſu poteſt incerta ſapientiæ & occulta comprehendere. Et ideo in ſpecie *Jeſu Nave* veri Salvatoris ſignificabatur aſſutura præſentia, per quem fierent omnes docibiles Dei, qui legem aperiret, Evangelium revelaret. *S. Ambroſ.* in *Pſal.* 47.

a *Joſ.* 5. 2.

* Non enim prophetæ ſic ait, Et dixit Dominus ad me; ſed, ad *Jeſum*: ut offenderet quod non de ſe loqueretur, ſed de Chriſto, ad quem cum Deus loquebatur. Chriſti enim figuram gerebat ille *Jeſus*. *Lact. l.* 4. *c.* 17.

b *Rom.* 2. 29.

c *Col.* 2. 11.

Ex. 24. 13. *Joſ.* 1. 1. *Rom.* 15. 8.

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 ſucceſſour of *Moſes*, in that he repreſenteth *Jeſus*, in as much 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 en-

Joh. 1. 17.

* πύπον δὲ ἔφερεν αὐτῷ ὁ τῷ Ναυῆ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἀρξάμενος δὲ ἄρχειν τοῦ λαοῦ ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς βαπτισθεὶς ἤρξατο εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. *S. Cyril. Catech.* 10.

ters

tersupon his propheticall office. He chuſeth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve ſtones over with them; as our *Jeſus* thence began to chuſe his * twelve Apoſtles, thoſe foundation-ſtones in the Church of God, whoſe [a] *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*, [b] *Verily I ſay unto you, that the Publicans and Harlots go into the kingdome of God before you.* [c] *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 onely wrought by the power of him whoſe name he bare, but did alſo ſignifie that in the later dayes, toward the ſetting of the Sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darkneſſe, *the Sun of righteouſneſſe ſhould ariſe with healing in his wings*, and giving a check to the approching night, become [d] *the true light which lightneth every man that cometh into the world.*

* S. Cyril *addeth that he divided the land by twelve men.* δώδεκα δὲ διαιρέντας τὴν κληρονομίαν καθίστησι ὁ τῆς Ναυῆ υἱὸς καὶ δώδεκα τοὺς Ἀποστόλους κήρυκας τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀποστέλλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Ib.

a *Revel.* 21. 14.
b *Mat.* 21. 31.
c *Joſ.* 10. 12, 13.
d *Joh.* 1. 9.
† *by the ſame*

S. Cyril. πιστεύσασαν· Ῥαὰβ τὴν πόρνην ἔσωσεν ὁ τυπικὸς· ὁ δὲ ἀληθὴς φησὶν, ὅτι οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. † Stetit Sol, quia in *Jeſu* & typum futuri agnoſcebat & nomen. Neque enim in ſua virtute *Jeſu Nave*, ſed in *Chriſti* myſterio cœleſtibus luminibus imperabat. Deſignabatur enim Dei filium in hoc ſeculum eſſe venturum, qui mundani luminis concidentis & jam vergentis in tenebras virtute divina differret occaſum, lucem redderet, inveheret claritatem. *S. Ambroſ. Apolog. David. poſter. c.* 4. Ille imperavit ſoli ut ſtaret, & ſtetit, & iſtius typo ille magnus erat. Ille imperabat, ſed Dominus efficiebat. *S. Hieron. in Pſal.* 76.

But to paſſe 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 kingdome was not of this world*, in a ſpirituall manner goeth in and out before us againſt our ſpirituall enemies, ſubduing ſin and Satan, and ſo opening and clearing our way

to

to heaven; deſtroying the laſt enemy, death, ſo giving us poſ-
ſeſſion of eternall life. Thus do we believe the man called
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
Luk. 1. 69, 71. Saviour of the world, *whom God hath raiſed up an horn of ſalvation for us in the houſe of his ſervant David, That we ſhould be ſaved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us.*

The neceſſity of the belief of this part of the Article is not onely certain, but evident: becauſe there is no end of faith without a Saviour, and no other name but this by which we can be ſaved, and no way to be ſaved by him, but by believing in him. For *this is his commandement,*
1 Joh. 3. 23, 24. *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.* From him then, and from him alone muſt we expect ſalvation, acknowledging and confeſſing freely, there is nothing in our ſelves which can effect it, or deſerve it for us, nothing in any other creature which
1 Tim. 2. 5. can promerit or procure it to us. For *there is* but *one* God, *and one Mediatour between God and men, the man Chriſt Jeſus.* 'Tis onely *the beloved Son in whom* God *is well pleaſed*; he is *clothed with a veſture dipt in bloud, he*
Iſ. 53. 6. *hath trod the wine-preſſe alone: we like ſheep have gone aſtray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us*
Coloſ. 1. 20. *all. By him God hath reconciled all things to himſelf*, by him, I ſay, *whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.* By him alone is our ſalvation wrought: for his ſake then onely can we ask it, from him alone expect it.

Secondly, this Belief is neceſſary, that we may delight and rejoyce in the name of *Jeſus*, as that in which all our happineſſe is involv'd. At his nativity an Angel from heaven thus taught the ſhepherds, the firſt witneſſes of the
Luk. 2. 10, 11. bleſſed incarnation; *Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which ſhall be to all people. For unto you is born this*

day

day in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And what the Angel delivered at preſent, that the Prophet *Iſaiah*, that old Evangeliſt, foretold at diſtance. When *the people which walked in darkneſſe* ſhould *ſee a great light*, 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 as men rejoyce 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.* Iſ. 9. 2, 3, 6. Iſ. 35. 4, 10.

Thirdly, the belief in *Jeſus* ought to inflame our affection, to kindle our love toward him, ingaging us to hate all things in reſpect of him, that is, ſo farre as they are in oppoſition to him, or pretend to equall ſhare of affection with him. *He that loveth father or mother more then me, is not worthy of me*; *and he that loveth ſon or daughter more then me, is not worthy of me*, ſaith our Saviour; ſo forbidding all prelation of any naturall affection, becauſe our ſpirituall union is farre beyond all ſuch relations. Nor is a higher degree of love onely debarr'd us, but any equall pretenſion is as much forbidden. *If any man come to me*, ſaith the ſame Chriſt, *and hate not his father & mother, and wife and children, and brethren and ſiſters, yea and his own life alſo, he cannot be my diſciple.* 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 onely begotten Son.* Is it not he, who ſhew'd his own love unto us, farre beyond all poſſibility of parallell? for *greater love hath no man then this, that a man lay down his life for his friends*; but *while we were yet ſinners*, that is enemies, *Chriſt died for us*, and ſo became our *Jeſus*. Shall thus the Father ſhew his love in his Son, ſhall thus the Son ſhew his love in himſelf, and ſhall we no way ſtudy a requitall? or is there any proper return of love but love? Mat. 10. 37. Luk. 14. 26. Joh. 3. 16. Joh. 15. 13. Rom. 5. 8.

The voice of the Church, in the language of *Solomon* is *my love*: nor was that onely the expreſſion of a ſpouſe, but of * *Ignatius*, 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 chuſe but conclude with S. *Paul*, *If any man love not the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, let him be Anathema Maran atha.*

Cant. 2,7.3,5. 8,4.

* ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται.

1 *Cor.* 16. 22.

Laſtly, the confeſſion of faith in *Jeſus* is neceſſary to breed in us a correſpondent eſteem of him, & an abſolute obedience to him. That we may be raiſed to the true temper of S. *Paul*, who *counted all things but loſſe for the excellency of the knowledge of Chriſt Jeſus our Lord, for whom he ſuffered the loſſe of all things, and counted them but dung that he might win Chriſt*. Nor can we pretend to any true love of *Jeſus*, except we be ſenſible of the readineſſe of our obedience to him: as knowing what language he uſed to his diſciples, *If ye love me keep my commandments*; and what the Apoſtle of his boſome ſpake, *This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments*. His own diſciples once marvelled, and ſaid, *What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the ſea obey him*? How much more ſhould we wonder at all diſobedient Chriſtians, ſaying, What manner of men are theſe, who refuſe obedience unto him, whom the ſenſeleſſe 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 then they? Shall the *exorciſt ſay to the evil ſpirit, I adjure thee by the name of Jeſus*, 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 croſſe* for us, that he might be raiſed to full power, and abſolute dominion

Phil. 3. 8.

Ioh. 14. 15.

1 *Ioh.* 5. 3.

Mat. 8. 27.

Mark 9 38. *Luk.* 9. 49. *Act.* 19. 15.

Philip. 2. 8,

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.* Philip. 2. 9. 10.

Having thus declared the Originall of the name *Jeſus*, the means and wayes 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 ſaies, when he makes his confeſſion in theſe words, *I believe in Jeſus*, which may be not unfitly in this manner deſcribed. I believe not onely that there is a God who made the world; but I acknowledge and profeſſe that I am fully perſwaded 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 onely way for the ſalvation of their ſouls, and wrought the ſame way out for them by the vertue of his bloud; obtaining remiſſion for ſinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives; and ſhall at laſt himſelf actually conferre the ſame ſalvation, which he hath promulged and procured, upon all thoſe which unfeignedly and ſtedfaſtly believe in him. I acknowledge there is no other way to heaven beſide that which he hath ſhewn us, there is no other means which can procure it for us but his bloud, there is no other perſon which ſhall conferre it on us but himſelf. And with this full acknowledgement, *I believe in Jeſus.*

AND IN JESUS CHRIST.

HAving thus explained the proper Name of our Saviour, *Jeſus*, we come unto that Title of his Office uſually joyned with his Name, which is therefore the more diligently to be examined, becauſe the † Jewes, which alwayes acknowledged him to be *Jeſus*, ever denied him to be *Chriſt, and agreed together,* [a] *that if any man did confeſſe that he was Chriſt, he ſhould be put out of the Synagogue.*

† Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ κατηνέχθησαν τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸ δὲ καὶ Χειστὸν εἶναι ἥνυτον ὑκάτι. S. Cyril. Catech. 10.

[a] *Joh.* 9. 22.

For the full explication of this Title, it will be neceſſary, firſt, to deliver the ſignification of the word; ſecondly, to ſhew upon what grounds the Jewes alwayes expected a *Chriſt* or *Meſſias*; thirdly, to prove that the *Meſsias* promiſed to the Jewes 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 ſeverall 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*; *Joh.* 4. 25. 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 *Samaria*, who ſpake in Syriac; *Chriſt*, the interpretation of S. *John*, who wrote his Go-

Joh. 1. 41.

* Σύγγονε Μεσσίαν (ὃ ἐστιν ἑρμηνευόμενον, ὁ Θεὸς ἀνὴρ Χειστὸς Ἰουδαίοισιν ἀκούεται Ἕλλάδι φωνῇ. Nonnus.

† *From* משח unxit *in the Hebrew,* משיח & משיחא unctus *in the Syriac. in the Greek, by changing* ש *into* σ, *by omitting* ח *a gutturall not fit for their pronunciation, and by adding* ς *as their*

ſpel.

ordinary termination, משיחא *is turn'd into* Messias. *That this was the Greek* Χειστὸς *and the Latine* Christus *is evident; and yet the Latines living at a diſtance, ſtrangers to the cuſtomes of the Jewes, and the doctrine of the Chriſtians, miſtook this name, and call'd him* Chreſtus, *from the Greek* χρηστός. *So* Suetonius *in the life of* Claudius, *c.* 25. Judæos impulſore *Chreſto* aſſidue tumultuantes *Roma* expulit. *which was not only his miſtake, but generally the* Romans *at firſt as they named him* Chreſtus, *ſo they called us* Chreſtiani. *Tertul. adv. Gentes.* Sed & cum perperam Chreſtianus pronunciatur à vobis (nam nec nominis certa eſt notitia penes vos) de ſuavitate vel benignitate compoſitum eſt. *Lactant.* l. 4. c. 17. Sed expenenda hujus nominis ratio eſt propter ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata littera Chreſtum ſolent dicere. *Upon which miſtake* Juſtine Martyr *juſtifies the Chriſtians of his time,* ἐπεὶ δ' ἔξεστι γε ἐκ τῶν καταγραφέντων ὑμῶν ὀνόματος, χρηστότατοι ὑπάρχομεν. *And again,* Χειστιανοὶ (*or rather* Χρηστιανοὶ) γὰρ ὄντως καταγρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μισεῖσθαι ὑπ' ἀδίκων. Apol. 2. *I was then the ignorance of the Jews affairs which cauſed the Romans to name our Saviour* Chreſtus, *and the true title is certainly* Chriſtus. Χειστὸς μὲν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρίεσθαι, *ſaith* Juſtine, τὸ τῷ Χριστῷ ὄνομα πρῶτον Μωσέως τοῖς χριομένοις ἐπιθεῖναι, *ſayes* Euſeb. Dem. Evang. l. 4. c. 15. Quoniam Græci veteres χρίεσθαι dicebant ungi quod nunc ἀλείφεσθαι. ob hanc rationem nos eum *Chriſtum* nuncupamus, id eſt unctum, qui Hebraice *Meſſias* dicitur *Lact.* l. 4. c. 7. *So the Latines generally* Chriſtus à chriſmate: *and without queſtion* χρισὸς *is from* χρίσμα. *Yet I conceive the firſt ſignification of this word among the Greeks hath not been yet ſufficiently diſcovered. The firſt of the ancients in whom I meet with the word* χρισὸς *is* Æſchylus *the Tragœdian, in whom I find it had another ſenſe then now we take it in; for in his language that is not* χρισὸν *which is anointed, but that with which it is anointed; ſo that it ſignifieth not the ſubject of unction, but the ointment as diffuſed in the ſubject. The place is this in his* Prometheus Vinctus.

Οὐκ ἦν ἀλέξημ' οὐδὲν, οὐδὲ βρώσιμον,
Οὐ χρισὸν, οὐδὲ πιστὸν, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων
Χρεία κατεσκέλλουσο.----

Prometheus *ſhews himſelf to be the inventer of the art of Phyſick, that before him therefore there was no medicine, neither to be taken internally by eating or by drinking, nor externally by way of inunction, as the Scholiaſt very well expounds it.* οὐκ ἦν οὐδὲν βοήθημα θεραπείας, οὐδὲ διὰ βρώσεως προσφερόμενον, (*which is* οὐδὲ βρώσιμον *in* Æſchylus) ἔτε δὲ διὰ ἀναχρίσεως ἔξωθεν (*which is* οὐ χρισὸν) οὐδὲ διὰ πόσεως (τοῦτο δὲ δηλοῖ τὸ πιστὸν.) *As therefore* πῶ πίνω, πιστὸν, *ſo from* χρίω χρίσω, χρισὸν. *and as* πιστὸν *is not that which receiveth drink, but that drink which is received, not* quod potat, *but* quod potabile eſt; *ſo* χρισὸν *is not that which receiveth oyl, but that which is receiv'd by inunction. So the Scholiaſt upon* Ariſtophanes, Τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μὲν ὄντι καταπλαστὰ, τὰ δὲ χρισὰ, τὰ δὲ ποτά. *and the Scholiaſt of* Theocritus, Ἰσέον ὅτι τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μὲν εἰσι χρισὰ, ἅπερ χρίομεθα εἰς θεραπείαν· τὰ δὲ ποτὰ, ἅπερ πίνομεν· τὰ δὲ ἔδιμαξα, ἅπερ ἐσθίομεν. Idyl. 11. *So that* χρισὸν *in his judgement is the ſame with* ἔγχρισον *in* Theocritus.

Οὐδὲν τοσῆδ' ἔρασμα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, ὅτ' ἔγχειον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, ὅτ' ὀπίπασον
Ἢ ταὶ Πιερίδες.------

In the same sense with Æschylus did Euripides *use* χρισὸν φάρμακον. *and not onely those ancient Poets, but even the later Orators:* as in Curyonemus. πολὺ χρῖον καὶ διεφθαρμένα ζώματος καὶ νοσοῦντος ψυχὴ διεφθαρμένη, μᾶ Δί', οὐ τῶν φαρμάκων χρισῶν ἢ ποτῶν. Orat. 78. *and the* LXX *have us'd it in this sense;* as when the Hebrew *speaks of* שֶׁמֶן הַמִּשְׁחָה *oleum unctionis, they translate it* τῦ ὄμικχυμένυ ὀπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τῦ ἐλαίυ τῦ χρισῦ Levit. 21. 10. *and again vers.* 12. שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת כִּי τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαιον τὸ χρισὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ. *Oleum unctionis then is* ἔλαιον χρισὸν, *which in* Exodus 29. 7. 35, 13. 40. 9. *the same Translatours correspondent to the Hebrew phrase call* ἔλαιον χείσματος, *and more frequently* ἔλαιον χείσεως. *But although it appear from hence that the first use of the word* χρισὸς *among the Greeks was to signifie the act or matter used in unction, not the subject or person anointed, yet in the vulgar acception of the* LXX *it was most constantly receiv'd for the person anointed, of the same validity with* χριστὸς *or* κεχρισμένος. Suidas χρισὸς, ὁ κεχρισμένος ἐν ἐλαίῳ. *as also with* ἠλειμμένος. *For though* Lactantius *in the place fore-cited seem to think that word an improper version of the Hebrew* מָשִׁיחַ. unde in quibusdam Græcis scripturis, quæ male de Hebraicis interpretatæ sunt, ἠλειμμένος, id est, unguento curatus, scriptum invenitur. ἀπὸ τῦ ἀλείφεσθαι; *yet the* LXX *have so translated it,* Num. 3. 3. οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ ἠλειμμένοι. *And although* Athenæus *hath observed,* πολλῶν τὰ μὲν ὅτι χείσματα, τάδε δ' ἀλείμματα. *yet in the vulgar use of the words there is no difference, as he himself speaks a little after.* τὸ δὲ χείσασθαι τῷ τοιούτῳ ἀλείμματι μυείσασθαι εἴρηκεν. *So* Hesych. ἀλεῖψαι, ἠλαίωσε χείσαι. *and* Suidas, ἠλειψάμην, ἐχεισάμην. Χρισὸς *then in the vulgar use of the* LXX *is a person anointed, and in that sense is our Saviour called* Christ.

spel in the Greek as the most generall language in those dayes: and the signification of them both is, the Anointed. S. *Paul* and the rest of the Apostles writing in that language, used the Greek name, which the Latines did retain, calling him constantly *Christus*, and we in English have retain'd the same, as universally naming him *Christ*.

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 involveth the design in the custome of anointing. For in the Law whatsoever was anointed, was thereby set apart, as ordained to some speciall use or office; and therefore under the notion of unction, we must understand that

that promotion and ordination. *Jacob poured oyl on the top of a pillar*, and that anointing was the conſecration 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. When therefore *Jeſus* is call'd the *Meſſias* or *Chriſt*, and that ſo long after the anointing oil had ceaſed, it ſignified no leſſe then 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 us'd, were but types and ſhadows. Gen. 28. 18.

That there was among the Jewes an expectation of ſuch a *Chriſt* to come, is moſt evident. The woman of *Samaria* could ſpeak with confidence, *I know that Meſſias cometh.* And the unbelieving Jewes, 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.* 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 moe miracles then theſe which this man hath done?* Whether therefore they doubted, or whether they believed 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.* As ſoon as *John* began to baptize, the *Jewes ſent Prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem, to ask him, who art thou?* 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:* So without queſtion their firſt demand Joh. 4. 25. Luk 3. 15. Joh. 7. 27. 31. 40. 41. Joh. 1. 19. 20.

mand was, † art thou the *Christ*? and he answered, I am not. From whence it clearly appeareth that there was a generall expectation among the Jewes of a *Messias* to come; nor onely so, but it was alwayes counted amongst them an * article of their faith, 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 enquiry to look into the grounds upon which they built that expectation. It is most certain that the *Messias* was promised by God, both before, and under the Law. God said unto *Abram*, a *In Isaac shall thy seed be called*. and we know that was a promise of a *Messias* to come, because S. *Paul* hath taught us, b *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*. The Lord said unto *Moses*, *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee*. And S. *Peter* hath sufficiently satisfied us, that this Prophet promised to *Moses*, is Jesus *the Christ*. Many are the prophecies which concern him, many promises which are made of him; but yet some of them very obscure, others though plainer, yet have relation onely to the person, not to the notion or the word *Messias*. Whereseever 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*: and yet even there the Greek Translation hath not the *Messiah*, but the *Unction*. It may therefore seem something strange, how so universall an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the *Messias* should be spread through the Church of the Jewes. But if we consider that in the space of seventy yeares of the Babylonish captivity, the ordinary Jewes had lost the exact understanding of the old Hebrew language before spoken in *Judea*, and therefore when the Scriptures were read unto them, they found it necessary to interpret them to the people in the Chaldee

† So Nonnus hath expressed, what in the Evangelist is to be understood. Μυστικόλοι δ' ἐρέεινον ὁμήλυδες ὀξέϊ μυθῷ, Τίς σὺ πέλεις; μὴ χερσὶν ἔρυς;

* Auctor Sepher Ikkarim, l. 4. c. ult. Maimon. Tract. de Regibus. c. 11.

a Gen. 21. 12.

b Gal. 3. 16.

Act. 3. 22.

Dan. 9. 26.

Chaldee language which they had lately learn'd. 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.* Nehem. 8. 8. 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 generall opinion of the learned Jewes. By which means it came to paſſe that not onely 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 expreſſe mention of the *Meſsias* in above ſeventy places, beſide that of *Daniel*. The Jewes then informed by the plain words of *Daniel*, 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 fulfill'd: 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 law-giver from between his feet, untill Shiloh come, and to him ſhall the gathering of the people be.* Gen. 49. 10. But the ſceptre is departed from *Judah*, neither is there one Law-giver left between his feet, therefore *Shiloh*, that is the *Meſsias*, is already come. That the Jewiſh government hath totally fail'd, is not without the great-

eſt 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 Jewes, and from the deſcription immediately added to the name. For * all the old Paraphraſts call him expreſly the *Meſſias*, and the words which follow, *to him ſhall the gathering of the people be*, ſpeak no leſſe; 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*; [a] *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*, [b] *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. [c] *Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren ſhall praiſe, thy hand ſhall be in the neck of thine enemies, thy fathers children ſhall bow down before thee.* Thou ſhalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother *Reuben*, and by vertue 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 untill it make way for a greater, know that this government ſhall not fail, untill there come a ſon out of your loynes, who ſhall be farre greater then your ſelf: for whereas your dominion reacheth onely over your brethren, and ſo is confin'd unto the tribes of *Iſrael*; his kingdome ſhall be univerſall, and all nations of the earth ſhall ſerve him. Being then this *Shiloh* is ſo deſcribed in the text, and acknowledged by the ancient Jewes to be the *Meſſias*; being God had pro-

* *For inſtead of* עד כי יבא שילה *Onkelos renders it,* עד דיתי משיחא *and Jonathan and the Jeruſalem Targum,* עד זמן דייתי מלכא משיחא. *Beſide the Cabaliſts did generally ſo interpret it, becauſe according to their computation make the ſame number with the letters of* משיח, *and in the* Talmud, *Cod.* Sanhedrim *Rabbi* Johanan *asking what was the name of the* Meſſias, *they of the School of* R. Schila *anſwer,* שילה שמו *his name is* Shiloh, *according to that which is written, untill* Shiloh *come.*

a *Iſ.* 11. 10.
b *Mic.* 4. 1.
c *Gen.* 49. 8.

promiſed by *Jacob* the government of *Iſrael* ſhould not fail untill *Shiloh* came; being that government is viſibly and undeniably already fail'd; it followeth inevitably, that the *Meſsias* is already come.

In the ſame manner the Prophet *Malachy* hath given an expreſſe 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 & I will ſhake the heavens, & 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. The glory of this later houſe ſhall be greater then 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 Jewes confeſs'd 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 then the glory of the firſt, without the coming of the *Meſsias* to it. For the Jewes themſelves have obſerved that five ſignes 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 audi-

Mal. 3. 1.

Hag. 2. 6, 7, 9.

ble voice; the fire upon the Altar, which came down from heaven, and immediately consum'd the sacrifices; 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 oyl of unction; and lastly, the spirit of Prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the propheticall office were indued. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure or building of it, as appeared by the teares dropt from those eyes which had beheld the former. Ezr. 3. 12. *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, Hag. 2. 3. *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 inferiour to the first, being all those signes 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, then by the coming of him into it, in whom all those signes of the divine glory were farre 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, the onely propitiatory by his bloud; 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, & from whose fulnesse we do all receive. In him were all those signes of the divine glory united, which were thus divided in the first temple, in him

him they were all more eminently contained then in thoſe: therefore his coming to the ſecond Temple was as the ſufficient, ſo the onely means, by which the glory of it could be greater then the glory of the firſt. If then the *Meſsias* was to come while the ſecond temple ſtood, as appeareth by Gods prediction and promiſe, if that temple many ages ſince hath ceas'd to be, there being not one ſtone left upon a ſtone, if it certainly were before the deſtruction of it in greater glory then 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.

Having thus demonſtrated out of the promiſes given to the Jewes, 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 particular, 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 liv'd and died there before the Commonwealth of *Iſrael* was diſperſed, before 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 ſhew of probability pretend to be, or was accepted as the *Meſsias*. Therefore we muſt confeſſe he was, and onely he could be the *Chriſt*. Secondly, all other prophecies belonging to the *Meſsias* were fulfill'd 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 every where manifeſt.

* The Jews, which mention *Meſsias* as a ſon of *Joſeph* or 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

* *The Jewes have invented*

ſtile משיח בן יוסף, *the other* משיח בן דוד. *The ſon of* Joſeph *they name alſo the ſon of* Ephraim, *and the ſon of* David *the ſon of* Judah, *as the* Targum Cant. 4. 5. *Thy two breaſts are like two young roes.* תרין מריקיך משיח בר דוד ומשיח בר אפרים *two are thy redeemers,* Meſſias *the ſon of* David, *and* Meſſias *the ſon of* Ephraim.

of *Ephraim*, do not deny, but rather dignifie the Son of *David* or of *Judah*, whom they confeſſe to be the greater *Chriſt*. *There ſhall come forth a* [*] *rod out of the ſtemme of Jeſſe, 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*. Now who was it but *Jeſus*, of whom the elders ſpake, [a] *Behold the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David?* who but he ſaid, *I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning ſtarre?* The Jewes did all acknowledge it, as appears by the queſtion of our Saviour, [b] *How ſay the Scribes that Chriſt is the ſon of David?* [c] *What think ye of Chriſt? whoſe ſon is he? they ſay unto him, the ſon of David.* and that of the people amazed at the ſeeing of the blind, and ſpeaking of the dumbe: [d] *Is this the ſon of David?* The blind cried out unto him, *Jeſus, thou ſon of David, have mercy on us*; and the multitude cried [e] *Hoſanna to the ſon of David*. The Genealogy of *Jeſus* ſhews his family: the firſt words of the Goſpel are, *The book of the generation of Jeſus Chriſt, the ſon of David*, The prophecy therefore was certainly fulfill'd in reſpect of his linage, *for it is evident that our Lord ſprang out of Judah*. 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 Judea*. The people doubted whether *Jeſus* was the *Chriſt*,

Iſ. 11. 1, 10.

[*] *which the Chaldee Paraphraſe thus tranſlates,* ויפוק מלכא מבנוהי רישו ומשיח מבני בנוהי יתרבי. *A king ſhall come of the ſons of Jeſſe, and the Meſſias out of his ſons ſons.*

[a] *Rev.* 5, 5. 22, 16.

[b] *Mar.* 12, 35.

[c] *Mat.* 22, 42.

[d] *Mat.* 12, 23.

[e] *Mat.* 21. 9.

Mat. 1, 1.

Heb. 7. 14.

Mat. 2, 4, 5.

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?* That place of Scripture which they meant was cited by the Scribes to *Herod*, according to the interpretation then current among the Jewes, and ſtill preſerved in the * Chaldee Paraphrate. *For thus it is written in the Prophet,* a *And thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah art not the leaſt among the princes of Juda, for out of thee ſhall come a governour that ſhall rule my people Iſrael.* This prediction was moſt manifeſtly and remarkably fulfill'd in the birth of *Jeſus*, when by the providence of God it was ſo order'd 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 unto *Bethlehem* of *Judea*, the city of *David*, there to be taxed, b *becauſe they were of the houſe and linage of David.* And while they were there, as the dayes of the Virgin *Mary* were accompliſhed, ſo the prophecy was fulfill'd, 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.*

Joh. 7. 41, 42.

* *Which expreſly tranſlateth it thus.*
מנך קדמי יפוק משיחא למהוי עביד שולטן על ישראל
Out of thee ſhall come before me the Meſſias, that he may exerciſe domination in Iſrael.

a *Mat.* 2. 5, 6.
b *Luk.* 2. 4.

Luk. 2. 11.

× But if we adde 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 greatneſſe of a *Meſſias*, then that of a Virgin, which is moſt miraculous? what name can be thought fitter for him then that of *Immanuel*, God with us, whoſe land *Judea* 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

Iſ. 7. 14.

Iſ. 8. 8.

Mat. 1.22. of the bleſſed Virgin Mary, *that it might be fulfill'd 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 fulfill'd 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 acknowledged of neceſſity to be the true *Meſſias*. But all this is manifeſtly true of *Jeſus*. Therefore we muſt confeſſe 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 *Hoſeah* have expreſſed him, as we ſhall hereafter have further occaſion to ſhew. And not onely ſo, but as a greater Prophet, and more perfect Doctour, then ever any was which preceded him, more univerſall then they all.

Iſ. 42.1,4. *I have put my ſpirit upon him*, ſaith God, *he ſhall bring forth judgement to the Gentiles, and the Iles ſhall wait for his law.* Now it is as evident that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* was the moſt perfect Prophet, the * Prince and Lord of all the Prophets, Doctours, 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, a *I ſay unto you*: nor like the Interpreters of *Moſes*, for b *he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes*: with the greateſt perſpicuity; not as thoſe before him under types and ſhadowes, but plainly and clearly; from whence both he and his doctrine is frequently called Light,

* ἀρχιποίμην, 1 Pet. 5.4. ὁ ποίμην τῶν προβάτων ὁ μέγας. Heb. 13. 20. ὁ ποίμην καὶ ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν. 1 Pet. 2. 25.

a Mat. 5. often.

b Mat. 7. 29.

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. Whatſoever 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?* Mat. 11. 5. And *Jeſus* returned this anſwer unto him, ſhewing the ground of that meſſage, *the works of Chriſt*, was a ſufficient reſolution of the queſtion ſent; *Go and ſhew 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.* And as *Jeſus* alledged the works which he wrought to be a ſufficient teſtimony that he was the *Meſſias*; ſo did thoſe Jewes acknowledge it, who ſaid, *When Chriſt cometh, will he do mo miracles then theſe which this man doth?* Joh. 7. 31. And *Nicodemus* a Ruler among them confeſſed little leſſe: *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.* Joh. 3. 2. 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 Gods conſtant preſence with his people; and yet all thoſe wrought by ſo many ſeverall perſons in the ſpace of above three thouſand yeares, are farre ſhort of thoſe which this one *Jeſus* did perform within the compaſſe of three yeares. The ambitious diligence of the Jewes hath reckon'd 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 compar'd with all which he wrought, when S. *John* teſtifieth with as great certain-

ty of truth, as height of hyperbole, *that there are many*
Joh. 21. 25. *other things wh ch Jesus did the which if they should be written every one*, he *supposed that even the world it self could not contain the books that should be written*! Nor did our Saviour excell all others in the number of his miracles onely, but in the power of working. Whatsoever miracle *Moses* wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else consulting with God, receiv'd it by command from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as immanent or inhering in him. Whereas this
Col. 2. 9. power must of necessity be in. *Jesus, in whom dwelt all*
Joh. 5. 26. *the fulnesse of the* Godhead *bodily*, and *to whom the father had given to have life in himself*. This he sufficiently shewed 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
Mark 5. 29. when the woman which *had an issue of bloud twelve yeares touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her bloud was dried up* by the vertue which flowed out from the greater fountain of his power. And lest this example should be single, we find that the *men of*
Matt. 14. 34. 36. *Genesaret*, the *people out of all* Judea *and* Jerusalem, *and from the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon*, even *the whole*
Luk. 6. 17, 19. *multitude sought to touch him, for there went vertue out of him, and heal'd them all.* Once indeed *Christ* seemeth to have pray'd before he raised *Lazarus* from the
Joh. 11. 42. 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 conferre it upon his
Luk. 10. 19. disciples; *Behold I give unto you power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy:*
Mat. 10. 8. Upon the Apostles; *Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers,*

raise

raiſe the dead caſt out devils; freely ye have received, freely give: Upon the firſt believers; *Theſe ſignes 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 then theſe ſhall he do.* He then which did more actions divine and powerfull then *Moſes* and all the Prophets ever did, he which perform'd them in a manner farre more divine then that by which they wrought, hath done all which can be expected the *Meſſias*, foretold by them, ſhould do. Mark 16.17. Joh.14.12.

Nor hath our *Jeſus* onely 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 *Iſaias* what his condition was to be, whom he calls the *Servant of God*; and the later Jewes cannot deny but their † fathers conſtantly underſtood that place of the *Meſſias*. Iſ. 52. 13.

† *For firſt, inſtead of thoſe words, Behold my ſervant ſhall deal prudently, the* Targum *hath it plainly* הא יצלח עבדי משיחא *Behold my Son the* Meſſias *ſhall proſper. and* Solomon Jarchi *on the place,* רבותינו מוקמי לה במשיח *Our Rabbins underſtand this of the* Meſſias. *And the reaſon which he renders of their interpretation is very obſervable. For they ſay, ſayes he, that the* Meſſias *is ſtricken, as it is written, He took our infirmities, and bare our griefs; which are the words of the 4. verſe of the 53. chapter. From whence we may perceive how the ancient Jewes did joyn the later part of the 52. chap. with the 53. and expound them of the ſame perſon. Beſide he cites a certain* Midraſh *or Gloſſe, which attributes the ſame verſe to the* Meſſias, *and that is to be found in* Bereſhit Rabba *upon* Gen. 28. 10. *where falling upon that place in* Zach. 4. 7. *What art thou O great mountain before* Zerubbabel? *he anſwers;* דר הגדול זה משיח *that great mountain is the* Meſſias. *Then asking again, Why doth he call the* Meſſias *a great mountain? he gives this anſwer,* שהוא גדול מן האבות שני חנה *becauſe he is greater then the Fathers, as it is written,* ושכיל עבדי יוה משיח *behold my ſervant ſhall underſtand, that is, the* Meſſias, *which are the words of the verſe before cited. And the ſame* Bereſhit Rabba, *upon* Gen. 24. 67. *ſaith* Meſſias *the King was in the generation of the wicked, that he gave himſelf to ſeek for mercies for Iſrael, and to falling and humbling himſelf for them, as it is written,*

and ſo produceth the words of Iſaiah 53. 5. *From whence it appears again, that the Author thereof interpreted both the chapters of the ſame* Meſſias. *And further it is obſervable that the* Midraſh *upon* Ruth 2. 14. *expounds the ſame verſe in the ſame manner. And Rabbi* Moſes Aſſhech *ſpeaks yet more fully of the conſent of the ancient Jewiſh Doctours upon this place* הנה זֹל פה אחד קיימו וקבלו כי על מלך המשיח ודבר. *behold our Doctours of happy memory conclude with one mouth, as they have received from their anceſtours, that this is ſpoken of the* Meſſias. *From hence it appeares that it was originally the generall ſenſe of the Jewes, 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 Jewes may well be ſuſpected to frame their contrary expoſitions out of a wilfull oppoſition to Chriſtianity.*

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 paines which preceded and led unto it. For the firſt the Prophet hath punctually deſcrib'd his condition, ſaying, *He hath no form or comelineſſe, and when we ſhall ſee him, there is no beauty that we ſhould deſire him. He is deſpiſed and rejected of men.* He * ſeems to deſcribe a perſonage no way amiable, an aſpect indeed rather uncomely: and ſo the moſt † ancient writers have interpreted *Iſaias*, and confeſſed the fulfilling of it in the body of our Saviour. But what the aſpect of his outward appearance was, becauſe the Scriptures are ſilent,

Iſ. 53. 2, 3.

* *The firſt* לא תאר לו *ſeems to ſignifie no leſſe, as being from the root* תאר *which ſignifieth 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* יפת תאר ויפה תואר forma pulchra, Gen. 29. 17. *and ſo* Joſeph Gen. 39. 6. *ſo* Abigail *and* Eſther, *and in generall* Deut. 21. 11. *with an addition of fair added to* תאר. *whereas* David *is call'd without ſuch addition* איש תאר, *but with the full ſignification,* ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς τῷ εἴδει. *In the* 8. *of* Judges *the* 18. אחד כתאר בני המלך. οἷς ὁμοίωμα ὑῶ βασιλέως. *ſo the Roman; but the* Aldus *and* Complut. *better,* ὡς εἶδος ὑῶν βασιλέως. *according to that verſe of* Euripides *cited by* Athenæus *and* Porphyrius, Πρῶτον μὲν εἶδος ἄξιον τυράννου. *The* Meſſias *was to be a King whoſe externall form and perſonage ſpake no ſuch Majeſty.* † *As* Juſtine Martyr, Ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὁπ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, ᾠόμιζομένου Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ τέκτονος ὑὸς νόμῳ, καὶ ἀνεδύς, ὡς αἱ γραφαὶ ἐκήρυσσον, φαινομένου. Dial. *cum*

we

Tryph. *And* Clemens Alex. Τὸν δὲ κύριον αὐτὸν τοῦτο ὄφιν αἰσχρὸν γεγονέναι διὰ Ἡσαΐου τὸ πνεῦμα μαρτυρεῖ· καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος, &c. Pæd. 3. c. 1. ὅπως γε καὶ αὐτὸς ἡ κραυλὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐν σαρκὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπῳ διελήλυθε καὶ ἄμορφος. Strom. 3. *And* Celſus *impudently arguing againſt the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon our Saviour, ſayes it is impoſſible that any body, in which ſomething of the divinity were, ſhould not differ from others.* τοῦτο δὲ, *the body of Chriſt,* οὐδὲν ἄλλο διέφερεν, ἀλλ', ὡς φασι, μικρὸν, καὶ δυσπρόσιτος, καὶ ἀγεννὴς ἦν. *This which* Celſus *by his* ὡς φασι *ſeems to take from the common report of Chriſtians in his age,* Origen *will have him take it out of* Iſaiah, *and upon that acknowledgeth* τὸ δυσπρόσιτος, *but the other two,* μικρὸν *and* ἀγεννὲς, *denies.* Ὁμολογουμένως τοίνυν γέγραπται τὰ περὶ τῆς δυσπροσιτείας γεγονέναι τὸ Ἰησοῦ σῶμα, ἃ μὲν ὡς ἐκτέθειται, καὶ ἀγεννὲς, οὐδὲ σαφῶς δηλοῦται ὅτι μικρὸν ἦν· ἔχει δὲ ἡ λέξις οὕτω παρὰ τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ ἀναγεγραμμένη, &c. *and then cites this place, and ſo returns it as an anſwer to the argument of* Celſus, *that becauſe he was foretold to be as he was, he muſt be the Son of God.* μεγάλη κατασκευὴ δεῖ τὸ τὸν ἀμόρφον δοκοῦντα εἶναι Ἰησοῦν ὑὸν εἶναι θεοῦ, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐτῶν τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ προφητευθῆναι καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ. Orig. *contra* Celſum, p. 337, 338. *In the ſame ſenſe did* S. Cyril *take theſe words of the Prophet; who ſpeaking of thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt,* ſpecioſus forma præ filiis hominum, *obſerves this muſt be underſtood of his divinity,* κίνωσις γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ταπείνωσις τῆς μετὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίας ὅλον ἐστὶ τὸ μυστήριον· γεγραπται γοῦν ὁ Προφήτης Ἡσαΐας περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος, οὐδὲ κάλλος, &c. *and again,* οὐκ εἶδεν πίφυκεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ λίαν ἀκαλλωπίστου. Tertullian *ſpeaks plainly as to the prophecy, and too freely in his way of expreſſion:* Sed carnis terrenæ non mira conditio ipſa erat quæ cætera ejus miranda faciebat, cum dicerent, *unde huic doctrina hæc & ſigna iſta?* adeo nec humanæ honeſtatis corpus fuit, nedum cœleſtis claritatis. Tacentibus apud nos quoque prophetis (*Iſai.* 53. 2.) de ignobili aſpectu ejus, ipſæ paſſiones ipſæque contumeliæ loquuntur. Paſſiones quidem humanam carnem, contumeliæ vero inhonestam probavere. An auſus eſſet aliquis ungue ſummo perſtringere corpus novum, ſpuraminibus contaminare faciem niſi merentem? *de Carne Chriſti, c.* 9. *And that we may be ſure he pointed at that place in* Iſaiah, *he ſaies that Chriſt was* ne aſpectu quidem honeſtus: Annuntiavimus enim, inquit, de illo ſicut puerulus, ſicut radix in terra ſitienti, & non eſt ſpecies ejus neque gloria. *Adv. Marcion. l.* 3. *c.* 17. *& adv. Judæos, c.* 14. *This humility of Chriſt in taking upon him the nature of man without the ordinary ornaments of man, at firſt acknowledged, was afterwards denied, as appears by* S. Hierome, *on the* 56. *of* Iſaiah. Inglorius erit inter homines aſpectus ejus, non quo formæ ſignificat fœditatem, ſed quod in humilitate venerit & paupertate. *And Epiſt.* 140. Abſque paſſionibus crucis univerſis pulchrior eſt virgo de virgine, qui non ex voluntate Dei, ſed ex Deo natus eſt. Niſi enim habuiſſet & in vultu quiddam oculiſque fidereum, nunquam eum ſtatim ſecuti eſſent Apoſtoli, nec qui ad comprehendendum eum venerant corruiſſent. *So* S. Chryſ. *interprets the words of* Iſaiah *of his divinity, or humility, or his paſſion; but thoſe of the Pſalmiſt, of his native corporall beauty.* Οὐδὲ γὰρ θαυματοποιῶν ἦν θαυμαστὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φαινόμενος ἁπλῶς πολλῆς ἔγεμε χάριτος· καὶ τοῦτο ὁ προφήτης δηλῶν ἔλεγεν, ὡραῖος κάλλει παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώ-

πων. Homil. 28. in Matth. *Afterwards they began to magnifie the externall beauty of his body, and confin'd themselves to one kind of picture or pourtraicture, with a zealous pretence of a likenesse not to be denied, which 800 yeares hence was knewn by none, every severall country having a severall Image. Whence came that argument of the Iconoclastæ, which of those Images was the true.* πθεν ἦν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις, ἢ ὥσπερ Ἰνδοὶ γράφουσιν, ἢ ἀπαρ Ἕλλησιν, ἢ ἀπαρ' Αἰγυπτίοις· οὐχ ὁμοίως αἱ ἀλλήλαις αὐταί. *And well might none of these be like another, when every nation painted our Saviour in the neerest similitude to the people of their own country.* Ἕλληνες μὲν αὐτῆς ὅμοιον ὅτι γῆς φανῆναι τὸν Χριστὸν νομίζουσι, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ μᾶλλον ἑαυτοῖς ἐοικότα· Ἰνδοὶ δὲ πάλιν μορφῇ τῇ αὐτῶν, καὶ Αἰθίοπες ὅμοιον ὡς ἑαυτοῖς. Photius Epist. 64. *And the difference of opinions in this kind is sufficiently apparent out of those words in Suidas,* Ἰσέον δὲ ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ἀκριβέστατοι περὶ ἱστορικῶν, ὡς τὸ ἕλον καὶ ὀλιγόστιχον εἰκονέστερόν ἐστι γεγράφθαι τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

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 Jewes without honour and inglorious. For though *being* Phil. 2.6,7. *in the forme of God, he thought it not robbery to be equall with God; yet he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the forme of a servant.* For thirty yeares he liv'd with his mother *Mary*, and *Joseph* his reputed father, of Luk. 2. 51. a mean profession, *and was subject to them.* When he left his mothers house, and entred on his propheticall office, he passed from place to place, sometimes receiv'd into a house othertimes lodging in the fields; for while Matt. 8. 20. *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 Jewes a neglect of his works, and contempt of his doctrine. a*Is not this the Carpenters son?* nay further, b*Is not this the* † *Carpenter, the son of Mary? and they were offended at him.* Thus was it fulfill'd in him, *he was despised and rejected of men, and they esteemed him not.*

a Matt. 13. 55.
b Mar. 6. 3.
† ὁ τέκτονος νομιζόμενος· παῦται γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα ἐργάζετο ὢν ἀνθρώποις ὢν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά. Just. Marr. Dial. cum Tryph.

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 grosse, we must acknowledge

ledge it fulfill'd in him to the higheſt degree imaginable, that he was *a man of ſorrowes and acquainted with grief.* *Iſ* 53.3. But if we compare the particular predictions with the hiſtoricall paſſages of his ſufferings, if we joyn 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*; S. *Matthew* will ſhew 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 ſhew how he was faſtened to the croſſe, and *Jeſus* himſelf *the print of the nailes.* 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*; S. *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 ſhew in whoſe perſon the Father ſpake it. *Eli Eli lamaſabachthani.* Let *Iſaiah* foretell, *he was numbred with the tranſgreſſours*; and you ſhall find him *crucified between two thieves, one on his right hand, the other on 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 fulfill'd, ſaid, I thirſt: and they took a ſponge, and filled it with vineger, and put it on a reed, and gave it him to drink.* Read further yet, *They part my garments among them, and caſt lots upon my veſture*; and to fulfill the prediction, the ſouldiers ſhall make good the diſtinction, *who took his garments, and made four parts, to*

Zach. 11.12. *Mat.* 26.15. *Iſ.* 53.5. *Zach.* 12.10. *Pſal.* 22.16. *Joh.* 20.25. *Pſal.* 22.7,8. *Mat.* 27. 39, 43. *Pſal.* 22.1. *Mat.* 27.46. *Iſ.* 53.12. *Mar.* 15.27. *Pſal.* 69.21. *Joh.* 19.28. *Mat.* 27.48. *Pſal.* 22.18. *Joh.* 19.23,24.

every

every ſouldier a part, and alſo his coat: now the coat was without ſeam woven from the top throughout; they ſaid therefore among themſelves, Let not us rent it, but caſt lots for it whoſe it ſhall be. Laſtly, let the Prophets teach us,
Iſ.53.7,8. 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 lambe he ſuffered, and the very Jewes 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 ſuffered.

Neither onely in his paſſion, but after his death all things were fulfill'd in *Jeſus* which were propheſied con-
Iſ. 53.9. cerning 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 tombe of *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* an honourable counſel-
Hoſ.6.2. lour. *After two dayes will he revive us, in the third day he will raiſe us up*, ſaith *Hoſeah* of the people of *Iſrael:*
* *Hoſ.11.1.* in whoſe language they were the * type of *Chriſt* and the
Pſ.110.1. third day *Jeſus* roſe from the dead. *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord*, ſaith *David, ſit thou at my right hand.* Now
Act.2.34. *David is not aſcended into the heavens*, and conſequently cannot be ſet at the right hand of God; but *Jeſus* is already
Act.2.36. 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 vertue of that office to do; he which ſuffered all thoſe paines 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 paſſe; he, I ſay, muſt in-

infallibly be the true *Messias*. But *Jesus* alone taught, did, suffer'd and obtain'd all these things, as we have shewed. Therefore we may again infallibly conclude that our *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

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 deliver'd; if it were absolutely impossible that the doctrine reveal'd 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 prov'd 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 universall 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 then *Solomon*, of whom these words were spoken, *All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him. It shall come to passe in the last dayes*, saith *Isaiah*, *that the mountain of the Lords 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 generall, 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 *Judea* were setled, being the promise of God was to bring all nations in at the coming

Psal. 2. 8.
Psal. 72. 11.
Isa. 2. 2.
Mal. 1. 11.

ming of the *Messias*, being this was it which the Jews so much oppos'd, as loath to part from their ancient & peculiar privilege; he which actually wrought this work, must certainly be the *Messias*: & 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 to *go teach all nations*, and were *endued with power from on high*, by the plentifull 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 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 S. *James* the Bishop of *Jerusalem* spake thus unto S. *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 Jewes strangers, scattered through *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia*, and the rest of the *Roman* Provinces, will appear out of the Epistles of S. *Peter*, S. *James*, and S. *John*. And yet all these are nothing to the fulnesse of the Gentiles which came after. First, those which were before Gentile-worshippers, acknowledging the same God with the Jewes, but not receiving the Law; who had before abandoned their old Idolatry, and already embraced the true doctrine of one God, and did confesse the Deity which the Jewes did worship to be that onely true God; but yet refused to be circumcised, and so to oblige themselves to the keeping of the whole law. Now the Apostles preach

Mat. 15. 24.

Mat. 28. 19.
Luc. 24. 49.

Act. 2. 41.

Act. 4. 4.

Act. 5. 14.

Act. 9. 31.

Act. 21. 20. πόσαι μυριάδες.

preaching the ſame God with *Moſes*, whom they all acknowledged, and teaching that circumciſion and the reſt of the legall 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 Jewes, 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 receiv'd the Goſpel. How much did *Jeſus* work by one S. *Paul* to *the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed*? how did he paſſe *from Jeruſalem round* about through *Phœnice*, *Syria*, and *Arabia*, through *Aſia*, *Achaia*, and *Macedonia*, even *to Illyricum*, fully *preaching the Goſpel of Chriſt*? How farre did others paſſe beſide S. *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 the Apoſtles dayes; and in not many yeares after, notwithſtanding millions were cut off in their bloudy perſecutions, yet did their * numbers equallize halfe the *Roman* Empire; And little above two ages after the death of the laſt Apoſtle, the Emperours of the world gave in their names to Chriſt, and ſubmitted their ſceptres

Joh. 12. 20. *Act.* 2. 5.

Ro. 15. 18, 19.

Coloſ. 1. 23.

* Tanta hominum multitudo, pars pene major civitatis cujusque, in ſilentio & modeſtia agimus. *Tertul.* ad *Scapul.* c. 3. Si hoſtes exertos, non tantum vindices occultos agere vellemus, deeſſet nobis vis numerorum & copiarum? Plures nimirum *Mauri* & *Marcomanni*, ipſique *Parthi*, vel quantæcunque unius tamen loci & ſuorum finium gentes, quam totius orbis? Heſterni ſumus & veſtra omnia implevimus, urbes, inſulas, caſtella, municipia, conciliabula, caſtra ipſa, tribus, decurias, palatium, ſenatum, forum. *Id. Apolog.* cap. 36. Potuimus & inermes, nec

nec rebelles, ſed tantummodo diſcordes, ſolius divortii invidia adverſus vos dimicaſſe. Si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti ſinum abrupiſſemus à vobis, ſuffudiſſet utique dominationem veſtram tot qualiumcunque amiſſio civium, imo etiam & ipſa deſtitutione puniſſet; proculdubio expaviſſetis ad ſolitudinem veſtram, ad ſilentium rerum, & ſtuporem quendam quaſi mortuæ urbis, quæſiſſetis quibus in ea imperaſſetis. *Id. Ibid.* And Irenæus, who wrote before Tertullian, and is mention'd by him, ſpeaks of the Chriſtians in his time living in the Court of Rome: Quid autem & hi qui in regali aula ſunt fideles, nonne ex eis quæ *Cæſaris* ſunt habent ut enſilia, & his qui non habent unuſquiſque ſecundum ſuam virtutem præſtat?

Iſ. 49.23. to his laws, that *Kings* might become *the nurſing fathers, and Queens the nurſing mothers* of the Church.

From hence it came to paſſe, 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 onely 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 morall part thereof, which as an univerſall 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 receiv'd, 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 expreſly; *It ſhall*

Zach. 13.2. *come to paſſe in that day, that I will cut off the names of the Idols out of the land, and they ſhall no more be remembred, alſo I will cauſe the prophets and the unclean ſpirit to paſſe out of the land.*

Now being this generall reception of the Goſpel was ſo anciently, ſo frequently foretold, being the ſame was ſo clearly and univerſally perform'd, even this might ſeem ſufficient to perſwade that *Jeſus* is *Chriſt*. But leſt any ſhould not yet be fully ſatisfied, we ſhall further ſhew, that it is impoſſible *Jeſus* ſhould have been ſo received for the true *Meſsias*, had he not been ſo; or that his doctrine

ctrine which teacheth him to be the *Christ*, ſhould be admitted by all nations for divine, had it not been ſuch. 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 ſucceſſe, 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 ſucceſſe: for firſt, it abſolutely condemned all other Religions, ſetled and corroborated by a conſtant ſucceſſion of many ages, under which many nations and kingdomes, and eſpecially at that time the *Roman*, had ſignally flouriſhed. Secondly, it contained Precepts farre more ungratefull and troubleſome to fleſh and bloud, and contrariant to the generall inclination of mankind; as the abnegation of our ſelves, the mortifying of the fleſh, the love of our enemies, and the bearing of the croſſe. Thirdly, it inforced 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 ſeem'd as abſolutely impoſſible, the Reſurrection. Fourthly, it delivered certain predictions which were to be fulfill'd in the perſons of ſuch as ſhould embrace it, which ſeem ſufficient to have kept moſt part of the world from liſtning to it, as dangers, loſſes, afflictions, tribulations, and in ſumme, *All that would live godly in Christ Jeſus, ſhould ſuffer perſecution.* 2 *Tim.* 3. 12.

If we look upon the Teachers of this Doctrine, there appeared nothing in them which could promiſe any ſuch ſucceſſe. The firſt Revealer and Promulger bred in the houſe of a Carpenter, brought up at the feet of no Profeſſour,

feſſour, 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 authour of it; *Chriſt crucified, unto the Jewes a ſtumbling-block, and unto the Greeks fooliſhneſſe?* What in thoſe which followed him, ſent by him, and thence call'd 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 kingdomes and empires ſhould at laſt come in to them, except their doctrine were indeed divine, except that *Jeſus* whom they teſtified to be the *Chriſt*, were truly ſo?

1 Cor. 1. 23.

If we conſider the manner in which they delivered this Doctrine to the world, it will adde no advantage to their perſons, or advance the probability of ſucceſſe. For in their delivery they uſed no ſuch rhetoricall 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 perſwade and convince men; they made uſe of no force or violence to compell, no corporall 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 mans wiſdome, but in the demonſtration of the Spirit.* 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, onely that they might embrace ſuch precepts as were moſt unacceptable to their naturall inclinations, and that upon ſuch promiſes as ſeem'd not probable to their reaſon, nor could have any influence on their ſenſe,

1 Cor. 2. 4.

and

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 perſwaſion of them who were both illiterate and obſcure: That they ſhould be enticed with words without eloquence, convinced without the leaſt ſubtility, conſtrained without any force. I ſay, it is no way imaginable, how this ſhould come to paſſe, had not the Doctrine of the Goſpel which did thus prevail, been certainly divine; had not the light of the word, which thus diſpell'd the clouds of all former Religions, come from heaven; had not that *Jeſus, the authour and finiſher of our faith*, been the true *Meſſias*.

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, ſuffer'd 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 ſhew'd that all theſe things are exactly fulfill'd in *Jeſus*, and in him alone. We muſt therefore acknowledge and profeſſe that this *Jeſus* is the promiſed *Meſſias*, that is, the *Chriſt*.

Having thus manifeſted the truth of this propoſition, *Jeſus is the Chriſt*, and ſhewed the interpretation of the word *Chriſt* to be Anointed; we find it yet * neceſſary for the explication of this Article, to enquire what was the end, or immediate effect of his Unction, and how or in what manner he was anointed to that end.

* In Chriſti nomine ſubauditur qui unxit, & ipſe qui unctus eſt, & ipſa unctio in qua unctus eſt.

For the firſt, as the *Meſſias* was foretold, ſo was he *Iren.* l. 3. c. 20.

he typified; nor were the actions preſcribed under the Law leſſe predictive then the words of the Prophets. Nay * whoſoever were then anointed, were therefore ſo, becauſe he was to be anointed. Now it is evident that among the Jewes they were wont to † anoint thoſe which were appointed as Kings over them; So a *Samuel ſaid unto Saul, the Lord ſent me to anoint thee to be King over his people, over Iſrael.* When *Saul* was rejected, and *David* produced before *Samuel*, the Lord ſaid, *Ariſe, anoint him, for this is he.* And ſome ‖ may have contented themſelves with this, that the *Meſſias* was to be a King. But not onely the Kings, but beſide, and long before them, the High Prieſts were alſo anointed, inſomuch as the * anointed, 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 *Meſſias* was to be a King and a Prieſt. But being not onely the High Prieſts and Kings were actually anointed, though they principally and moſt frequently, for *the Lord ſaid unto Elias,* b *Go anoint Hazael to be King over Syria, and Jehu the ſon of Nimſhi*

* οἱ βασιλεῖς πάντες καὶ οἱ χρισθέντες ἀπὸ τούτου μετέπειτα καὶ βασιλεῖς καλούμενοι καὶ χριστοί. Juſt. Mart. Dial.

† *Chriſtus* à chriſmate dicitur: quia ſicut antiqui reges à ſacerdotibus oleo ſacro profundebantur, ſic *Chriſtus* Sp. S. infuſione repletus eſt. *Author* Serm. 131. de *Temp.*

a 1 *Sam.* 15. 1.

b 1 *Kin.* 19. 15, 16.

‖ Sicut nunc *Romanis* indumentum purpuræ inſigne eſt regiæ dignitatis aſſumptæ: ſic illis unctio ſacri unguenti nomen ac poteſtatem regiam conferebat. *Lact.* l. 4. c. 7.

* *For though at the firſt the ſons of* Aaron *were anointed as well as* Aaron, *as appears* Ex. 40. 15. Thou ſhalt anoint them as thou didſt anoint their father, that they may adminiſter to me in the Prieſts office: *Yet they were not after anointed, but the ſucceſſours of* Aaron *onely.* 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, onely the ſucceſſours in the High-prieſthood ſhall reiterate the unction: from whence the* Prieſt that is anointed *afterward ſignified the High Prieſt, as* Lev. 4. 3. הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ. LXX ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ χρισθεὶς, *by way of explication; whereas verſe the* 5. *and the* 16. *of the ſame chapter, and* 6. 22. *they render it by a bare tranſlation,* ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός.

† *As* Lact. Erat Judæis ante præceptum ut ſacrum conficerent unguentum, quo perungi poſſent ii qui vocabantur ad ſacerdotium vel ad regnum. l. 4. c. 7. & S. *Auguſt.* Prioribus Veteris Teſtamenti temporibus ad duas ſolas perſonas pertinuit unctio. *Enar.* 2. *Pſal.* 21. Chriſtus vel Pontificale vel Regium nomen eſt. Nam prius & Pontifices unguento chriſmatis conſecrabantur & Reges. *Ruff.* in *Symb.*

ſhalt

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 order'd and diſpos'd, both in the Conſtitution and Adminiſtration of it, for, and with reſpect unto, the *Meſſias*. The Conſtitution of that people was made by a ſejunction 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 *royall prieſthood*: and that Adminiſtration of the people did conſiſt in three functions, propheticall, regall, ſacerdotall; 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 eternall prieſthood *after the order of Melchizedeck*, and of the throne of *David*, or an everlaſting kingdome. 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 all one, and conſequently that the *Chriſt* was to be Prophet, Prieſt, and King. Again, the Redemption or Salvation which the *Meſſias* was to bring, conſiſteth in the freeing of a ſinner

* τοῦτο τὸ χρίσμα μὴ μόνον Ἀρχιερεῦσι παραδόθηναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς μετὰ τοῦτα Προφήταις καὶ Βασιλεῦσιν, οἷς καὶ αὐτοῖς τούτῳ χρίεσθαι μόνοις ἐξὸν ἦν τοῦ μύρου. Euſ. Demonſt. Evan. *l.* 4. 15. & Hiſt. *l.* 1. *c.* 4. *Wherefore S.* Aug. *recollecting a place in his* 83 *Queſtions, in which he had taught, the two fiſhes in the Goſpel, duas illas perſonas ſignificare quibus populus ille regebatur, ut per eas conſiliorum moderamen acciperet, regiam ſcilicet & ſacerdotalem, ad quas etiam ſacro-*

ſancta illa unctio pertinebat, *makes this particular Retractation*; *Dicendum potius fuit, maxime pertinebat, quoniam unctos aliquando legimus & Prophetas. Retract. l.* 1. *c.* 26.

from the ſtate of ſin and eternall death into a ſtate of righteouſneſſe and eternall life. Now a freedome from ſin in reſpect of the guilt, could not be wrought without a ſacrifice propitiatory, and therefore there was a neceſſity of a Prieſt; a freedome 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 ungodlineſſe, therefore there was alſo need of a Prophet; a tranſlation from the ſtate of death into eternall 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.

That *Jeſus* was anointed to the Propheticall Office, though we need no more to prove it then the prediction
Iſ. 61. 1. of *Iſaiah*, *The ſpirit of the Lord is upon me, becauſe he hath anointed me to preach the Goſpel to the poor*; the ex-
Luk. 4. 21, 22. plication of our Saviour, *This day is this Scripture fulfill'd in your eares*; and the confeſſion of the Synagogue at *Nazareth*, who *all bare him witneſſe, and wondred at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth*: yet whether we conſider his Preparation, his Miſſion, or his Adminiſtration, all of them ſpeak him fully to have performed it. For to *Jeremiah* indeed God ſaid, *Before*
Jer. 1. 5. *thou cameſt forth out of the wombe, I ſanctified thee, I ordained thee a* Prophet *unto the Nations*; & of *John* the Ba-
Luk. 1. 15. ptiſt, *He ſhall be filled with the Holy Ghoſt even from his mothers wombe*. And if theſe became ſingular Prophets by their preparative ſanctification, how much more eminent muſt his propheticall preparation be, to whoſe mother it is
Luk. 1. 35. ſaid, *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee*? If the Levites muſt be

thirty

thirty years old, every one that came to do the ſervice of the miniſtry; Jeſus will not enter upon the publick adminiſtration of this office, *till he begin to be about thirty yeares 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. Num. 4. 47. Luk. 3. 23.

As for his Miſſion, never any was confirmed with ſuch letters of credence, ſuch irrefragable teſtimonials, as the formall teſtimony of *John* the Baptiſt, and the more virtuall teſtimony of his Miracles. *Behold, I will ſend you Eliſah the Prophet before the coming of the great and dreadfull 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 Jewes took notice of this teſtimony, who *ſaid unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bareſt witneſſe, 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 witneſſe 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 witneſſe of *John* were thus cogent, yet the teſtimony of Miracles was farre more irrefragable. *I have greater witneſſe then that of John,* ſaith our Saviour; *for the works which my Father hath given me to finiſh, the ſame works that I do, bear witneſſe of me, that the Father hath ſent me.* Notwithſtanding the precedent record of *John, Jeſus* requireth not an abſolute aſſent 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,*

Mal. 4. 5. Luk. 1. 17. Joh. 1. 34. Joh. 3. 26. Joh. 5. 33. Joh. 10. 41. Joh. 5. 36. Jo. 10. 37, 38.

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 then they all.

Now the Propheticall 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 this Office muſt
Luk.1.18. be attributed unto *Jeſus*. *For no man hath ſeen God at any time, the onely begotten Son, which is in the boſome of*
Joh.17.8,14. *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
1 Pet.2.22. a moſt innocent and holy life to perſwade it, for *he did no ſin, neither was guile found in his mouth*; who wrought moſt powerfull and divine works to confirm it, and was
Joh.3.2. thereby *known* to be *a teacher from God*; who died a moſt painfull and ſhamefull death to ratifie it, witneſſing
1 Tim.6.13. a good profeſſion before *Pontius Pilate*; which in it ſelf unto that purpoſe efficacious, was made more evidently operative in the raiſing of himſelf from death. The propagation and perpetuall ſucceſſion of this Doctrine muſt likewiſe be attributed unto *Jeſus*, as to no temporary or accidentall Prophet, but as to him who inſtituted and inſtructed all who have any relation to that function. For
1 Pet.1.11. the *Spirit of Chriſt was in the* Prophets. and *when he aſ-*
Eph.4.8,11. *cended 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.*

Now as *Jeſus* was anointed with the Unction of *Elizeus* to the Propheticall, ſo was he alſo with the Unction

of

of *Aaron* to the Sacerdotall 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*; 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.* But though he were of another order, yet whatſoever *Aaron* did as a Prieſt was wholly Typicall, 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 conferr'd upon his family, before his conſecration. We read of *the Prieſts which came near the Lord*; of *young men of the children of Iſrael, which offered burnt-offerings and ſacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord*; which without queſtion were no other then the * firſt-born to whom the Prieſthood did belong. *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. a *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.* Not that he had any thing 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 wouldſt not, but a body haſt thou prepared me*; and *by the offering of this body of Jeſus Chriſt are we ſanctified.* For he who is our Prieſt hath † *given himſelf an offering and a ſacrifice to God for a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour.*

Hebr. 7. 14.

Ex. 19. 22. *Ex.* 24. 5.

* *For the Hebrew* נערי *ſignifying* juvenes, *by the* Targum *is rendred* בוכרי, *that is*, primogeniti.

a *Heb.* 8. 3.

Heb. 10. 5.

Heb. 10. 10.

Eph. 5. 2.

† Unus ipſe erat qui offerebat, & quod offerebat. S. *Aug.* Unum cum illo manebat cui offerebat, unum in ſe fecit pro quibus offerebat, unus ipſe erat qui offerebat, & quod offerebat. *Id. de Trinit.*

Now when *Jeſus* had thus given himſelf a propitiatory ſacrifice for ſin, he aſcended up on high, and entred

into the Holy of holies not made with hands, and there appeared before God as an atonement for our ſin. Nor is he prevalent onely in his own oblation once offer'd, but in his conſtant interceſſion. *Who is he that condemneth?* Rom. 8. 34. 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 perſwaſion, that *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.* 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. [a] *Aaron was ſeparated that he ſhould ſanctifie the moſt holy things, he and his ſons for ever, to burn incenſe before the Lord, to miniſter unto him, and to bleſſe in his name for ever.* We read of no other ſacerdotall Act perform'd by *Melchizedek* the Prieſt of the moſt High God, but onely that of bleſſing, and that in reſpect both of God and man: Firſt, [b] *he bleſſed* man, *and ſaid, Bleſſed be Abram of the moſt High God, poſſeſſour 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 bleſſe the people with the ſolemn form of Benediction, but at the evening ſacrifice they bleſſed them not; to ſhew that in the evening of the world, the laſt dayes, which are the dayes 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, [c] *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

Heb. 7. 25. Παράκλησιν ἔχομεν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς ὡς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πεκαλινδέμενον τῷ παρόδῳ καὶ προσπίπτουσα δαλικῶς· ἄπαγε πλὴν δάλην ὀίτως ὑπόνοιαν καὶ ἀναξίαν τῷ πνεύματι. ὅτε γὰρ τῷ παρόδῳ τοῦτο ἐπιζητεῖν ὅτε τῷ ὑπὲ πάσχειν, ἢ ὡς πρεῖ θεῷ διανοεῖσθαι δίκαιον. ἀλλ' οἷς πίπτουσιν ὡς ἀνθρωποις πρέπει καρτερεῖν ὡς λόγος, καὶ παραινίτης τοῦτο γοεῖταί μοι ἡ παράκλησις. S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 36.

a 1 Chr. 23. 13.

b Gen. 14. 19, 20.

c Luk. 1. 8, 21, 22.

he was dumbe; ſhewing the power of benediction was now paſſing to another and farre 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 bleſſe 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 continuall interceſſion for us, who was raiſed from the dead that he might bleſſe us with an everlaſting benediction, is a moſt true and moſt perfect Prieſt. Luk. 24. 50.

The third Office belonging to the *Meſſias* was the Regall, as appeareth by the moſt ancient * tradition of the Jewes, and by the expreſſe predictions of the Prophets. [a] *Yet have I ſet my King*, ſaith the Pſalmiſt, *upon my holy hill of Sion.* [b] *Unto us a childe is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government ſhall be upon his ſhoulder*, ſaith the Prophet *Iſaiah*, who calleth him *the Prince of peace*, ſhewing the perpetuity of his power, and particularity of his ſeat. [c] *Of the encreaſe of his government and peace there ſhall be no end upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdome, to order it, and to eſtabliſh it with judgement 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 kingdome there ſhall be no end.* He acknowledgeth himſelf this Office, though by a ſtrange and unlikely repreſentation of it, the riding on an aſſe: but by that it was fulfill'd which was ſpoken by the Prophet; *Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee meek, and ſitting on an aſſe.* He made as ſtrange a confeſſion of it unto *Pilate*;

* *For the Chaldee Paraphraſe in the moſt places where it mentioneth the* Meſſiah, *doth it with the addition of* King, מלכא משיחא.

a Pſ. 2. 6.

b Iſ. 9. 6, 7.

c Luk. 1. 32, 33.

Mat. 21. 5.

late; for when he ſaid unto him, *Art thou a king then?*
Joh. 18. 37. *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 witneſſe unto the truth.* The 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 publick execution was deferred till then, *when God raiſed him from*
Eph. 1. 20, 21. *the dead, and ſet him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, farre above all principality, and power, and*
Revel. 19. 13, 16. *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.* This Regall 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 inabled to walk in it. Secondly, he protecteth the ſame, by helping them to ſubdue their luſts, which reign in their mortall 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 ruleth and protecteth here, he rewardeth hereafter
Rev. 1. 6. in a moſt royall manner, making *them Kings and Prieſts unto God and his father.* On the contrary, he ſheweth his Regall Dominion in the deſtruction of his enemies, whether they were temporall or ſpirituall enemies. Temporall, as the *Jewes* and *Romans*, who joyned together in his crucifixion. While he was on earth he told his
Mat. 16. 28. Diſciples, *There be ſome ſtanding here which ſhall not taſte of death, till they ſee the Son of man coming in his Kingdome.* and in that kingdome he was then ſeen to come, when he brought utter deſtruction on the *Jewes* by the *Roman* armies, not long after to be deſtroyed themſelves.

ſelves. But beſide theſe viſible enemies, there are other ſpirituall, thoſe which hinder the bringing in of his own people into his fathers Kingdome, 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.* Thus Sin, Satan, and Death, being the enemies to his Kingdome, 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.* Thus is our *Jeſus* become the *Prince of the Kings of the earth*; thus is the *Lambe* acknowledged to be *Lord of lords, and King of kings.*

Luk. 19. 27.

1 Cor. 15. 25, 26.

Rev. 1. 5. 17. 14.

Wherefore ſeeing we have already ſhewed that the Prophetical, Sacerdotall, and Regall Offices were to belong unto the promiſed *Meſſias*, as the proper end, and immediate effect of his Unction; 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 onely to ſhew the manner of this Unction, 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 oyl to be made, and appropriated it to that uſe: and the pouring that oyl upon the body of any perſon, was his anointing to that office for which he was deſigned. But being that oyl ſo appropriated to this uſe was loſt many hundred yeares before our Saviours birth, being the cuſtome of anointing in this manner had a long time ceaſed, being howſoever we never read that *Jeſus* was at all anointed with oyl; it remaineth ſtill worthy our enquiry, how he was anointed, ſo as to anſwer to the former unctions; and

what it was which answered to that oyl, which then was lost, and was at the first but as a type of this which now we search for.

† בימות המשיח עתיד הקדוש ברוך הוא להחזיר לעמו אותו שמן המשחה שעשה משה שנגנז עם הארון ובו ימשחו המלכים והכהנים הגדולים בימי ההם.

In the dayes of the Messias God will restore unto his people the oyl of unction which Moses made, which was hidden with the ark; and the Kings and High priests shall be anointed with it in those dayes.

The † *Jewes* tell us, that the anointing oyl was hid in the dayes of *Josiah*, and that it shall be found and produced again when the *Messias* comes, that he may be anointed with it, and the Kings and High Priests of his dayes. But though the losse of that oyl 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 Typicall and Correspondent Oyl, as between the representing and represented *Christ*. The Prophet *David* calleth it not by the vulgar name of oyl of unction, but the [a] *oyl of gladnesse*. For though that place may in the first sense be understood of *Solomon*, whom when *Zadoc* the Priest anointed, [b] *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 rejoyced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them*; though from thence it might be said of him, *thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladnesse above thy fellowes:* yet being those words are spoken unto God, as well as of God, (* *therefore God, thy God,*) the oyl with which that God is

Abarbanel. *Comment. ad* 30. Exodi. *Now the losse of that oyl, which they call the hiding of it, may well be thought to foretell the period of the Mosaicall Administration, being they confesse that after that they never had any Priests anointed, because they had no power to make the same oyl. So plainly confesseth the same* Abarbanel. לא היה כהן משוח בבית שני לפי שכבר חיה נגנז שמן המשחה שנגנז יאשיהו עם שאר הדברים הקדושים ולא היה להם רשות לעשותו.

a *Psal.* 45. 5. b 1 *Kin.* 1. 39. 40.

* Duas personas, ejus qui unctus est Dei, & qui unxit, intellige. Unde & *Aquila* elohim אלוהים verbum Hebraicum non nominativo casu, sed vocativo interpretatur, dicens θεὲ, & nos propter intelligentiam Dee posuimus, quod Latina lingua non accipit, ne quis perverse putet Deum dilecti & amantissimi & regis bis Patrem nominari. S. *Hieron.* Epist. 104. Quod sequitur, *Unxit te Deus Deus tuus*, primum nomen *Dei* vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo:

anoint-

quod ſatis miror, cur *Aquila* non, ut cœperat in primo verſiculo, vocativo caſu interpretatus ſit, ſed nominativo, bis nominans Deum qui ſupradictum unxerit Deum. *Id. ib.*

anointed, muſt in the ultimate and higheſt ſenſe ſignifie a farre greater *gladneſſe* then that at *Solomons* coronation was, even the fountain of all joy and felicity in the Church of God.

The * Ancients tell us that this oyl is the Divinity it ſelf, and in the language of the Scriptures it is the Holy Ghoſt. S. *Peter* 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 oyl, yet there is ſome doubt, when *Jeſus* was anointed with it. For we know the Angel ſaid unto the bleſſed Virgin,[a] *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 S. *Peter* ſpake, he *was anointed then with the Holy Ghoſt and with power.* Again, being we read that after he was thirty yeares of age, the Spirit like a Dove deſcended and lighted upon him, and he deſcending

* So Gregory Naz. expounds the place. ὃν ἔχρισεν ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους λοιπὸν, χρίσας τὸν ἀνθρωπότητα τῇ θεότητι, ὥστε ποιῆσαι τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν. And again, Χριστὸς δὲ διὰ τὴν θεότητα. (not that his Divinity was anointed, or Chriſt anointed in reſpect of his Divinity, but that he was anointed in his humanity by his Divinity.) Χρίεται δὲ ἄυτη τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ὡς ὑπηρεσίᾳ, κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους χριστοὺς, ἀγγέλους, παρουσίᾳ δὲ ὅλης τῆς θεότητος, ὃς ἦρεν ἄνθρωπον ἀκίνησε τὸ χρίον, καὶ ποιῆσαι θεὸν τὸ χριόμενον. Orat. 2. de Filio. a Luk. 1. 35. † Χριστὸς ἐχρίσθη ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς τῷ χρίσματι τῆς σαρκώσεως. Germanus Conſtant. Καὶ χρίσας δὲ οὐχ ἑτέρως φαμὲν τὸν υἱὸν, ἢ, ὅτι κατὰ σάρκα γενόμενον, ἐλογότι καθ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀνθρωπήσαντα. *Titus Boſtrenſ.* Deus eſt qui ungit, & Deus qui ſecundum carnem ungitur Dei filius. Denique quos habet unctionis ſuæ *Chriſtus* niſi in carne participes? Vides igitur quia Deus à Deo unctus, ſed in aſſumptione naturæ unctus humanæ Dei filius deſignatur. *S. Ambroſ.* de Fide *l.* 1. *c.* 2. Hæc omnia carni conveniunt, cum piiſſimum & glorioſiſſimum verbum unitum eſt pro ſalute cunctorum. *Caſſiodorus* in *Pſal.* 44.

ding in the power of the Spirit into *Galilee*, ſaid unto them of *Nazareth*, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your eares*, 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 Baptiſme. Nor need we to contend which of theſe two was the true time of our Saviours 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 [a] *Samuel took the horn of oyl, 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, [b] *I have found David my ſervant, with my holy oyl have I anointed him.* And yet he was again anointed at *Hebron*, firſt, [c] *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 *Iſrael*, which yet he was not to exerciſe till the death of *Saul*, and acceptation of the Tribes; and therefore when the time was come that he ſhould actually enter upon his Regall 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 actuall performance of all thoſe functions which belonged to him, then doth the ſame Spirit which had ſanctified him at his conception,

† S. Hierome *mentioning that place of the Pſalm*, Quando conſortes nominantur, naturam carnis intelligit, quia Deus conſortes ſubſtantiæ ſuæ non habet. Et quia erat unctio ſpiritualis & nequaquam humani corporis (ut fuit in ſacerdotibus Judæorum) idcirco præ conſortibus, id eſt cæteris ſanctis, unctus eſſe memoratur. Cujus unctio illo expleta eſt tempore, quando baptizatus eſt in *Jordane*, & Spiritus Sanctus in ſpecie columbæ deſcendit ſuper eum, & manſit in illo. *Comment. in Eſaiam, c. 61.* In illa columba quæ ſuper ipſum poſt baptiſma deſcendit, cum ſacramento baptiſmatis, & veri ſacerdotii jura ſuſcepit, fuſo videlicet ſuper eum oleo exultationis, de quo Pſalmiſta canit; Unxit te, inquit, Deus, Deus tuus. *Petrus Damianus*, Opuſcul. 6. c. 4. a 1 *Sam.* 16. 13. b *Pſal.* 89. 20. c 2 *Sam.* 2, 4. 5, 1, 3.

viſibly

visibly descend upon him at his inauguration. And that most properly upon his Baptisme, because according to the customes of those ancient nations, washing was wont to * precede their unctions: wherefore a *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*: 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.*

a *Mat.* 3. 16.

* *As appears by those entertainments so frequently mentioned by* Homer *in his* Odysses; *as when* Telemachus *and* Pisistratus *are invited into the Court of* Menelaus.

Ἐς ῥ' ἀναμίνθυς βάντας εὐξέσας λόεσθον.
Τὰς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ. Od. Δ.

Thus Ulysses *is entertained*, Od. Θ. *thus* Pyræus *and* Telemachus, Od. P. *and* Venus *returning to* Paphus, *is so ordered by the* Charites.

Ἔνθα δέ μιν χάριτες λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ
Ἀμβρόσιῳ, οἷα θεοὺς ἐπινήνοθεν αἰὲν ἐόντας. Od. Θ.

† *The common customs of the Jewes, as appears by the words of* Naomi *to* Ruth, Wash thy self therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee. *Ruth* 3. 3. *They say in the* Gemara, *that this is a Maxime of the Doctours.* אמרו בגמרא תנו רבנן אין מושחין את המלכים אלא מעין Abarbanel *in* 30. Exod.

Now as we have shewed that *Jesus* was anointed with the Holy Ghost, lest any should deny any such descension to be a proper or sufficient unction, we shall further make it appear, that the Effusion, or Action of the Spirit, eminently containeth whatsoever the *Jewes* have imagined to be performed or signified by those legall anointings. Two very good reasons they render, why God did command the use of such anointing oyl, as in respect of the action. First, that it might signifie 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

Abarbanel *Ibid.*

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 ſpirituall Unction was ſo farre from giving leſſe then an aptitude to receive the divine influx, that it was that divine influx nay the Divinity it ſelf, the Godhead dwelling in him bodily. In reſpect of the matter, they give two cauſes why it was oyl, and not any other liquour. 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 *fatneſſe wherewith they honour God and man.* Therefore it was fit that thoſe perſons which were called to a greater dignity then the reſt of the *Jewes*, ſhould be conſecrated by oyl, as the beſt ſign of election to honour. And can there be a greater honour then to be the Son of God, the *beloved Son*, as *Jeſus* was proclaimed at this Unction, by which he was conſecrated to ſuch an Office as will obtain him a name farre above all names? Secondly, they tell us that oyl continueth uncorrupted longer then any other liquour. And indeed it hath been obſerved to preſerve not onely it ſelf, 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 oyl, the moſt proper embleme of Eternity. But even by this reaſon of their own, their Unction is ceaſed, being the ſucceſſion of their Kings and Prieſts is long ſince cut off, and their eternall and eternizing oyl loſt long before. And onely that one *Jeſus* who was a-

Mat. 3. 17.

Judg. 9. 9.

† Unguenta optime ſervantur in alabaſtris, odores in oleo. Plin. Hiſt. l. 13. c. 2. Exiſtimatur & ebori vindicando à carie utile eſſe. Certe ſimulacrum Saturni Romæ intus oleo repletum eſt. Id. l. 15. c. 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. Οὗτος γὰρ μετὰ τὸ κατασκευάσαι Πισαῖον εἴδωλον (ἐξ ἐλέφαντος δὲ τοῦτο ἦν) ἔλαιον ἐχχεῖσθαι προσέταξεν ἀμφὶ τοὺς πόδας, ἵνμπροσθεν τῷ ἀχλαμάδος, ἀθάνατον εἰς δυνάμιν φυλάσσων αὐτό. Proclus apud Epiphan. Hær. 64. §. 18.

nointed

nointed with the moſt ſpirituall oyl, *continueth for ever, and therefore hath an unchangeable Prieſthood, as being made not after the law of a carnall commandement, but after the power of an endleſſe life.* Heb.7.16,24. Beſide they obſerve, that ſimple oyl without any mixture was ſufficient for the Candleſtick, but that which was deſigned for Unction muſt be compounded with principall ſpices, which ſignifie a goood name, alwayes to be acquired by thoſe in places of greateſt dignity, by the moſt laudable and honourable actions. And certainly never was ſuch an admixtion of ſpices, as in the Unction of our Saviour, by which he was endued with all variety of the graces of God, by which he was inabled to *offer himſelf a ſacrifice for a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour.* For as *he was full of grace and truth*; ſo *of his fulneſſe have we all received, grace for grace*: and as we *have received anointing of him*; ſo we *are unto God a ſweet ſavour of Chriſt.* Again, it was ſufficient to anoint the veſſels of the Sanctuary in any part, but it was particularly commanded that the oyl ſhould be powred upon the head of the Kings and Prieſts, as the ſeat of all the animal faculties, the fountain of all dignitie, and * originall of all the members of the body. This was more eminently fulfill'd in *Jeſus*, who by his Unction, or as *Chriſt*, became the *head of the Church*; nay the a *head of all principality and power, from which all the body by joynts and bands having nouriſhment miniſtred, and knit together, increaſeth with the encreaſe of God.* 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 Affuſion, (as it is written, b *He poured of the anointing oyl upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to ſanctifie him*;) the firſt to ſignifie their ſeparation, the ſecond to aſſure them of the falling of the Spirit upon them. Now what more clear then that our *Chriſt* was anointed by Affuſion, whether we

1 Joh.1.16.
1 Joh.2.27.
2 Cor.2.15.

* *According to the Etymology in the Hebrew language, of which* Abarbanel *here takes notice*; ולכן נקרא ראש כי הוא ראשית לכל האברי יהיות מעולה שבהם.

a Col.2.10,19.
b Lev.8.12.

we look upon his conception, *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee*; or his inauguration, *the spirit descended and lighted upon him?* And thus according unto all particulars required by the Jewes themselves to compleat their legall Unctions, we have sufficiently shewed that *Jesus* was, as most eminently, so most properly, anointed with the Spirit of God.

Wherefore being we have shewn that a *Messias* was to come into the world; being we have proved that he is already come, by the same predictions by which we believe he was to come; being we have demonstrated that *Jesus* born in the dayes of *Herod*, was, and is, that promised *Messias*; being we have further 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 Legall and Typicall Unction: I cannot see what further can be expected for explication or confirmation of this truth, that *Jesus is the Christ*.

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 conferre 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 fundamentall doctrine which the Apostles not onely testified, as they did that of the Resurrection, but argued, prov'd, and demonstrated out of the Law and the Prophets. We find S. *Paul* at *Thessalonica three Sabbath-dayes reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alledging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus whom I preach unto you, is Christ*. We find him again at *Corinth*

Act.17.2,3.

vinth preſſed in ſpirit, and teſtifying to the Jewes, that Jeſus was Chriſt. Thus *Apollos* by birth a *Jew*, but inſtructed in the Chriſtian faith by *Aquila* and *Priſcilla*, *mightily convinced the Jewes, and that publickly ſhewing by the Scriptures, that Jeſus was Chriſt.* This was the touchſtone by which all men at firſt were tried, whether they were Chriſtian or Antichriſtian. *For whoſoever believeth*, ſaith S. *John*, *that Jeſus is the Chriſt, is born of God.* What greater commendation of the aſſertion of this truth? *Who is a lyar*, 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.* What higher condemnation of the negation of it? 18, 5. 28.

Secondly, as it is neceſſary to be believed as a moſt fundamentall truth, ſo it hath as neceſſary an influence upon our converſations, becauſe except it hath ſo, it cannot clearly be maintain'd. Nothing can be more abſurd in a diſputant, then to pretend to demonſtrate a Truth as infallible, and at the ſame time to ſhew 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 farre as he is able, that the true *Chriſt* is not yet come, at leaſt that *Jeſus* is not he. We ſufficiently demonſtrate to the *Jewes* that our Saviour, who did and ſuffer'd ſo much, is the true *Meſſias*; but by our lives we recall our arguments, and ſtrengthen their wilfull oppoſition. For there was certainly a promiſe, that when Chriſt ſhould come, *the wolf ſhould dwell with the lambe, 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*; that is, there ſhould be ſo much love, unanimity, and brotherly kindneſſe in the Kingdome 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 our ſelves, we muſt con- Iſ. 11, 6.

ſeſſe there was never more bitterneſſe of ſpirit, more rancour of malice, more heat of contention, more manifeſt ſymptomes of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableneſſe, then 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 plow-ſhares, and their ſpears into pruning-hooks; nation ſhould not lift up ſword againſt nation, neither ſhould they learn warre any more.* Whereas there is no other Art ſo much ſtudied, ſo much applauded, ſo violently aſſerted, not onely as lawfull, but as neceſſary. Look upon the face of Chriſtendome divided into ſeverall Kingdomes and Principalities; what are all theſe, but ſo many publick enemies, either exercising or deſigning warre? The Church was not more famous, or did more encreaſe by the firſt bloud was ſhed in the primitive times, through the externall violence of ten perſecutions, then now 'tis infamous, and declines through conſtant violence, fraud and rapine, through publick ingagements of the greateſt Empires in armes, through civile and inteſtine warres, and leſt any way of ſhedding Chriſtian bloud ſhould be unaſſayed, even by Maſſacres. It was likewiſe prophecied of the dayes of the *Meſſias*, that all Idolatry ſhould totally ceaſe, that all falſe teachers ſhould be cut off, and unclean ſpirits reſtrained. And can we think that the *Jewes*, who really abhorre the thoughts of worſhipping an image, can ever be perſwaded there is no Idolatry committed in the Chriſtian Church? Or can we excuſe our ſelves in the leaſt degree from the plague of the locuſts of *Egypt*, the falſe teachers? Can ſo many ſchiſmes and ſects ariſe, and ſpread? can ſo many hereſies be acknowledged & 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 of Idolatry, falſe doctrine and

Iſ. 2. 4.

Zach. 13. 2.

and hereſy, let us often remember what we ever profeſſe in our Creed, that *Jeſus* is *the Chriſt*, that the Kingdome of the *Meſſias* cannot conſiſt with theſe impieties.

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.* Mat. 17. 5. He is that Wiſdome 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 doores.* Prov. 8. 34. *There is one thing needfull*, ſaith our Saviour, *and Mary choſe that good part, who ſate at Jeſus feet, and heard his word.* Luk. 10. 39, 42. Which devout poſture teacheth us as a willingneſſe to hear, ſo a readineſſe to obey: and the proper effect which the Belief of this Propheticall Office worketh in us, is our *Obedience of faith*. We muſt conſider him as our High Prieſt, that we may adde Confidence to that Obedience. For we have *boldneſſe to enter into the Holieſt by the bloud of Jeſus*; and *having an High Prieſt over the houſe of God, we may draw near with a true heart in full aſſurance of faith, and hold faſt the profeſſion of it without wavering.* Heb. 10. 19, 21, 22, 23. 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 *glorifie God in our body and in our ſpirit, which are Gods.* 1 Cor. 6. 20. Again, an apprehenſion of him as a King is neceſſary for the performance of our true and entire allegeance to him. *Send the lamb of the Ruler of the earth*, do him homage, acknowledge him your King, ſhew your ſelves faithfull and obedient ſubjects. Isa. 16. 1. We can pretend, and he hath required,

quired, no leſſe. 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.* Can we imagine he ſhould ſo ſtrictly injoyn ſubjection to *higher powers*, the higheſt of whom are here below, and that he doth not expect exact obedience to him who is exalted *farre above all principalities and powers, and is ſet down at the right hand of God*? 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 kingdome prepared for you*: which title as it ſecures our hope, in reſpect of his power; as it magnifies our reward by the excellency of our inheritance; ſo alſo it teacheth us the indiſpenſable condition of obedience.

Mat. 28. 18, 20.

Mat. 25. 34.

Fourthly, the belief of *Jeſus* the *Chriſt* is neceſſary to inſtruct us what it is to be a Chriſtian and how farre we ſtand obliged by owning that name. Thoſe who did firſt embrace the faith were ſtiled *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 *Nazarens*, and *Galileans*. But in a ſhort time they gained a name derived from their Saviour, though not from that

Act. 6. 1, 7.

* *For when our Saviour gave that command to his Apoſtles,* πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη *go make all nations diſciples: they which delivered the Goſpel were* μαθητεύοντες; *they which were taught it and received it were at that time* μαθητευθέντες, *and after by a name habitual* μαθηταί, *tranſlated by* Tertull. Diſcentes, *ordinarily* Diſcipuli. Μαθητὴς οὖν ὅτιν, ὡς μανθάνομαι παρ' αὐτῆ τῆ Κυείῳ, πᾶς ὁ τῷ Κυείῳ προσηλυτωθεὶς, ὥστε ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ, τυγχάνειν ἀκόλουθον ἀπὸ λόγων αὐτῷ, πιστεύειν τε καὶ πείθεσθαι αὐτῷ ὡς δεσπότῃ, καὶ βασιλεῖ, καὶ ἰατρῷ, καὶ διδασκάλῳ ἀληθείας, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου. *Thus then in the language of the Scriptures,* μαθητεύειν τινὰ *is to make a diſciple; as* μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοὺς, *Act.* 14. 21. μαθητεύειν τινὶ, *to be a diſciple; as* Joſeph *of* Arimathea ἐμαθητεύσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ. μαθητευθῆναι *the ſame; as* γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, *Mat.* 27. 57. *Thus* μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Κυείῳ, *is often uſed by* S. Baſil de Baptiſmate, *whoſe title is,* Ὅτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Κυείῳ, καὶ τότε καταξιωθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτί-

name

σμαλος, according to our Saviours method. Hence those which were first converted to the faith were called μαθηται, as the Disciples of Christ their Doctour & Master. † οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, as when Herod stretched forth his hand κακῶσαί τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, to mischief some of those which were of the Church. ‖ As when Saul went down to Damascus with a commission, ὅπως ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Act. 9. 2. 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 Greek any more then the way. So when S. Paul went to the Synagogue at Corinth, divers were hardened and believed not, κακολογοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους. Act. 19. 9. here we translate it, spake evil of that way; but Beza has left his Articulus pronominis vice fungitur, which he had from Erasmus, and both otherwise supplied it, male loquentes de via Dei. and the Old Translation, which in the former had hujus viæ, in this hath simply maledicentes viæ. and certainly ἡ ὁδὸς is nothing but the way. Again, at Ephesus, ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ. Act. 19. 23. de via, V. Transl. Beza again ob viam Dei. but it is nothing but the way. Thus Felix put off S. Paul, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, till he had a more exact knowledge of the way. V. Tr. de via hac. Beza, ad sectam istam. whereas then the phrase is so simply and so frequently the same, it can be nothing else but the word then in use, to signifie the religion which the Christians professed. And so some also of the Ancients seem to have spoken, as appears by the language of the Melchizedecians, Χριστὸς ἐξαλάγη ἵνα ἡμᾶς καλέσῃ ἐκ πολλῶν ὁδῶν εἰς μίαν ταύτην τὴν γνῶσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἀπέστρεψεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ εἰδώλων, καὶ κατέδησεν ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδόν.

name of his which signifieth Salvation; for from *Christ* they were called *Christians*. A title so honourable, and of such concernment, that S. *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 Bishop of that place, as Ecclesiasticall 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 Authour and Master whom they served. In which the Primitive Christi-

* S. Luke noteth the place, but neither time when, nor person by whom this name was given. Tertullian seems to make it as ancient as the reign of Tiberius, Apolog. c. 5. Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in sæculum introivit. 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 isti et disciplinæ, ut jam edidimus, à Tiberio est. c. 7. However, the name of Christian is not so ancient as Tiberius, nor, as I think, at Caius. Some ancient Au-

thour in Suidas assures us, that it was first named in the reign of Claudius, when S. Peter had ordained Euodius Bishop of Antioch. Ἰσέον δὲ ὅτι ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου βασιλέως Ῥώμης Πέτρος τῷ ἀποστόλῳ χειροτονήσας Εὐόδιον, μίαν ὁμόδοξον εἰ πάλαι λεγόμενοι Ναζωραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι, Χριστιανοί. Suid. in Ναζωραῖος & in Χριστιανοί And Johannes Antiochenus confirms not only the time, but tells us that Euodius the Bishop was the authour of the name. Καὶ ὁπὶ ἀυτῦ (Κλαυδίου) Χριστιανοὶ ἀνομάδησαν, τῦ ἀυτῦ ἐπισκόπου Εὐοδίου πρωτομιλήσαντος αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπιθέντος τὸ ὄνομα τῦτο· πρώην γὰρ Ναζωραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι ἐκαλῦντο οἱ Χριστιανοί. 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 authour and finisher of our faith. At nunc Secta ediciur in nomine utique sui autoris. Quid novi si aliqua disciplina de Magistro cognomentum sectatoribus suis inducit? Nonne Philosophi de auctoribus suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pythagorici? Etiam à locis conventiculorum & stationum suarum Stoici, Academici? Neque Medici ab *Erasistrato*, & Grammatici ab *Aristarcho*, Coci etiam ab *Apicio*? Neque tamen quenquam offendit professio nominis cum institutione transmissa ab institutore. *Tertull.* Apolog. *c.* 3.

† *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, then that he was a Christian.* Τοσαύτη περιέσχεν ἀντιπαρετάξατο αὐτοῖς ὥστε μήτε τὸ ἴδιον κατειπεῖν ὄνομα μήτε ἔθνος μήτε πόλεως ὅθεν ἦν, μήτε εἰ δοῦλος ἢ ἐλεύθερος εἴη· ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐπερωτώμενα ἀπεκρίνατο τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ φωνῇ, Χριστιανός εἰμι. τῦτο γὰρ ἀντὶ ὀνόματος, καὶ ἀντὶ πόλεως, καὶ ἀντὶ γένους, καὶ ἀντὶ παντὸς ἐπαλλήλως ὡμολόγει. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl. l.* 5. *c.* 1. *The same doth S.* Chrysostome *testifie of S.* Lucian. πόθεν εἶ παιδίσκη; Χριστιανός εἰμι· φησι. πῶς ἔχεις δεσπότην; Χριστιανός εἰμι. τίνας γεννήτορας; ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἅπαντα ἔλεγεν, ὅτι Χριστιανός εἰμι. 2 *Tim.* 2. 19.

* So Blandina in the French persecution. ἦν αὐτῆς ἀνάληψις καὶ ἀνάπαυσις καὶ ἀναλγησία τῶν συμβαινόντων, τὸ λέγειν ὅτι Χριστιανή εἰμι, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν οὐδὲν φαῦλον γίνεται. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl. l.* 5. *c.* 1.

ans so much delighted, that before the face of their enemies they would acknowledge no other name but that, though hated, reviled, tormented, martyred for it. Nor is this name of greater honour to us, then of obligation. There are two parts of the seal of the foundation of God, and one of them is this, [a] *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* It was a common answer of the ancient Martyr, * *I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done.* The very name was thought to

speak

ſpeak ſomething of * emendation; and whoſoever put it on, became the better man. Except ſuch reformation accompany our profeſſion, there is no † advantage in the appellation; 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. For as a *the precious ointment upon the head ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard and went down to the skirts of his garments*: ſo the Spirit which without meaſure was poured upon Chriſt our head, is by him diffuſed through all the members of his ‖ body. For b *God hath eſtabliſhed and anointed us in Chriſt*: c *We have an unction from the Holy one, and the anointing which we have received from him abideth in us.* Neceſſary then it cannot chuſe 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.

* Alſi quos ante hoc nomen vagos, viles, improbos noverant, ex ipſo denotant quod laudant, cæcitate odii in ſuffragium impingunt. Quæ mulier? quam laſciva! quam feſtiva! qui juvenis? quam laſcivus! quam amaſius! facti ſunt *Chriſtiani*, ita nomen emendationis imputatur. *Tertul.*

† Totum in id revolvitur, ut qui Chriſtiani nominis opus non agit, Chriſtianus non eſſe videatur. Nomen enim ſine actu atque officio ſuo nihil eſt. *Salvian.* de Provid. *l.* 4. Ἐάν τις τὸ ὄνομα λαβὼν τῦ χριστιανισμῦ ἀνυβείζῃ τὸν χειτὸν, ὑβρὶν ὄφελ & ἀυτῦ ἀπὸ τῆς σωσηρείας. *S. Baſil.* ad *Amphiloch.*

‖ Chriſtianus vero, quantum interpretatio eſt, de unctione deducitur. *Tertull.* Apolog. *c.* 3.

a *Pſal.* 133. 2. b 2 *Cor.* 1. 21. c 1 *Jo.* 2. 20, 27.

Thus having run through all the particulars at firſt deſigned for the explication of the title *Chriſt*, we may at laſt clearly expreſſe, 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.

* Inde apparet *Chriſti* corpus nos eſſe, qui omnes unguimur, & omnes in illo & *Chriſti*, & *Chriſtus* ſumus, quia quodammodo totus *Chriſtus* caput & corpus eſt. S. *Auguſt.* in *Pſal.* 26.

ons. I am fully assured by all those predictions that the *Messias* so promised is already come. I am as certainly perswaded, that the man born in the dayes 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 especiall offices, belonging to him as the Mediatour 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, farre above all principalities and powers, whereby when he hath subdued all our enemies, he will conferre actuall, perfect, and eternall happinesse upon us. I believe this Unction by which he became the true *Messias*, was not performed by any materiall oyl, but by the Spirit of God, which he received as the Head, and conveyeth to his members. And in this full acknowledgement *I believe in Jesus Christ*.

HIS ONELY SON.

AFter our Saviours Nomination immediately followeth his Filiation: and justly, after we have acknowledged him to be *the Christ*, do we confesse him to be the *Son of God*; because these two were ever inseparable, and even by the *Jewes* 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

*Joh.*1.49.

*Joh.*11.27.

*Mat.*26.63.

Con-

Confeſſion of S. *Peter*; *We believe and are ſure that thou art that Chriſt, the Son of the living God.* And the Goſpel of S. *John* was therefore written, that *we might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God.* Certain then it is that all the *Jewes*, as they looked for a *Meſſias* to come, ſo they believed that *Meſſias* to be the Son of God: and that by reaſon of a conſtant interpretation of the ſecond Pſalm, as appropriated unto him. Well therefore after we have expreſſed our faith in *Jeſus Chriſt*, is added that which alwayes had ſo great affinity with it, the *onely Son of God.*

Joh. 6. 69.

Joh. 20. 31.

In theſe words there is little variety to be obſerved, except that what we tranſlate the *onely Son*, that in the phraſe of the Scripture and the Greek Church, is the *onely-begotten.* It is then ſufficient for the explication of theſe words, to ſhew 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 ſo be his Son, as no other is or can be ſo; and therefore he alone ſhould have the name of the onely-begotten.

† *The Latines indeed generally uſe the word* Unicum. *So* Ruffinus; Et in unico filio ejus. *which is ſo farre from being in his apprehenſion the ſame with* unigenitus, *that he referres it as well to Lord as Son.* Hic ergo *Jeſus Chriſtus*, filius unicus Dei, qui eſt & Dominus noſter unicus, & ad filium referri, & ad dominum poteſt. *So S.* Aug. *in* Enchiridio, *c.* 34. *and* Leo *Epiſt.* 10. *Which is therefore to be obſerved, becauſe in the antient Copies of thoſe Epiſtles the word* unicum *was not to be found; as appeareth by the diſcourſe of* Vigilius, *who in the fourth book againſt* Eutyches *hath theſe words:* Illa primitus uno diluens volumine, quæ Leonis objiciuntur Epiſtolæ, cujus hoc ſibi primo capitulum iſte neſcio quis propoſuit; Fidelium Univerſitas profitetur credere ſe in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, & in *Jeſum Chriſtum* filium ejus Dominum noſtrum. *That which he aimes at is the tenth Epiſtle of* Leo, *in which theſe words are found, but with the addition of* unicum, *which, as it ſeems, then was not there: as appeares yet farther by the words which follow.* Miror tamen quomodo hunc locum iſte notavit, & illum prætermiſit, ubi unici filii commemorationem idem Beatus *Leo* facit, dicens, Idem vero ſempiterni genitoris unigenitus ſempiternus, natus de Spiritu S. ex *Maria* Virgine, *which words are to be found in the ſame Epiſtle. Howſoever it was in the firſt copies of* Leo, *both* Ruffinus *and* S. Auguſtine, *who were before him, and* Maximus Taurinenſis, Chryſologus, Etherius *and* Beatus, *who were later, read it,* & in Jeſum Chriſtum filium ejus unicum. *But the word uſed in the Scriptures, and kept conſtantly by the Greeks, is* μονογενὴς, *the* onely-begotten.

First then, it cannot be denied that *Chriſt* is the Son of God, for that reaſon, becauſe he was begotten by the Spirit of God of the Virgin *Mary*; *for that which is conceived* (or rather † 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 rather which is begotten of thee) *ſhall be called the Son of God.* And the reaſon is clear, becauſe that Holy Ghoſt is God. For were he any Creature, and not God himſelf, who thus begat our Saviour of the Virgin, he muſt have been the Son of a Creature, not of God.

† *For the Original is* τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν. *and 'tis the obſervation of S.* Baſil, ἐκ ἔφηται τὸ γινηθὲν, ἀλλὰ τὸ γεννηθέν. *Indeed the vulgar tranſlation renders it,* quod in ea natum eſt, *and in S.* Luke, quod naſcetur ſanctum; *and it muſt be confeſſed this was the moſt ancient tranſlation. For ſo* Tertullian *read it,* Per virginem dicitis natum, non ex virgine, & in vulva, non ex vulva, quia & Angelus in ſomnis ad *Joſeph. Nam quod in ea natum eſt,* inquit, *de Sp. S. eſt.* De Carne Chriſti, *c.* 19. *and of that in S.* Luke, Hæc & ab Angelo exceperat ſecundum noſtrum Evangelium, *Propterea quod in te naſcetur vocabitur ſanctum, filius Dei.* Adv. *Marcion. l.* 4. *c.* 7. *Yet* quod in ea natum eſt *cannot be proper, while it is yet in the womb; nor can the childe firſt be ſaid to be born, and then that the mother ſhall bring it forth. 'Tis true indeed,* γεννᾶν *ſignifies not alwayes to beget, but ſometimes to bear or bring forth.* as ἡ γυνὴ σε Ἐλισάβετ γεννήσει υἱόν σοι. Luk. 1. 23. *and* v. 57. καὶ ἐγέννησε υἱόν. So τῷ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντι ἐν Βηθλεὲμ, Mat. 2. 1. *muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of* Chriſt's *nativity, for it is moſt certain that he was not begot at* Bethlehem, *and this without queſtion muſt be the meaning of* Herods *inquiſition,* πῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται. *where the* Meſſias *was to be born. But though* γεννᾶν *have ſometime the ſignification of bearing or bringing forth; yet* τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν *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 S.* Baſil *rejects that interpretation.* γεννᾶν *is one thing,* συλλαμβάνειν *another. Seeing then the Nativity was not yet come, and* γεννηθὲν *ſpeaks of ſomething already paſt, therefore the Old Tranſlation is not good,* quod in ea natum eſt. *Seeing though the conception indeed were paſt, yet* γεννᾶν *ſignifieth not to conceive, and ſo not properly to be interpreted, that which is conceived; ſeeing* γεννᾶν *is moſt properly to beget, as* ἡ γεννητικὴ *the generative faculty: therefore I conceive the fitteſt interpretation of thoſe words* τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν, *that which is begotten in her. And becauſe the Angel in S.* Luke *ſpeaks of the ſame thing, therefore I interpret* τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ, *in the ſame manner, that which is begotten of thee.*

Secondly,

Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the ſame *Chriſt* thus begotten by the Spirit of God, was deſigned to ſo high an Office by the ſpeciall and immediate will of God, that by vertue thereof he muſt be acknowledged the *Son of* God. He urgeth this argument himſelf againſt the *Jewes*. *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 immortall 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 wombe 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 deſin'd 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.*

Act. 13. 33.

Luk. 20. 36.

Rom. 1. 4.

Coloſ. 1. 18.

Fourthly, *Chriſt*, after his reſurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his Fathers 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*

Heb.1.3,4,5. *ſet down on the right hand of the Majeſty on high, being made ſo much better then the Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name then 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 four-fold 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 actuall poſſeſſion, as heir of all.

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 *onely begotten Son*. For although to be born of a Virgin be in it ſelf miraculous, and juſtly entitles *Chriſt* unto the Son of God; yet is it not ſo farre above the production of all mankind, as to place him in that ſingular eminence which muſt be attributed to the onely-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 farre 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 confeſſe him to be the Son of God, who in all probability underſtood nothing of his being born of a Virgin; much leſſe did they foreſee his riſing from the dead, or inheriting all things. Wherefore ſuppoſing all theſe wayes by which *Chriſt* is repreſented to us as the Son of God, we ſhall find out one more yet, farre more proper in it ſelf, 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 confeſſe him the *Onely-begotten*.

Luk.3.38.

To

To which purpoſe I obſerve, that the actuall 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 Virgins wombe. Which that I may be able to evince, I ſhall proceed in this following method, as not onely 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 actuall 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 Virgins wombe, was not any created being, but eſſentially divine. Thirdly, we will ſhew 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. 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 onely-begotten Son of the Father.*

As for the firſt, that *Jeſus Chriſt* had a reall 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 reall 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 two ſuppoſitions not to be denied: firſt, 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: ſecondly, 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 expreſſe words of the Scripture. Therefore I conclude, that *Jeſus Chriſt* had a reall 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?* For he ſpeaketh of a reall aſcenſion, ſuch as was to be ſeen or looked upon, ſuch as they might view as ſpectatours. The place to which that aſcenſion tended, was truly and really the Heaven of heavens. The verb ſubſtantive, not otherwiſe uſed, ſufficiently teſtifieth not a figurative but a reall 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 before he aſcended at all. We ſhall therefore farther ſhew that this aſcenſion was the firſt, that what was born of the Virgin was never in heaven before this time of which he ſpeaks;

Joh.6.62. θεωρῆτε, *as it came to paſſe,* βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη. *Act.1.9.*

ἦν ἣν.

ſpeaks; and being in heaven before this aſcenſion, 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 remarkable 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 wiſdome which he ſhewed when he diſputed with the Doctours; and were it not worthy our knowledge whether it were before he was in heaven or after? The diligent ſeeking of *Joſeph* and *Mary*, and her words when they found him, *Son, why haſt thou dealt ſo with us*? ſhew that he had not been miſſing from them till then, and conſequently not aſcended into heaven. After that he went down to *Nazareth*, and *was ſubject to them*: 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 Embaſſadour 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 wilderneſſe to be tempted of the devil: and 'twere ſtrange if any time could then be found for his Aſcenſion; for *he was forty dayes in the wilderneſſe*, and certainly heaven is no ſuch kind of place; he was all that time *with the beaſts*, who undoubtedly are none of the celeſtiall Hierarchy; *and tempted of Satan*, whoſe dominion reacheth no higher then the air. Wherefore

Luk. 2. 48.

Mark 1. 13.

in

in thoſe forty dayes *Chriſt* aſcended not into heaven,
Mark 1.13. but rather heaven deſcended unto him, for *the Angels*
Luk. 4. 14. *miniſtred unto him.* After *this he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee*, 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 onely raiſed without any written teſtimony of the word, or unwritten teſtimony of tradition, but is without any reaſon in it ſelf, 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? Nor is this onely aſſerted without reaſon, but alſo againſt that rule to be obſerved by *Chriſt* as he was anointed to the Sacerdotall Office. For the Holy of holies *made with*
Heb. 9. 24. 7. *hands* was the *figure of the true*, (that is *heaven it ſelf*) into which the *High Prieſt alone went once every year*; and *Chriſt* as our High Prieſt *entred in once into the holy place.* 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 confeſſe he was, then did he not aſcend till after his death, becauſe he was to enter in but *once*, and that not without bloud. 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.

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.* He oppoſeth himſelf unto the Manna in the wilderneſſe, which never was really in heaven, or had its originall from thence. *Moſes gave you not that bread from heaven*: 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.* 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 oppos'd to *Chriſt*, the oppoſition is placed in this very origination. *John* the Baptiſt was *filled with the Holy Ghoſt even from his mothers wombe*; 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.* *Adam* was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman; and yet he is ſo farre from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is diſtinguiſhed from the ſecond *Adam*. For *the firſt man is of the earth earthy, 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 S. *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 con-

Joh. 6.33,51.
32.
38.
Luk.1.15.
Joh.3.31.
1 Cor.15.47.
Eph.4.9.

ception 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
Jo.16.27,28. 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 later 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 ſhew of reaſon be denied, that *Chriſt* had a reall being and exiſtence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and diſtinct from the being which he received here.

Secondly, we ſhall prove not onely a bare priority of exiſtence, but a preexiſtence 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 confeſſe, the bleſſed Virgin was firſt ſaluted by the Angel ſix moneths after *Elizabeth* conceived, and many hundred yeares 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 reall being and exiſtence ſome ſpace of time before he was made man. For the firſt, it is the expreſſe teſtimony of *John* himſelf. *This is he of*
Joh. 1. 15. *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 wombe, at his conception; into the world, at his nativity; unto his office, at his baptiſme; alwayes after *John*, and at the ſame diſtance. Secondly, he attributeth

unto

unto *Chriſt* a priority of dignity, ſaying, *he is preferred before me*; as appeareth by the reiteration of theſe words; *He it is who coming after me, is preferred before me, whoſe ſhoes latchet I am not worthy to unloſe.* The addition of which expreſſion of his own unworthineſſe, ſheweth, that to *be preferred before him*, is the ſame with being *worthier then he*, to which the ſame expreſſion is conſtantly added by all the other three Evangeliſts. Thirdly, he rendreth 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 any thing as the cauſe or reaſon of it ſelf, 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 ſpake at large. This man Chriſt *Jeſus*, who came into the world, and entreth on his propheticall Office ſix moneths after me, is notwithſtanding of farre more worth and greater dignity then I am; even ſo much greater, that I muſt acknowledge my ſelf 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. 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 preexiſtence to the *Jewes*; *Verily verily, I ſay unto you, before Abraham was, I am.* Which words plainly and literally expounded, muſt evidently contain this truth. For firſt, *Abraham* in all the Scriptures never hath any other ſignification then ſuch as denotes the perſon called by that name; and the queſtion to which theſe words are direct-

Joh. 1. 27.

Joh. 8. 58.

ed 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 preexiſtence 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 unuſuall or improper to ſignifie a priority in reſpect of any thing paſt, becauſe no preſent inſtant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth: 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.

* So Nonnus here more briefly and plainly then uſuall; Ἀβρ. ἐμ πρὶν γένος ἦεν, ἐγὼ πέλον. So Jo. 14. 19. τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με; Have I been ſo long time with you, and yet haſt thou not known me? and Jo. 15. 27. ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε, becauſe ye have been (or continued) with me from the beginning. Thus Nonnus, Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγαῶτες ὅλην διήτορες ἦεν. Joh. 6. 24. Ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ. When the people ſaw that Jeſus was not there. Nor onely doth S. John uſe thus the preſent tenſe for that which is paſt, but a frequently for that which is to come. For as before, τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, ſo on the contrary, ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι. Joh. 7. 33. and ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται. Joh. 12, 26. 14, 3. 17, 24. Wherefore it is very indifferent whether (Joh. 7. 34.) we read ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, or ὅπου εἶμι. For Nonnus ſeems to have read it εἶμι by his tranſlation, οἷς ἀγαπὸν ἦγεν ὁδεύειν and the Iewes queſtion, πῆ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι; ſhewes they underſtood it ſo: for this εἶμι though of a preſent form, is of a future ſignification. Heſyc. Εἶμι, πορεύσομαι. And ſo it agreeth with that which follows, Jo. 8. 21. ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν. If we read εἰμὶ, as the Old Tranſlation, ubi ego ſum, it will have the force of ἔσομαι, and agree with the other; ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, κἀκεῖ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. Howſoever it is clear, S. John uſeth the preſent εἰμὶ either in relation to what is paſt, or what is to come, and it therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand requireth. And certainly the place now under our conſideration, can admit no other relation but to the time already paſt

And

in which Abraham *lived. And we find the preſent tenſe in the ſame manner joyned with the Aoriſt elſewhere: as* Pſal. 90. 2. πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι καὶ πλασθῆναι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ ἀπὸ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος, σὺ εἶ. *What can be more parallell then* πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι *to* πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, *and* σὺ εἶ *to* ἐγώ εἰμι. *In the ſame manner, though by another word,* πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἑδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾷ με. Prov. 8. 25.

And then the words will plainly ſignifie thus much. Do you queſtion how I could ſee *Abraham*, who am not yet fifty yeares old? Verily verily, I ſay unto you, Before ever *Abraham*, the perſon whom you ſpeak of, was born, I had a reall being and exiſtence, (by which I was capable of the ſight of him) in which I have continued untill now. In this ſenſe certainly the *Jewes* underſtood our Saviours anſwer, as pertinent to their queſtion, but in their opinion blaſphemous, and therefore *they took up ſtones to caſt at him*. This literall and plain explication is yet further 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 ſhew of reaſon to admit; whether they interpret the former part of ſomething to come, as the calling of the *Gentiles*, or the later of a preexiſtence 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 *Jewes* ſenſeleſly offended and fooliſhly exaſperated with thoſe words, which any of them might have ſpoken as well as he. For the firſt interpretation maketh our Saviour thus to ſpeak. Do ye ſo much wonder how I ſhould *have ſeen Abraham*, who am *not yet fifty yeares old*? do ye imagine ſo great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye moſt aſſured that what I ſpeak un-

in thoſe forty dayes *Chriſt* aſcended not into heaven,
Mark 1. 13. but rather heaven deſcended unto him, for *the Angels*
Luk. 4. 14. *miniſtred unto him.* After *this he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee*, 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 onely raiſed without any written teſtimony of the word, or unwritten teſtimony of tradition, but is without any reaſon in it ſelf, 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? Nor is this onely aſſerted without reaſon, but alſo againſt that rule to be obſerved by *Chriſt* as he was anointed to the Sacerdotall Office. For the Holy of holies *made with*
Heb. 9. 24. *hands* was the *figure of the true*, (that is *heaven it ſelf*)
7. into which the *High Prieſt alone went once every year*; and *Chriſt* as our High Prieſt *entred in once into the holy place.* 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 confeſſe he was, then did he not aſcend till after his death, becauſe he was to enter in but *once*, and that not without bloud. 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.

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.* He oppoſeth himſelf unto the Manna in the wilderneſſe, which never was really in heaven, or had its originall from thence. *Moſes gave you not that bread from heaven*: 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.* 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 oppos'd to *Chriſt*, the oppoſition is placed in this very origination. *John* the Baptiſt was *filled with the Holy Ghoſt even from his mothers wombe*; 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.* *Adam* was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman; and yet he is ſo farre from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is diſtinguiſhed from the ſecond *Adam*. For *the firſt man is of the earth earthy, 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 S. *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 con-

Joh. 6.33,51.
32.
38.
Luk.1.15.
Joh.3.31.
1 Cor.15.47.
Eph.4.9.

ception 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
Jo.16.27,28. 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 later 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 ſhew of reaſon be denied, that *Chriſt* had a reall being and exiſtence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and diſtinct from the being which he received here.

Secondly, we ſhall prove not onely a bare priority of exiſtence, but a preexiſtence 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 confeſſe, the bleſſed Virgin was firſt ſaluted by the Angel ſix moneths after *Elizabeth* conceived, and many hundred yeares 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 reall being and exiſtence ſome ſpace of time before he was made man. For the firſt, it is the expreſſe teſtimony of *John* himſelf. *This is he of*
Joh. 1. 15. *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 wombe, at his conception; into the world, at his nativity; unto his office, at his baptiſme; alwayes after *John*, and at the ſame diſtance. Secondly, he attributeth unto

unto *Chriſt* a priority of dignity, ſaying, *he is preferred before me*; as appeareth by the reiteration of theſe words; *He it is who coming after me, is preferred before me, whoſe ſhoes latchet I am not worthy to unloſe.* The addition of which expreſſion of his own unworthineſſe, ſheweth, that to *be preferred before him*, is the ſame with being *worthier then he*, to which the ſame expreſſion is conſtantly added by all the other three Evangeliſts. Thirdly, he rendreth 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 any thing as the cauſe or reaſon of it ſelf, 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 ſpake at large. This man Chriſt *Jeſus*, who came into the world, and entreth on his propheticall Office ſix moneths after me, is notwithſtanding of farre more worth and greater dignity then I am; even ſo much greater, that I muſt acknowledge my ſelf 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. 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 preexiſtence to the *Jewes*; *Verily verily, I ſay unto you, before Abraham was, I am.* Which words plainly and literally expounded, muſt evidently contain this truth. For firſt, *Abraham* in all the Scriptures never hath any other ſignification then ſuch as denotes the perſon called by that name; and the queſtion to which theſe words are direct-

Joh. 1. 27.

Joh. 8. 58.

ed 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 preexiſtence 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 unuſuall or improper to ſignifie a priority in reſpect of any thing paſt, becauſe no preſent inſtant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth: 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.

* So Nonnus *here more briefly and plainly then uſuall*; Ἀβραὰμ πρὶν γένος ἔσχεν, ἐγὼ πέλων. So Jo. 14. 19. τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με; Have I been ſo long time with you, and yet haſt thou not known me? and Jo. 15. 27. ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε, becauſe ye have been (or continued) with me from the beginning. Thus Nonnus, Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγαῶτες ὅλων ἀπήτορες ἔργων. Joh. 6 24. Ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ. When the people ſaw that Jeſus was not there. Nor onely doth S. John uſe thus the preſent tenſe for that which is paſt, but a frequently for that which is to come. For as before, τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, ſo on the contrary, ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι. Joh. 7. 33. and ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται. Joh. 12, 26. 14, 3. 17, 24. Wherefore it is very indifferent whether (Joh. 7. 34.) we read ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, or ὅπου εἶμι. For Nonnus ſeems to have read it εἶμι by his tranſlation, εἰς ἀγαπὸν ἦνυσε ὁδεύων and the Iewes queſtion, πῦ ὅτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι; ſhewes they underſtood it ſo: for this εἶμι though of a preſent form, is of a future ſignification. Heſyc. Εἶμι, πορεύσομαι. And ſo it agreeth with that which follows, Jo. 8. 21. ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν. If we read εἰμὶ, as the Old Tranſlation, ubi ego ſum, it will have the force of ἔσομαι, and agree with the other; ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, κἀ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. Howſoever it is clear, S. John uſeth the preſent εἰμὶ either in relation to what is paſt, or what is to come, and is therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand requireth. And certainly the place now under our conſideration, can admit no other relation but to the time already paſt

And

in which Abraham *lived. And we find the preſent tenſe in the ſame manner joyned with the Aoriſt elſewhere: as* Pſal. 90. 2. πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι καὶ πλασθῆναι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ ἀπὸ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνός σὺ εἶ. *What can be more parallell then* πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι *to* εἶναι Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, *and* σὺ εἶ *to* ἐγώ εἰμι. *In the ſame manner, though by another word,* πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη ἑδρασθῆναι, πρὸ δὲ πάντων βουνῶν γεννᾷ με. Prov. 8. 25.

And then the words will plainly ſignifie thus much. Do you queſtion how I could ſee *Abraham*, who am not yet fifty yeares old? Verily verily, I ſay unto you, Before ever *Abraham*, the perſon whom you ſpeak of, was born, I had a reall being and exiſtence, (by which I was capable of the ſight of him) in which I have continued untill now. In this ſenſe certainly the *Jewes* underſtood our Saviours anſwer, as pertinent to their queſtion, but in their opinion blaſphemous, and therefore *they took up ſtones to caſt at him.* This literall and plain explication is yet further 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 ſhew of reaſon to admit; whether they interpret the former part of ſomething to come, as the calling of the *Gentiles*, or the later of a preexiſtence 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 *Jewes* ſenſeleſly offended and fooliſhly exaſperated with thoſe words, which any of them might have ſpoken as well as he. For the firſt interpretation maketh our Saviour thus to ſpeak. Do ye ſo much wonder how I ſhould *have ſeen Abraham*, who am *not yet fifty yeares old?* do ye imagine ſo great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye moſt aſſured that what I ſpeak un-

to 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; 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 magnifie my ſelf: for what I ſpeak is as true of you as 'tis 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 confeſſe 'tis more then eighteen hundred yeares ſince that Patriarch died, and leſſe then 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 magnifie my ſelf 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 *Jewes* 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 *Jewes*; being thoſe ſtrained explications render the words of *Chriſt* not onely impertinent to the occaſion, but vain and uſeleſſe to the hearers of them; being our Saviour gave this anſwer in words of another language, moſt probably uncapable of any ſuch interpretations; we muſt adhere unto that literall ſenſe already deliver'd, by which it appeareth *Chriſt* had a being, as before *John*, ſo alſo before *Abraham*, and conſequently that he did exiſt

two

two thouſand yeares before he was born, or begotten of the Virgin.

Thirdly, we ſhall extend this preexiſtence to a farre longer ſpace of time, to the end of the firſt world, nay to the beginning of it. For he which was before the floud, and at the creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin. But *Chriſt* was really before the floud, 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 floud, is evident by the words of S. *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 ſometime were diſobedient, when once the long-ſuffering of God waited in the dayes of Noah while the ark was a preparing.* From which words it appeareth, that *Chriſt* preached by the ſame Spirit by the vertue 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 floud, while the ark was preparing. It is certain then that *Chriſt* did preach unto thoſe perſons which in the dayes of *Noah* were diſobedient all that time *the long-ſuffering of* God waited, and conſequently ſo long as repentance was offer'd. 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 S. *Peter* of the promulgation of the Goſpel to the *Gentiles* after the Holy Ghoſt deſcended upon the Apoſtles, when the words themſelves

1 Pet. 3. 18, 19, 20.

ἀπεθανατοί ποτε, ὅτε ἀπαξεξεδέχε- το ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε.

refuſe

refuſe all relation to any ſuch times or perſons. For all thoſe of whom S. *Peter* ſpeaks were diſobedient in the dayes of *Noah*. But none of thoſe to whom the Apoſtles preached were ever diſobedient in the dayes of *Noah*. Therefore none of thoſe to which the Apoſtles preached, were any of thoſe of which S. *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 floud, even while they lived, and conſequently that he was before it. For though 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, by the ſending of *Noah, the eighth preacher of righteouſneſſe*: yet to do any thing by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonſtrates the exiſtence of the principall cauſe, as if he did it of himſelf without any intervening inſtrument. The ſecond

2 Pet. 2. 5. *I have thus tranſlated this place of* S. Peter, *becauſe it may adde ſome advantage to the argument: for if* Noah *were the eighth preacher of righteouſneſſe, 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 preexiſtence of another* 1000 *yeares. However thoſe words,* ἀλλ' ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξε, *may be better interpreted then they are, when we tranſlate them,* but ſaved Noah the eighth perſon, a preacher of righteouſneſſe. *For firſt, if we look upon the Greek phraſe,* ὄγδοος Νῶε *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 of the reſt, but onely conſigniſieth the number which were with him. As when we read in the Supplices of* Æſchylus, Τὸ γὰρ τεκόντων σέβας, Τρίτον τόδ' ὂν θεσμοῖς Δίκας γέγεσθαι μαιότιμον, *we muſt not underſtand it, as if Honour due to parents were the third Commandement at* Athens, *but one of the three remarkable lawes left at* Eleuſis *by* Tripolemus. *So* Porphyrius, Φασὶ δὲ καὶ Τριπτόλεμον Ἀθηναίοις νομοθετῆσαι, καὶ τρεῖς νόμων αὐτῷ γραῖς ἔτι Ξενοκράτης ὁ φιλόσοφος λέγει διαμένειν Ἐλευσῖνι τάσδε· Γονεῖς τιμᾶν· Θεοὺς καρποῖς ἀγάλλειν· Ζῶα μὴ σίνεσθαι. De Abſtinent. *l.* 4. *which words are thus tranſlated by* S. Hierome, *who hath made uſe of moſt part of that fourth book of* Porphyrius, *Xenocrates* Philoſophus de *Triptolemi* legibus apud *Athenienſes* tria tantum præcepta in templo *Eleuſina* reſidere ſcribit; Honorandos Parentes, Venerandos Deos, Carnibus non veſcendum. *Adver.* Jovinianum, *lib.* 2. *where we ſee, Honour due to parents, the firſt precept, though by* Æſchylus *call'd the*

part

third, not in reſpect of the order, but the number. Thus Dinarchus *the Orateur,* ἀπὸ τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἐφεξῆς δίκαιος αὐτός. *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, & many more might be after or below him; but from hence it is inferred, that there were ten* ἐφεξῆς *waiting on the* Σεμναὶ θεαὶ, *and no more, of which number that man was one. After this manner ſpeak the Attick writers, eſpecially* Thucydides. *And ſo we may underſtand S.* Peter, *that God preſerved* Noah *(a preacher of righteouſneſſe) with ſeven more, of which he deſerveth to be named the firſt, rather then the laſt or eighth. But ſecondly, the Ordinall* ὄγδοον *may poſſibly not belong to the name or perſon of* Noah, *but to his title or office; and then we muſt tranſlate* ὄγδοον Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, Noah *the eighth preacher of righteouſneſſe. For we read at the birth of* Enos *that men began to call upon the name of the Lord, Gen.* 4. 26. *which the ancients underſtood peculiarly of his perſon: as the* LXX. ἔτος ἤλπισαν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. *and the vulgar Latine,* iſte cœpit invocare nomen domini. *The* Jewes *have a tradition, that God ſent in the ſea upon mankind in the dayes of* Enos *and deſtroyed many. From whence it ſeems* Enos *was a Preacher or Prophet, and ſo the reſt that followed him; and then* Noah *is the eighth.*

part of the Argument, that *Chriſt* made this world, and conſequently had a reall being at the beginning of it, the Scriptures manifeſtly and plentifully aſſure us. For the ſame *Son by whom in theſe laſt dayes God ſpake unto us,* is he *by whom alſo he made the worlds.* So that, as *through faith we underſtand that the worlds were framed by the word of* God, ſo muſt we * alſo believe that they were made by the Son of God. Which the Apoſtle doth not onely in the entrance of his Epiſtle deliver, but in the ſequele prove. For ſhewing greater things have been ſpoken of him then ever were attributed to any of the Angels, the moſt glorious of all the creatures of God; among the reſt, he ſaith, the Scripture ſpake a *unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. And* not onely 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 yeares ſhall not fail.* Now

Heb. 1. 2.

Heb. 11. 3.

* *It being in both places expreſſed in the ſame phraſe by the ſame Author.* Δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν. *Heb.* 1. 2. πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ.

a *Heb.* 1. 8, 10, 11, 12.

whatſoever the perſon be to whom theſe words were ſpoken, it cannot be denied but he was the Creatour 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*, referres this place of the Pſalmiſt plainly to the former, of which he had ſaid expreſly, *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 Apoſtles 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 ſhew that the Son of God ſhall deſtroy the heavens, muſt withall acknowledge that he created them: whoſoever denieth him to be here ſpoken of as the Creatour, muſt alſo denie him to be underſtood as the deſtroyer. 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 S. *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 literall expoſition is ſo clear that no man hath ever pretended to a metaphorical; it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profeſſion of the Pſalmiſt,

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 teſtifie as much, but onely that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the reſt. For they which 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 wayes 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 ſhew, that they are not ſpoken of the Son of God. If they ſpeak ſo expreſly 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 metaphoricall. The place before alledged is of the firſt kind, which ſpeaketh ſo clearly of the Creation, or reall production of the world, that they never denied it: and I have ſo manifeſtly ſhewed it ſpoken to the Son of God, that it is beyond all poſſibility of gain-ſaying.

Thus having aſſerted the creation acknowledged reall unto *Chriſt*, we ſhall the eaſier perſwade that likewiſe to be ſuch, which is pretended to be metaphoricall. In the Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians* we read of the Son of God, *in whom we have redemption through his bloud*; and we are ſure thoſe words can be ſpoken of none other then *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.* In which words our Saviour is expreſly ſtiled the *firſt-born of every Creature*, Col. 1. 14. Col. 1. 15, 16, 17.

ture, that is, begotten by God, as the * *Son of his love*, antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing 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 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 onely of corporeall substances: lest therefore those immateriall beings might seem exempted from the Son's creation, because omitted in *Moses* his description, he addeth *visible and invisible*; and lest in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestiall Hierarchy, any Order might seem exempted from an essentiall dependance 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 instrumentall cause which worketh by and for another, he sheweth him as well the finall as the efficient cause; for *all things were created by him and for him*. Lastly, whereas all things first receive their being by creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by vertue of Gods conservation, *in whom we live, and move, and have our being*; lest in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the Con-

* In relation to the precedent words τῷ υἱῷ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, for that υἱὸς ἀγαπητὸς was the υἱὸς πρωτότοκος.

Conſerver, as well as the Creatour; 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 Creatour of the world; and if they were ſpoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his Majeſty, who is no where more plainly or fully ſet forth unto us as the Maker of the world.

Now although this were ſufficient to perſwade 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 compell us ſo to underſtand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of Creation in the language of the Scriptures, the one literall, the other metaphoricall; 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 S. *Paul.* and again, *In Chriſt Jeſus neither circumciſion availeth any thing, nor incircumciſion, but a new creature.* Inſtead of which words he had before, *faith working by love.* For *we are 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. And therefore he which is ſo created is called a new man, in oppoſition to the old man, which is *corrupt according to the deceitfull 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 righteouſneſſe, and true holineſſe*; and *which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him.* The new creation then is deſcribed to us as con-

2 Cor. 5. 17. Gal. 6. 15. 5, 6. Eph. 2. 10. Eph. 4. 22, 23, 24. Coloſ. 3. 10.

* ἀνανέωσις or ἀνακαίνωσις, as the new man νέος ἄνθρωπος, or καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. The first ὁ ἀνανεούμενος, the laſt ὁ ἀνακαινούμενος, both the ſame. Suidas, Ἀνακαίνισις, ἡ ἀνανέωσις· λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἀνακαίνωσις. which is the language of the New Teſtament. This renovation being thus called καινὴ κτίσις, the Ancients framed a proper word for it, which is, ἀνάκτισις. ὃν ἦλθε πάντων ἐλπὶς ἐν ἀνθρώποις κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα κακῶν ἀναίρεσις. Juſtin. Qu. & Reſp. ad Græcos. This new creation doth ſo neceſſarily inferre an alteration, that it is called by S. Paul a *Metamorphoſis*; μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν. Rom. 12. 2.

ſiſting 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 reall change, though not ſubſtantiall, 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 expreſly 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 onely 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 alwayes 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 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

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 generall word, intending thereby onely the new, and while he doth ſo, expreſſe particularly and eſpecially thoſe parts of the old creation which are incapable of the new, or at leaſt have no relation to it. 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 alwayes ſuch, nor were they ſo by the vertue of *Chriſts* incarnation, for *he took not on him the nature of Angels*. We acknowledge in mankind a new creation, becauſe an old man becomes a new; but there is no ſuch notion in the celeſtiall Hierarchy, becauſe no old and new Angels: they which fell, are fallen for eternity; they which ſtand, alwayes 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 expreſly affirms. But they were never created by a new creation *unto true holineſſe and righteouſneſſe*, becauſe they alwayes 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.

Nor need we doubt of this interpretation, or the Doctrine ariſing from it, ſeeing it is ſo clearly delivered by S. *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 any thing made that was made.* Whereas we have proved *Chriſt* had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, becauſe he was at Joh. 1. 1, 2, 3.

the

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 S. *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 penn'd to give full ſatisfaction in this point, then theſe words of S. *John*, which ſeem with a ſtrange brevity deſign'd 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. S. *John* would teach, that this *Chriſt* did make the world, which was created four thouſand yeares 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 yeares after. Neither of theſe with any ſhew of probability will reach to the Creation of the world. Wherefore he produceth a name of his, as yet unknown unto the world, or rather not taken notice of, though in frequent uſe among the *Jewes*, which belonged unto him who was made man, but before he was ſo. Under this name he ſhewes at firſt that he had a being in the † beginning; 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, when he made all things:

† ἐν ἀρχῇ, *the firſt word of Moſes; whence the Syriac Tranſlation,* בּרשׁית. *So* Solomon, מראשׁ מקדמי-ארץ ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τῆς γῆν ποιῆσαι. *Prov.* 8. 22.

* πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, *that is* παρὰ τὸ θεῷ, *that is, by* God. *As* Nonnus, Παλὸς ἦην ἀμέλικτος, ἀτέρμονι ζώθροος ἕδρῃ. *As Wiſdome ſpeaketh* Prov. 8. 30. then I was by him. ואהיה אצלו. ἤμην παρ' αὐτῷ. *Chald.* ודחויתן צדוי. et eram in latere ejus. *Moſchopulus* πρὸς χεῖρα. πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, τυτέστι μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. *As* Mat. 13. 56. αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσι; Mar. 14. 49. καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 1. Cor. 16. 6. πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμενῶ.

things: and therefore well may we conceive 'twas he, to whom God *ſaid, Let us make man in our image, after our likeneſſe*; and of whom thoſe words may be underſtood, *Behold the man is become as one of us.* 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 any thing out ofnothing, 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 frame a falſe conception of different Gods, he returnes unto the ſecond aſſertion, and joynes it with the firſt; *The ſame was in the beginning with God*: and then delivers that which at the firſt ſeem'd ſtrange, but now after thoſe three propoſitions may eaſily be accepted; *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* For now this is no new doctrine, but onely 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.* And ſo *By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hoſt of them by the breath of his mouth.* From whence *we underſtand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.* Neither was it a new interpretation, but that which was moſt familiar to the *Jewes*, who in their Synagogues, by the reading of the † Paraphraſe or Interpretation of the Hebrew text in the 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 S. *John* delivered ſo great a myſtery in ſo few words, as ſpeaking unto them who at the firſt apprehenſion underſtood him. Onely that which

Gen. 1. 26. *Gen.* 3. 22. *Gen.* 1. 3. *Pſal* 33. 6. *Heb.* 11. 3. 2 *Pet.* 3. 5.

† *I conceive this Chaldee Paraphraſe to repreſent the ſenſe of the Jewes of that age, as being their publick interpretation of the Scripture. Wherefore what we find common and frequent in it, we cannot but think the vulgar and generall opinion of that Nation. Now it is certain that this Paraphraſt doth often uſe* מימרא דיוי *the Word of God, for* יהוה *God himſelf, and that eſpecially with relation to the creation of the world. As* Iſa. 45. 12.

אנכי עשיתי ארץ ואדם עליה בראתי *I made the earth, and created man upon it, ſaith the Lord, the Holy One of Iſrael, which the Chaldee tranſlateth* אנא במימרי עבדת ארעא *I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it. In the ſame manner* Jer. 27. 5. *I made the earth and men, and beaſts on the face of the earth, the* Targum אנא במימרי עבדת ית ארעא. *And* Iſ. 48. 13. אף ידי יסדה ארץ. אף במימרי שכללת ארעא. *My hand alſo founded the earth. the Chaldee* Etiam in verbo meo fundavi terram. *And moſt clearly* Gen. 1. 27. *we read,* & creavit Deus hominem. *the* Jeruſalem Targum, Verbum Domini creavit hominem. *And* Gen. 3. 8. Audierunt vocem Domini Dei. *the Chaldee Paraphraſe* ושמעו ית קל מימרא דוי & audierunt vocem verbi Domini Dei. *Now this which the Chaldee Paraphraſt called* מימרא, *the Helleniſts named* Λόγον: *as appeareth by* Philo *the Jew, who wrote before S.* John, *and reckons in his Divinity, firſt* πατέρα τῶν ὅλων, *then* δεύτερον θεὸν, ὃς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος. *Quæſt. & Solut. Whom he calls* ἀρχὰν θεοῦ Λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν. *De Agricult. He attributes the creation of the world to this* Λόγος, *whom he termes* ὄργανον θεοῦ δι' οὗ (ὁ κόσμος) κατεσκευάσθη. *De Flammeo gladio.* Σκιὰ δὲ θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει. *Idem* Allegor. l. 2. *where we muſt obſerve, that though* Philo *makes the* Λόγος *of whom he ſpeaks, as inſtrumentall 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 expreſly for the Son of God. Nor ought we to look on* Philo Judæus *in this as a* Platoniſt, *but merely as a* Jew, *who referres his whole doctrine of this* Λόγος *to the firſt chapter of* Geneſis. *And the reſt of the* Iewes *before him, who had no ſuch knowledge out of* Plato's *School, uſed the ſame notion. For as* Jerem. 48. 13. *the hand of God, is by the Chaldee Paraphraſt tranſlated, the Word of God; ſo in the book of Wiſdome,* ἡ παντοδύναμός σου χεὶρ καὶ κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον, Sap. 11. 17. *is changed into* ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος ἀπ' οὐρανῶν. 18. 15. *&* Siracidis 42. 31. Ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ συγκεῖται πάντα. *Nay the Septuagint hath changed* Shaddai, *the undoubted name of the omnipotent God, into* Λόγος *the word.* Ezek. 1. 24. קול-שדי quaſi vox ſublimis Dei, qu d Hebraice appellatur שדי, & juxta LXX. Φωνὴ τοῦ Λόγου, id eſt, vox verbi, ut univerſa quæ prædicantur in mundo, vocem Filii Dei eſſe dicamus. S. *Hieron. If then all the* Iewes, *both they which underſtood the Chaldee expoſitions, 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* S. John *ſhould make uſe of any other Notion, then what they before had, and that by means whereof he might be ſo eaſily underſtood.*

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 it ſelf, ſo conſonant to the Notion of the Word, and the apprehenſion of the *Jewes*; it is infinitely to be preferred before any ſuch interpretation, as ſhall reſtrain the moſt univerſals

verſals to a few particulars, change the plaineſt expreſſions into figurative phraſes, and make of a ſublime truth, a weak, uſeleſſe, falſe diſcourſe. For who will grant that *in the beginning*, muſt be the ſame with that in S. *John's* Epiſtle, *from the beginning*? eſpecially when the very interpretation involves in it ſelf a contradiction. For the beginning in S. *John's* Epiſtle is that, in which the Apoſtles ſaw, and heard, and touch'd 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 Apoſtles 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 S. *Matthew* and S. *Luke*, who wrote before him, taught us more then this; that he had a being thirty yeares 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 actuall 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 to reveleth the will of God; *Chriſt* had not then revealed the will of God, and conſequently was not then actually the Word, but onely potentially or by deſignation. Secondly, 'tis a ſtrange figurative ſpeech, the *Word was with God*, that is, was known to God, eſpecially in this Apoſtles method. *In the beginning was the Word*; there *was* muſt ſignifie an actuall exiſtence: and if ſo, why in the next ſentence, *the Word was with God*, ſhall the ſame verb ſignifie an objective being onely? Certainly though to be

1 *Joh.* 1. 1.

Joh. 1. 31.

in the beginnirg, 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 it ſelf is plainly affirmative, and the excluſive particle *onely* 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 onely, for to all theſe he was certainly known. Thirdly, to paſſe 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 materiall, *the ſame was in the beginning with God*, and immediately ſubjoyned thoſe words, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; 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 later part, of the Apoſtles, who after the Aſcenſion of our Saviour, did nothing but what they were commanded and impowered 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 Expoſitours: for while *John* the Baptiſt onely 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

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. And therefore I conclude from the undeniable teſtimony of S. *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 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 reall being and exiſtence before *Chriſt* was begotten of the Virgin *Mary*. But all theſe we have already ſhewed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we muſt acknowledge, that *Jeſus Chriſt* had a reall being and exiſtence, before he was begotten by the Holy Ghoſt: Which is our firſt Aſſertion, properly oppoſed to the * *Photinians*.

* *The* Photinians *were Hereticks, ſo called from* Photinus, *Biſhop of* Sirmium, *but born in* Gallogræcia, *and ſcholar to* Marcellus *Biſhop of* Ancyra. *Photinus de Gallogræcia, Marcelli diſcipulus, Sirmii* Epiſcopus ordinatus, *Hebionis* Hæreſin inſtaurare conatus eſt. *S. Hieron.* Catal. Eccl. *Photinus Sirmienſis* Epiſcopus fuit à *Marcello* imbutus. Nam & *Diaconus* ſub eo aliquandiu fuit. *Hilar. Fragm. Wherefore when* Epiphanius *ſpeaketh thus of him,* ἔτος ὠφελήθη ἀπὸ Σιρμίου, *it hath no relation to the originall of his perſon, but his Hereſy; of which* S. Hilary, Peſtiſere natum Ieſum Chriſtum ex *Maria, Pannonia* defendit. De Trin. *He was a man of ſingular parts and abilities,* Φύσεως ἔχων ἓν λέγειν, καὶ πείθειν ἱκανὸς, *ſayes* Sozom. *l.* 4. *c.* 6. Γέγονε δὲ οὗτος ὁ Φωτεινὸς λαὸς τὸν τρόπον, καὶ ὠξυμένος τὴν γλῶτταν, πολλὰς δὲ διωδύνους ἀπατᾷν τῇ τῶν λόγων δεξιότητι καὶ ἑτοιμολογίᾳ. *Epiphan.* Hær. 71. Erat & ingenii viribus valens, & doctrinæ opibus excellens, & eloquio præpotens, quippe qui utroque ſermone copioſe & graviter diſputaret & ſcriberet. *Vincent.*

אנכי עשיתי ארץ ואדם עליה בראתי *I made the earth, and created man upon it, saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, which the Chaldee translateth* אנא במימרי עבדת ארעא *I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it. In the same manner* Jer. 27. 5. *I made the earth and men, and beasts on the face of the earth. the* Targum אנא במימרי עבדת ית ארעא. *And* Is. 48. 13. אף ידי יסדה ארץ. אף במימרי *My hand also founded the earth. the Chaldee* שכללת ארעא. Etiam in verbo meo fundavi terram. *And most clearly* Gen. 1. 27. *we read,* & creavit Deus hominem. *the* Jerusalem Targum, Verbum Domini creavit hominem. *And* Gen. 3. 8. Audierunt vocem Domini Dei. *the Chaldee Paraphraſe* ושמעין ית קל ממרא דוי & audierunt vocem verbi Domini Dei. *Now this which the Chaldee Paraphraſt called* ממרא, *the Helleniſts named* Λόγον: *as appeareth by* Philo *the* Jew, *who wrote before S.* John, *and reckons in his Divinity, firſt* πατέρα τῶν ὅλων, *then* δεύτερον θεὸν, ὃς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος. *Quæſt. & Solut. Whom he calls* ὀρθὸν θεοῦ Λόγον. πρωτόγονον υἱόν. *De Agricult. He attributes the creation of the world to this* Λόγος, *whom he termes* ὄργανον θεοῦ δι' οὗ (ὁ κόσμος) κατεσκευάσθη. *De Flammeo gladio.* Σκιὰ δὲ θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, ᾧ καθάπερ ὀργάνῳ προσχρησάμενος ἐκοσμοποίει. *Idem* Allegor. *l.* 2. *where we muſt obſerve, though* Philo *makes the* Λόγος *of whom he ſpeaks, as inſtrumentall 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 expreſly for the Son of God. Nor ought we to look on* Philo Judæus *in this as a* Platoniſt, *but merely as a* Jew, *who referres his whole doctrine of this* Λόγος *to the firſt chapter of* Geneſis. *And the reſt of the* Iewes *before him, who had no ſuch knowledge out of* Plato's *School, uſed the ſame notion. For as* Jerem. 48. 13. *the hand of God, is by the Chaldee Paraphraſt tranſlated, the Word of God: So in the book of Wiſdome,* ἡ παντοδυναμός σου χεὶρ ἡ κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον, Sap. 11. 17. *is changed into* ὁ παντοδυναμός σου Λόγος ἀπ' οὐρανῶν. 18. 15. & Siracidis 43. 31. Ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ συγκεῖσθαι πάντα. *Nay the Septuagint hath changed* Shaddai, *the undoubted name of the omnipotent God, into* Λόγος *the Word.* Ezek. 1. 24. בקול-שדי quaſi vox ſublimis Dei, quod Hebraice appellatur שדי, & juxta LXX. Φωνὴ τοῦ Λόγου, id eſt, vox verbi, ut univerſa quæ prædicantur in mundo, vocem Filii Dei eſſe dicamus. S. Hieron. *If then all the* Iewes, *both they which underſtood the Chaldee expoſitions, and thoſe which onely 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* S. John *ſhould make uſe of any other Notion, then what they before had, and that by means whereof he might be ſo eaſily underſtood.*

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 it ſelf, ſo conſonant to the Notion of the Word, and the apprehenſion of the *Jewes*; it is infinitely to be preferred before any ſuch interpretation, as ſhall reſtrain the moſt univerſals

verſals to a few particulars, change the plaineſt expreſſions into figurative phraſes, and make of a ſublime truth, a weak, uſeleſſe, falſe diſcourſe. For who will grant that *in the beginning*, muſt be the ſame with that in S. *John*'s Epiſtle, *from the beginning*? eſpecially when the very interpretation involves in it ſelf a contradiction. For the beginning in S. *John*'s Epiſtle is that, in which the Apoſtles ſaw, and heard, and touch'd 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 Apoſtles aſſection, 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 S. *Matthew* and S. *Luke*, who wrote before him, taught us more then this; that he had a being thirty yeares 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 actuall 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 onely potentially or by deſignation. Secondly, 'tis a ſtrange figurative ſpeech, the *Word was with God*, that is, was known to God, eſpecially in this Apoſtles method. *In the beginning was the Word*; there *was* muſt ſignifie an actuall exiſtence: and if ſo, why in the next ſentence, *the Word was with God*, ſhall the ſame verb ſignifie an objective being onely? Certainly though to be

1 *Joh.* 1. 1.

Joh. 1. 31.

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 it ſelf is plainly affirmative, and the excluſive particle *onely* 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 onely, for to all theſe he was certainly known. Thirdly, to paſſe 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 materiall, *the ſame was in the beginning with God*, and immediately ſubjoyned thoſe words, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; 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 later part, of the Apoſtles, who after the Aſcenſion of our Saviour, did nothing but what they were commanded and impowered 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 Expoſitours: for while *John* the Baptiſt onely 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

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. And therefore I conclude from the undeniable teſtimony of S. *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 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 reall being and exiſtence before *Chriſt* was begotten of the Virgin *Mary*. But all theſe we have already ſhewed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we muſt acknowledge, that *Jeſus Chriſt* had a reall being and exiſtence, before he was begotten by the Holy Ghoſt: Which is our firſt Aſſertion, properly oppoſed to the * *Photinians*.

* *The* Photinians *were Hereticks, ſo called from* Photinus, *Biſhop of* Sirmium, *but born in* Gallogræcia, *and ſcholar to* Marcellus *Biſhop of* Ancyra. *Photinus de Gallogræcia, Marcelli diſcipulus, Sirmii* Epiſcopus ordinatus, *Hebionis* Hæreſin inſtaurare conatus eſt. *S. Hieron.* Catal. Eccl. *Photinus Sirmienſis* Epiſcopus fuit à *Marcello* imbutus. Nam & *Diaconus* ſub eo aliquandiu fuit. *Hilar. Fragm. Wherefore when* Epiphanius *ſpeaketh thus of him,* ὗτος ὡρμᾶτο ἀπὸ Σιρμίου, *it hath no relation to the originall of his perſon, but his Hereſy; of which* S. Hilary, Peſtiſere natum Ieſum Chriſtum ex *Maria, Pannonia* defendit. De Trin. *He was a man of ſingular parts and abilities,* Φύσεως ἔχων ἔυ λέγειν, καὶ πείθειν ἱκανὸς, *ſayes* Sozom. *l.* 4. *c.* 6. Γέγονε δὲ ὗτος ὁ Φωτεινὸς λαὸς τὸν τρόπον, καὶ ἀξυμένος τὴν γλῶτταν, πολλὰς δὲ Ἰουδαίους ἀπατᾷν τῇ τῶ λόγω περιφορᾷ καὶ ἑτοιμολογίᾳ. *Epiphan.* Hær. 71. Erat & ingenii viribus valens, & doctrinæ opibus excellens, & eloquio præpotens, quippe qui utroque ſermone copioſe & graviter diſputaret & ſcriberet. *Vincent.*

Virin. c. 16. *He is said by some to follow the Heresy of* Ebion. *Hebionis* Hæresin instaurare conatus est, *sayes S. Hierome. and S. Hilary ordinarily understands him by the name of* Hebion, *and sometimes expounds himself,* Hebion, qui est *Photinus. But there is no similitude in their doctrines.* Hebion *being more Jew then Christian, and teaching* Christ *as much begotten by* Joseph, *as born of* Mary. Paulus Samosatenus *will have him agree wholly with* Paulus Samosatenus in omnibus. Epiphanius *with an* ἀπὸ μέρους, *and* ὑπόνοια. Socrates *and* Sozomen, *with him and with* Sabellius: *whereas he differ'd much from them both, especially from* Sabellius, *as being farre from a* Patripassian. *Marcellus* Sabellianæ hæresis assertor exiterat: *Photinus* vero novam hæresin jam ante protulerat, à *Sabellio* quidem in unione dissentiens, sed initium Christi ex *Maria* prædicabat. *Severus* Hist. Sac. *Wherefore it will not be unnecessary to collect out of Antiquity what did properly belong unto* Photinus, *because I think it not yet done, and we find it to begin and spread again.* Photinus mentis cæcitate decepus, in Christo verum, & substantiæ nostræ confessus est hominem, sed eundem Deum de Deo ante omnia sæcula genitum esse non credidit. *Leo* de Nativ. Christi, Serm. 4. Ecce *Photinus* hominem tantum profitetur Dei Filium, dicit illum non fuisse ante beatam *Mariam. Lucifer Claris.* Si quis in Christo sic veritatem prædicat animæ & carnis, ut veritatem in eo nolit accipere Deitatis, id est, qui sic dicit Christum hominem, ut Deum neget, non est Christianus Catholicus, sed Photinianus Hæreticus. *Fulg.* ad *Donat. l.* 16. Φωτεινὸς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγει τὸν γεγεννημένον, Θεὸν μὴ λέγων εἶναι τὸν τόκον, ἢ τὸν ἐκ μήτρας παρθένου ἄνθρωπον ὑποπεσόντα μεμεμένον θεῦ. *Theodot.* Homil. de Nativ. Ephes. Concil. *p.* 3. *c.* 10. Anathematizamus *Photinum*, qui *Hebionis* Hæresim instaurans, Dominum Jesum Christum tantum ex *Maria* Virgine confitetur. *Damasus* Profess. Fidei. Φάσκει δὲ ὅτος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς χειρὸν μὴ εἶναι, ἀπὸ δὲ Μαρίας ἢ δεῦρο αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν, ἐξότε, φησὶ, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπῆλθεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν, ἢ ἐγεννήθη ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου. Epiphan. Ἔλεγε δὲ ὡς θεὸς μὲν ὅτι παντοκράτωρ ἦν ὁ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας· τὴν δὲ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων γέννησίν τε ἢ ὕπαρξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀναίρει, ἀλλ' ἐκ Μαρίας γεγενῆσθαι τὸν Χριστὸν ἀσυγχώπτο. Sozomen *l.* 4. *c.* 6. *Photini* ergo secta hæc est. Dicit Deum singulum esse & solitarium, & more Judaico confitendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei Verbi, aut ullam Spiritus Sancti putat esse personam. Christum vero hominem tantummodo solitarium asserit, cui principium adscribit ex *Maria*; & hoc omnibus modis dogmatizat, solam nos personam Dei Patris, & solum Christum hominem colere debere. *Vinc. Lirinensis* Adv. Hæres. *c.* 17. *In the Disputation framed by* Vigilius *out of the seventh book of S.* Hilary, *as I conceive,* Photinus *rejecting the opinion of* Sabellius, *(whom* Socrates *and* Sozomen *said he followed) as impious, thus declares his own.* Unde magis ego dico, Deum Patrem Filium habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex *Maria* Virgine initium sumentem, qui per sanctæ conversationis excellentissimum atque inimitabile beatitudinis meritum, à Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus, & eximio Divinitatis honore donatus, *and again*; Ego Domino nostro Jesu Christo initium tribuo, purumque hominem fuisse affirmo, & per beatæ vitæ excellentissimum meritum Divinitatis honorem fuisse adeptum. vide eundem *lib.* 2. Adv. *Eutychen.*

Ignorat

Ignorat etiam *Fotinus* magnum pietatis, quod Apoſtolus memorat, ſacramentum, qui Chriſti ex Virgine fatetur exordium: Et propterea non credit ſine initio ſubſtantialiter Deum natum ex Deo Patre, in quo carnis veritatem confitetur ex Virgine. *Fulg.* ad *Thraſim. l.* 1. Gregory Nazianzen, *according to his cuſtome, gives a very brief, but remarkable expreſſion.* Φωτεινῆ τὸν χάπτοχειρῶν καὶ ἀπὸ Μαρίας ἀρχόμενον. Orat. 26. *But the Opinion of* Photinus *cannot be better underſtood then 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* Anathema's, *according to the ſeverall Hereſies then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of theſe the fifth aimes clearly at* Photinus. Si quis ſecundum præſcientiam vel prædeſtinationem ex *Maria* dicit filium eſſe, & non ante ſæcula ex Patre natum, apud Deum eſſe, & per eum facta eſſe omnia. Anathema ſit. *The* 13. 14. *and* 15. *alſo were particulars directed againſt him, as S.* Hilary *hath obſerved: but the laſt of all is moſt materiall.* Si quis Chriſtum Deum, Filium Dei, ante ſæcula ſubſiſtentem, & miniſtrantem Patri ad omnium perfectionem non dicat, ſed ex quo de *Maria* natus eſt, ex eo & Chriſtum & Filium nominarum eſſe, & initium accepiſſe ut ſit Deus, dicat, Anathema ſit. *Upon which the Obſervation of S.* Hilary *is this.* Concludi damnatio ejus Hæreſis, propter quam conventum erat, *(that is the* Photinian *)* expoſitione totius fidei cui adverſabatur, oportuit, quæ initium Dei Filii ex partu Virginis mentiebatur. *S. Hilar.* de Synod. contra *Arrianos. Thus was* Photinus *Biſhop of* Sirmium *condemned by a Council held in the ſame City. They all agreed ſuadenly in the condemnation of him,* Arrians, Semi-arrians *and* Catholicks; καθόλου εὐθὺς ſayes Socrates, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ὡς καλῶς καὶ δικαίως γενόμενον, πάντες ἐπῄνεσαν καὶ τότε καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα. *l.* 2. *c.* 29. *And becauſe his Hiſtory is very obſcure and intricate, take this brief Catalogue of his condemnations. 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 deliver'd only in a forged* Epilogus Concilii Romani. *He was then firſt condemned with* Marcellus *his maſter, as* Sulpitius Severus *relates, probably by the Synod at* Conſtantinople: *for in that* Marcellus *was deprived.* Sozom. *l.* 2. 33. Socrat. *l.* 1. 36. *Secondly, his Hereſy is renounced in the ſecond Synod at* Antioch. Athanaſ. *de Syn.* Socrat. *l.* 1. 19. *Thirdly, he was condemned in the Council of* Sardes. Epiphan. *&* Sulpitius Severus. *Fourthly, by a Council at* Milan. *S.* Hilar. *Fragm. 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. S.* Hilar. *Fragm. Sixthly, he was again condemned and depoſed at* Sirmium *by the Eaſtern Biſhops, and being convicted by* Baſil *Biſhop of* Ancyra, *was baniſhed from thence.* S. Hilar. Epiph. Socr. Sozom. Vigilius. *Indeed he was ſo generally condemned not onely then, but afterwards under* Valentinian, *as S.* Hierome *teſtifies, and the Synodic Epiſtle of the* Aquileian *Council, that his opinion was ſoon worn out of the world.* Ἦδη γὰρ καὶ διεσκεδάσθη εἰς ὀλίγον χρόνον ἡ τότε τῶν ἠπατημένων αἵρεσις, *ſayes* Epiphanius, *who lived not long after him. So ſuddenly was this opinion rejected by all Chriſtians, applauded by none but* Julian *the Heretick, who railed at S.* John *for making Chriſt God, and commended* Photinus *for denying it; as appeares by an Epiſtle written by* Iulian *unto him, as it is (though a mean*

tranſlation)

tranſlation) *delivered by* Facundus. Tu quidem, O *Photine*, verisimilis videris, & proximus ſalvare, bene faciens nequaquam in utero inducere, quem credidiſti Deum. *Facun. ad Juſtinian. l.* 4.

The ſecond Aſſertion, next to be made good, is, that the being which Chriſt had before he was begotten of the Virgin, was not any created, but the divine eſſence, by which he alwayes 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.* 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 ever the earth was, the Word was God*, the ſame God with whom he was. for we cannot with any ſhew of reaſon either imagine that he was with one God, and was another, becauſe there can be no more ſupreme Gods then 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 eternall and independent, in the third, of a † made, and depending God. eſpecially firſt, conſidering that the eternall God was ſo conſtantly among the *Jewes* call'd the Word, the onely reaſon which we can conceive why the Apoſtle ſhould thus uſe this phraſe: and then obſerving the manner of S. *Johns* writing, who riſes ſtrangely by degrees, making the laſt word of the

Heb. 3. 4.

Prov. 8. 23.

† *and that upon ſo poor a ground as the want of an Article, becauſe in the firſt place it is* ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, *in the ſecond,* θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, *not* ὁ θεός. *From hence to conclude,* ὁ θεὸς *is one God, that is,* κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *the ſupreme God;* θεὸς *another, no: the ſupreme, but one made God by him. Indeed they are beholding to* Epiphanius *for this Obſervation, whoſe words are theſe,* Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν θεὸς, ἄνευ τοῦ ἄρθρου, τὸν πυθόμενα

former

ἅπαμεν θεὸν τὸν ἐθνῶν, ἢ θεὸν τὸν ὄντα, (or rather ἐκ ὄντα.) ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν ὁ θεὸς, δῆλον ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρθρου τὸν ὄντα σημαίνομεν ἀληθῆ τε καὶ γινωσκόμενον. Samarit. *Hareſi.* *But whoſoever ſhall apply this rule to the ſacred Scriptures, will find it moſt fallacious. In the beginning* ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, *undoubtedly belongs to the true and ſupreme God: but it does not thence follow, that* πνεῦμα θεῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, *ſhould be underſtood of the Spirit of another, or inferiour God. Certainly S.* John, *when he ſpeaks of the Baptiſt* ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεῦ, *meant, he had his commiſſion from heaven; and when it is ſpoken of Chriſt,* ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεῦ γενέσθαι, *and again,* ἐκ θεῦ ἐγεννήθησαν, *it muſt be underſtood of the true God the Father. In the like manner,* θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε, *if it were taken* τυχόντως *of any ever called God, nay even of Chriſt Jeſus as man, it were certainly falſe. How can then any deny the Word to be the ſupreme God, becauſe he is called ſimply* θεὸς, *when S.* John *in the four next places, in which he ſpeaketh of the ſupreme God, mentioneth him without an Article? This Criticiſme of theirs was firſt the obſervation of* Arterius *the* Arrian, Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ μαχόμενος Παύλῳ χειρὸν κηρύσσειν τὴν τῆ θεῦ δύναμιν, ἢ τὴν τῆ θεῦ σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ δίχα τῆς περθήκης, δύναμιν θεῦ, καὶ θεῦ σοφίαν· ἄλλην μὲν οὖσαν τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῆ τῆ θεῦ δύναμιν τὴν ἔμψυτον αὐτῷ καὶ ζωὴν ἀρχὴν ἀγεννήτως, κηρύσσων. *Theſe are the words of* Arterius *recorded by* Athanaſius *Orat. 2. contra* Arrianos. *In which place notwithſtanding, none can deny but* θεῦ *is twice taken without an Article for the true and ſupreme God. Thus* Didymus *of* Alexandria *De Sp. S. 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 dona notantur. *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.* Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἦν τὸ ἄρθρον ἔχον τὸ περὶ τῆ περθήτου λεγόμενον νῦν πνεῦμα, ἵνα κἂν τοιοῦτον ἔχῃ. *Epiſt. ad* Serapionem. *Whereas we find in the ſame place of* S. John, *the ſame Spirit in the ſame ſenſe mentioned with and without an Article.* ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, *Joh.* 3. 5. *and,* τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆ πνεύματός, v. 6. *So 1 Joh.* 4. 1. μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα. *and again,* Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκετε τὸ πνεῦμα τῆ θεῦ· πᾶν πνεῦμα, &c. *And beſide, according to that diſtinction,* τὸ πνεῦμα *certainly ſtands for the gift of the Spirit,* 1 Theſſ. 5. 19. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε. *In the like manner, it is ſo farre from truth that the Scriptures obſerve ſo much the Articles, as to uſe* ὁ θεὸς *always for the true and ſupreme God, and* θεὸς *for the falſe or inferiour; that where the true is profeſſedly oppoſed to the falſe, even there he is ſtiled ſimply* θεός. *As,* ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν, ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς. Νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεὸν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεῦ. Gal. 4. 8, 9. *And where the ſupreme is diſtinguiſhed from him whom they make the inferiour God, he is called likewiſe* θεὸς *without an Article: as,* Παῦλος Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεῦ. *and* τῆ θελήματος

ματος θεῦ. 1 Cor. 1, 1, 2 Cor. 1. 1. Eph. 1. 1. Col. 1. 1. *And if this distinction were good, our Saviours argument to the Pharisees were not so.* Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι θεῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, Mat. 12. 28. *For it doth not follow, that if by the power of an inferiour or false God he cast out devils, that therefore the Kingdome of the true and supreme God is come upon them.*

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 darkneſſe, and the darkneſſe comprehended it not*: 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, then by having the same divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was begotten of the Virgin, was the divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.

Joh. 1. 4, 5.

Secondly, He who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equall 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 Virgins wombe, and existence in his humane nature. For, *being* (or rather † *subsisting*) *in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equall with God*: *But emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeneſſe of men.* 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 as much 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

Philip. 2. 6, 7. † In effigie Dei constitutus. *Tertull.* In figura Dei constitutus. *Cypr.*

nature

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 ſuffer'd 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. 'Tis true, at firſt he was ſubject, but as a Son, to his reputed father and undoubted mother. when he appear'd in publick, he lived after the manner of a Prophet, and a Doctour ſent from God, accompanied with a family, as 'twere, 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 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 likeneſſe of ſinfull fleſh*, ſubject unto all infirmities and miſeries of this life attending on the ſons of men fallen by the ſins 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 liv'd in a mean, low, and abject condition; *as a root out of a drie ground, he had no form nor comelineſſe*, 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 Apoſtles 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 diſadvantagious to that truth

Rom. 8. 3. *Gal.* 4. 4. *Iſa* 53. 2, 3.

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 likeneſſe of men.* where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the * originall text, and three diſtinct propoſitions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expreſſion of Chriſts exinanition, with an explication ſhewing in what it conſiſteth: which will clearly appear by this literall tranſlation, *But emptied himſelf, taking the form of a ſervant, being made in the likeneſſe of men.* Where if any man doubt how Chriſt emptied himſelf, the text will ſatisfie him, by taking the form of a ſervant; if any ſtill queſtion, how he took the form of a ſervant, he hath the Apoſtles reſolution, by being made in the likeneſſe of men. Indeed after the expreſſion of this exinanition, he goes on with a conjunction, to adde another act of Chriſts humiliation; a *And being found in faſhion as a man,* being already by his exinanition in the form of a ſervant, or the likeneſſe of men, *he humbled himſelf, and became* (or rather, † *becoming*) *obedient unto death, even the death of the croſſe.* As therefore his humiliation conſiſted in his obedience 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, b *Sacrifice and offering thou didſt not deſire, mine eares haſt thou opened:* the Apoſtle appropriateth the ſentence to Chriſt; *When he cometh into the world, he ſaith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldſt not, but a body haſt thou prepared me.* Now being the c boaring of the ear under the law was a note of perpetuall ſervitude, being this was expreſſed in the words of the

* ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος. *which is alſo exactly obſerved by the Vulgar Latine,* Sed ſemetipſum exinanivit, formam ſervi accipiens, in ſimilitudine hominum factus. *where* γενόμενος *is added by appoſition to* λαβών, *and have both equall relation to* ἐκένωσε *or, which is all one,* ἐκένωσε λαβών, ἔλαβε γενόμενος.

a *Phil.* 2. 8.

† ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, γενόμενος ὑπήκοος. *For in both theſe verſes there is but one conjunction, joyning together two acts of our Saviour, his firſt exinanition or* ἐκένωσε, *and his farther humiliation or* ἐταπείνωσε. *the reſt are all participles added for explication to the verbs.*

b *Pſal.* 40. 6. c *Ex.* 21. 6. *Deut.* 15. 17.

Pſalmiſt,

Pſalmiſt, and changed by the Apoſtle into the preparing of a body; it followeth, that when Chriſts body firſt was fram'd, 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 receive; muſt have that being before that aſſumption: but Chriſt is firſt expreſly ſaid to be in the form of God, and being ſo, to think it no robbery to be equall 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 of himſelf, and all exinanition neceſſarily preſuppoſeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impoſſible to empty any thing which hath no fulneſſe, as to fill any thing which hath no emptineſſe. But the fulneſſe 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 coevall with that precedent plenitude; then muſt we confeſſe, Chriſt was in the form of God before he was in the form of a ſervant: which is the ſecond Propoſition.

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 as really ſubſiſt in the divine nature, as in the nature of man. For he was ſo *in the form of God*, as thereby *to be* * *equall with God*. But no other

* τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. Patriarchæ Deo. *Tertul.* Eſſe ſe æqualem Deo. *Cypr.* Eſſe æqualis Deo. *Leporius.* *Thus all expreſſe the notion of equality, not of ſimilitude: nor can we underſtand any leſſe by* τὸ εἶναι ἴσα.

then τὸν ἰσόθεον, ἶσον and ἴσα being indifferently uſed by the Greeks. as Pindarus *Olym. Ode* 2.

ἶσον δὲ νύκτιον ἄεθλον,
ἴσα δ' ἐν ἁμέρᾳ ἄλλοτε ἄλλοις
ἔχοντες, ἀπονέστερον
ἰσχὺν γνώσεσθαι ἕκατον.

So whom the Greeks call ἰσόθεον, Homer ἶσα θεῷ. Odyſſ. o.

Τὸν νῦν ἶσα θεῷ Ἰθακήσιοι εἰσορόωσι.

where ἶσα has not the nature of an adverb, as belonging to εἰσορόωσι, but of a Noun referred to the antecedent Τὸν, or including an adverb added to a noun, τὸν νῦν ὡς ἰσόθεον. The collection of Grotius from this verſe is very ſtrange, εἶναι ἶσα θεῷ, eſt ſpectari tanquam Deum. As if he ſhould have ſaid, εἰσορόωσι ſignifies ſpectant, therefore εἶναι ſignifies ſpectari. This he was forced to put off thus; becauſe the ſtrength of our interpretation, rendring an equality, lies in the verb ſubſtantive τὸ εἶναι. For we acknowledge that ἶσα by it ſelf oft-times ſignifieth no more then 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 כ, as כְּלֵילוֹת quaſi in nocte, ἶσα νυκτί. 5. 14. כִּגְבִנָּה, ſicut caſeum, ἶσα τυρῷ. 10. 10. כְּרָקָב, quaſi putredo, Sym. ὁμοίως ζηπεδόνι, LXX ἶσα ἀσκῷ. 13. 28. כַּמַּיִם, ſicut aquam, ἶσα ποτῷ. 15. 16. כָּעֵץ, tanquam lignum, ἶσα ξύλῳ. 24. 20. כָּחֹמֶר, ſicut lutum, ἶσα πηλῷ. 27. 16. כַּמַּלְבּוּשׁ ſicut veſtimento, ἶσα ἱματίῳ. 29. 14 כְּבָקָר quaſi bos, ἶσα βοΐ. 40. 15. *Where we ſee the vulgar Latine uſeth for the Hebrew* כ quaſi, ſicut, tanquam, *the* LXX ἶσα. *Sometime it anſwereth to no word in the Originall, but ſupplieth a ſimilitude underſtood, not expreſſed in the Hebrew: as* עִיר, tanquam pullum, ἶσα ὄνῳ. 11. 12. וְאֶבֶן, & lapis, ἶσα λίθῳ. 18. 2. לְחֹמֶר, luto, ἶσα πηλῷ. 30. 19. *Once it rendreth an Hebrew word, rather according to the intention, then the ſignification;* כְּשֵׁלִי־אֹפֶר, comparabitur cineri. Ad verbum, proverbia cineris, ἶσα σποδῷ. 13. 12. *So that in all theſe places it is uſed adverbially for* inſtar, *and in none hath the addition of* τὸ εἶναι *to it.*

form beſide the eſſentiall, which is the divine nature it ſelf, could inferre an equality with God. *To whom will ye liken me, and make me equall? ſaith the Holy one.* There can be but one infinite, eternall and independent being; and there can be no compariſon between that, and whatſoever is finite, temporall, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himſelf equall with God, as being in the form of God, muſt be conceived to ſubſiſt in that one infinite, eternall, and independent nature of God. Again, the phraſe, *in the form of God*, not elſewhere mention'd, is uſed by the Apoſtle with a reſpect un-

Iſa. 40. 25. 46. 5.

to

to that other, of the *form of a ſervant*, exegetically continued *in the likeneſſe of man*; and the reſpect of one unto the other is ſo neceſſary, that if the form of God be not as reall and eſſentiall as the form of a ſervant, or the likeneſſe 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 Chriſts exinanition. But by the *form*, is certainly underſtood the true condition of a ſervant, and by *the likeneſſe*, infallibly meant the reall 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 expreſſe words of S. *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 ſubſiſted doth as truly ſignifie the divine, as the likeneſſe of man, the humane nature; it neceſſarily followeth, that Chriſt had a reall 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.

Thirdly, He which is expreſly ſtiled Alpha and Omega, the firſt and the laſt, without any reſtriction or limitation; as he is after, ſo was before any time aſſigneable, truly and eſſentially God. For by this title God deſcribeth his own being, and diſtinguiſheth 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 expreſly 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.* Iſa. 41, 4. 48, 12. 44, 6. Rev. 1. 11.

last. which anſwereth to that ſolemn call and proclamation in the Prophet, *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Iſrael my called.* He comforteth S. *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 Judgement with the ſame aſſertion, *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 reſtriction or limitation, without any aſſignation of any particular 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 attributed to the ſupreme God. There is yet another Scripture, in which the ſame deſcription may ſeem of a more dubious interpretation: a *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, the Almighty*; that

Iſa. 48. 12.

Rev. 1. 17.

13.

2. 8.

Rev. 22. 13.

* *With the Article, ſo much elſewhere ſtood upon,* τὸ Α̃ καὶ τὸ Ω̃, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος. *The Alpha and the Omega, the firſt and the laſt. For we muſt not take* τὸ Α̃ *as the Grammarians do, by which they ſignifie only the letter written in that figure, and called by that name.*

As appeareth by Eratoſthenes, *who was called* Βῆτα, *not* τὰ βήματα, *as* Suidas *corruptly.* Heſychius Illuſtrius, *from whom* Suidas *had that paſſage;* Ἐρατοσθένης διὰ τὸ δευτερεύειν πάντα ἐδεῖτο παιδείας τοῖς ἄκροις ἐγγίζων. Βῆτα ἐκλήθη. *And* Martianus Heracleota *in* Periplo, καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνον Ἐρατοσθένην, ὃν Βῆτα ἐκάλεσαν οἱ τῆς Μουσικῆς παῖδες. a Rev. 1. 8.

is,

is, the ſupreme eternall God, of the ſame divine eſſence with the Father, who was before deſcribed by, *him which is, and which was, and which is to come*; to whom the ſix wing'd beaſts continually cry, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and 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 S. *John*, and expreſſe 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 eternall 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 ſtile upon him, by which the Father did expreſſe his Godhead; it followeth, that he hath declar'd himſelf to be the ſupreme, almighty, and eternall 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 eternall God.

4. *Rev.* 4. 8. *Exod.* 3. 14.

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 expreſly call'd *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 onely God. But Chriſt was he whoſe glory *Iſaiah* ſaw, as S. *John* doth teſtifie, 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 certainly 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

Iſa. 6. 1, 3. *Jo.* 12. 41. 36. 37.

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; 38. *that the saying of Esaias the Prophet might be fulfill'd, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report?* And as they did not, so *they could not believe* in Christ, 39. *because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their* 40. *eyes and hardned 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 foresaw, 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 *Jewes* refusing to assent unto the doctrine of our Saviour, were those of 41. 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 *Isaiah* in that chapter spake were Christ himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardned hearts belong unto these *Jewes*, 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 *Isaiah*'s vision, and the appropriation of it unto Christ. Wherefore S. *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 eternall God; and consequently both together have seal'd this truth, that Christ did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternall Godhead.

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 onely and eternall God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other then the divine essence. Because all novity is repugnant to the

Deity,

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 Eternall God. Which may be thus demonſtrated. It hath been already prov'd, 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 one. It had been then enough to have alledg'd that Chriſt is God, to prove his ſupreme and eternall Deity: whereas now we are anſwered, that there are Gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name, that he is the one eternall 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 numbred 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.* Pſ. 82. 6. But we muſt not reckon Chriſt among thoſe Gods, we muſt not number the onely-begotten Son among thoſe children. For *they knew not, neither would they underſtand, they walked on in darkneſſe*: and whoſoever were Gods onely as they were, either did or might do ſo. Whereas Chriſt, *in whom alone dwelt all the fulneſſe of the Godhead bodily*, is not onely diſtinguiſht from, but oppoſed to ſuch Gods as thoſe, by his diſciples 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 darkneſſe.* S. *Paul* hath told us *there be gods many, and lords many*; but withall 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 5. Col. 1. 9. Joh. 16. 30. Joh. 1. 12. 1 Cor. 8. 5. 6.

oppos'd 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 ſtiled 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 Eternall God.

Again, thoſe who deny our Saviour to be the ſame God with the Father, have invented rules to be the touchſtone of the eternall power and Godhead. Firſt, where the name of God is taken abſolutely, as the ſubject of any propoſition, it alwayes 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 whenſoever 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 eternall 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 (whereof examples are innumerable;) though, if thoſe rules were granted, yet would

would not their Concluſion follow, becauſe the ſupreme God is often named (as they confeſſe) without an Article, and therefore the ſame name may ſignifie the ſame God, when ſpoken of Chriſt, as well as when of the Father, ſo farre as can concern the omiſſion of the Article: Yet, to complete my demonſtration, I ſhall ſhew 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 ſignifie that excellency, as the Article could have.

5. *Paul* unfolding the myſtery of Godlineſſe, hath delivered ſix Propoſitions together, and the ſubject of all and each of them is God. *Without controverſy great is the myſtery of godlineſſe: 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.* 1 Tim. 3. 16. 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 Baptiſme, 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 by the Spirit. His Nativity the Angels celebrated, in the diſcharge of his Office they miniſtred unto him, at his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion they were preſent, alwayes ready to confeſſe 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* S. Paul *from his mothers wombe, and called him by his grace, to reveal his Son unto him, that he might preach him among the heathen*: therefore he was God

* *Act.* 8. 5, 35. 9, 20. 11, 20. 17, 3, 18. 19, 13. *Rom.* 16. 25. 2 *Cor.* 1. 19. 1, 4. *Phil.* 1. 18.
† *Gal.* 1. 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.* *We have believed in Jeſus Chriſt*, ſaith S. *Paul*, who ſo taught the Jaylor trembling at his feet, *Believe in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and thou ſhalt be ſaved*: he therefore was God believed on in the world. When he had been forty dayes 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 in 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 S. *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 ſhew 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 men, *and received up in glory*, that is, was received glorioufly on earth, they teach us a language which the † Scriptures know not, and the Holy Ghoſt never us'd.

* *Act.* 19. 4.

Gal. 2. 16.

Act. 16 31.

† *For* θεὸς *is not* θέλημα θεοῦ, *much leſſe*

is ἀνελήφθη *received or embraced.* Elias *ſpeaketh not of his reception, but his aſcenſion, when he ſaith to* Eliſha, τί ποιήσω σοι πρὶν ἢ ἀναληφθῆναι ἀπό σου. 2 *Kings* 2. 9. *and,* ἐὰν ἴδῃς με ἀναλαμβανόμενον ἀπό σου ἔσται σοι οὕτως. *When he actually aſcended, as the Originall* ויעל, *it is no otherwiſe tranſlated by the Septuagint, then* ἀνελήφθη Ἠλιὰς ἐν συσσεισμῷ ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. *which language was preſerved by the Helleniſing Jews.* ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἐν λαίλαπι πυρός. *Syrac.* 48. 9. *and again,* ἀνελήφθη ἕως εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. 1 *Macc.* 2. 58. *Neither did they uſe it of* Elias *onely, but of* Enoch *alſo.* Οὐδὲ οἷς ἔκτισεν οἷος ὁ Ἐνὼχ εὐηρέστησε ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. *The ſame language is continued in the New Teſtament of our Saviours Aſcenſion,* ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. *Mar.* 16. 19 ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. *Act.* 1. 11. *and ſingly,* ἀνελήφθη. *Act.* 1. 2. *and* ἀνελήφθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν. *Act.* 1. 22. *As therefore* ἀνάληψις τῶ

And

Μωσέως in the language of the Iewes, was not the reception of Moſes *by the* Iſraelites, *but the aſſumption of his body; ſo* ἀνάληψις τοῦ Χριστοῦ *is the Aſcenſion of Chriſt.* Luk. 9. 51. *Wherefore this being the conſtant notion of the word, it muſt ſo be here likewiſe underſtood,* ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ. *as the Vulgar Latine, whoſe authority is pretended againſt us,* aſſumptum eſt in gloria; *rendring it here by the ſame word, by which he alwayes tranſlated* ἀνελήφθη.

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 onely Perſon to whom all theſe clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here joyntly attributed unto God, as ſure as the name of God is expreſſed in all the * Copies of the Originall language, ſo thus abſolutely and ſubjectively taken muſt it be underſtood of Chriſt.

* *For being the Epiſtle was written in the Greek language, it is enough if thoſe Copies do agree. I confeſſe the Vulgar Latine reads it otherwiſe;* Quod manifeſtatum eſt in carne. *and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however tranſlated by* Tremellius, *agreeth with the Latine; and both ſeem to have read* ὃ *inſtead of* Θεός. *But the joynt conſent of all the Greek Copies and Interpreters are above the authority of theſe two Tranſlatours; nor is the Arabick in this caſe conſiderable, as having no ſuch Antiquity as the former. But that which* Grotius *hath obſerved is of farre greater conſideration.* Addit Hincmarus opuſculo 55. illud Θεὸς hic poſitum à *Neſtorianis. For if at firſt the Greeks read* ὃ ἐφανερώθη, *and that* ὃ *were altered into* Θεὸς *by the* Neſtorians; *then ought we to correct the Greek Copy by the Latine, and confeſſe there is not onely 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 Originall* ὃ, *and make it* Θεὸς, *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 unto heaven, but Chriſt by the Holy Ghoſt remaining upon him,* καὶ τὴν ἀνάληψιν αὐτῷ χαριζόμενον. Concil. Epheſ. *part.* 1. *cap.* 17. *Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, becauſe the Catholick Greeks read it* Θεὸς *before there were ſuch Hereticks.* Neſtoriani à *Neſtorio* Epiſcopo Patriarcha *Conſtantinopolitano.* Aug. *Hæreſ.* Neſtorius *from whom that Hereſy began, was Patriarch of* Conſtantinople *after* Siſinnius, Siſinnius *after* Atticus. Atticus *after* Nectarius, *who ſucceeded* Joannes, *vulgarly call'd* Chryſoſtomus. *But S.* Chryſoſtome *read not* ὃ, *but* Θεὸς, *as appears*

Again,

by his Commentaries upon the place. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, τυτέστιν ὁ δημιουργός. *And S.* Cyril, *who by all means oppos'd* Neſtorius *upon the firſt appearance of his Hereſy, wrote two large Epiſtles to the Queens* Pulcheria *and* Eudocia; *in both which he maketh great uſe of this Text. In the firſt, after the repetition of the words as they are now in the Greek Copies, he proceedeth thus;* Τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς; ἢ δῆλον, ὅτι πάντα τὰ κτίσματος λόγος. ὅπου δὲ ἔγωγε μέγα τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ. *Wherefore in* S. Paul *he read* Θεὸς God, *and took that God to be the Word. In the ſecond, repeating the ſame text verbatim, he manageth it thus againſt* Neſtorius. Εἰ Θεὸς ὢν ὁ λόγος ἐνανθρωπῆσαι λέγοιτο, καὶ ὃ μὴ πω μαθὼν τὸ οἶναι θεὸς, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς ἦν ἀεὶ διαμένων, μέγα δὴ τότε καὶ ὁμολογούμενον μέγα ὅτι τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. εἰ δὲ ἄνθρωπος νοεῖται κοινὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, πῶς ἐν σαρκὶ φανερώθη; καί τοι πῶς οὐκ ἄπασιν ἐναργὲς, ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐν ζωῇ τὸ εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἄν ἑτέρως ὁρῶτό τινα; *And in the explanation of his ſecond Anathematiſme, he maketh uſe of no other Text but this, to prove the Hypoſtaticall Union; giving it this gloſſe or expoſition.* Τί ὅτι τὸ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ; τυτέστι γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, &c. *The ſame he urgeth in his Scholion De* Unigenito Incarnatione. *So alſo* Theodoret *contemporary with* S. Cyril, Θεὸς γὰρ ὢν καὶ θεοῦ υἱὸς, καὶ ἀόρατον ἔχων τὴν φύσιν, δῆλος ἅπασιν ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐγένετο, σαφῶς ἡμᾶς δύο φύσεις ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν σαρκὶ δὲ τὴν θείαν ἔφη φανερωθῆναι φύσιν. *Thirdly,* Hincmarus *does not ſay that the* Neſtorians *put* Θεὸς *into the Greek text; but that he which put it in was caſt out of his Biſhoprick for a* Neſtorian. *His words are theſe.* Quidam nimirum ipſas Scripturas verbis inlicitis impoſturaverunt, ſicut *Macedonius Conſtantinopolitanus* Epiſcopus, qui ab *Anaſtaſio* Imperatore ideo à Civitate expulſus legitur, quoniam falſavit Evangelia, & illum Apoſtoli locum ubi dicit, *quod apparuit in carne, juſtificatum eſt in Spiritu,* per cognationem Græcarum literarum O in Θ hoc modo mutando falſavit. Ubi enim habuit Qui, hoc eſt ΟΣ monoſyllabum . græcum, littera mutata O in Θ vertit, & fecit ΘΣ, id eſt ut eſſet, Deus apparuit per carnem. Quapropter tanquam *Neſtorianus* fuit expulſus. *Hincm.* Opuſc. 55. c. 18. *Now whereas* Hincmarus *ſayes* expulſus legitur, *we read not in* Eutgrius, *or the* Excerpta *of* Theodorus, *or in* Johannes Malala, *that* Macedonius *was caſt out of his Biſhoprick 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* Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtories *and Acts of the Councils, partly out of the relations of ſuch men as he thought fit to believe, extant in the fourth Tome of the Councils. In which, chap.* 19. *we have the ſame Relation, onely with this difference, that* O *is not turn'd into* Θ *but into* Ω; *and ſo* ΟΣ *becomes not* ΘΣ *but* ΩΣ. *So that firſt the Greek Copies are not ſaid to have read it* ὃ *but* ὃς, *and ſo not to have relation to the myſtery, but to the perſon of Chriſt; and therefore this makes nothing for the vulgar Latine. Secondly, whereas* Hincmarus *ſayes there was but one letter chang'd, no ſuch mutation can of* ΟΣ *make* ΘΕΟΣ, *it may* ΩΣ, *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 Catholick Biſhops under the pretence of* Neſtorianiſme, *but for other reaſons. Howſoever* Macedonius

cedonius could not falſifie 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* θεὸς, *without queſtion* Anaſtaſius *would have taken care for the reſtoring* ὃς, *which we find not in any Copy. It remaineth therefore that the* Neſtorians *did not falſifie the Text by reading* θεὸς ἐφανερώθη, *but that the Ancient Greek Fathers read it ſo; and conſequently, being the Greek is the Original, this Lection muſt be acknowledged Authenticall.*

Again, S. *Paul* ſpeaketh thus to the Elders of the Church of *Epheſus, Take heed unto your ſelves, 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 bloud.* In theſe words this doctrinall propoſition is clearly contained; God hath purchaſed the Church with his own bloud. For there is no other word either in or near the Text, which can by any Grammaticall conſtruction be joyned 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 bloud. If then the Holy Ghoſt hath not purchaſed the Church, if he hath not bloud to ſhed for our redemption, *and without bloudſhed there is no remiſſion*, if there be no other word to which, according to the literall conſtruction, the act of purchaſing can be applied, if the name of God, moſt frequently joyned to his * Church, 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 bloud. But this

Act. 20. 28.

**τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. For though the Church be properly the Church of Chriſt,* Mat. 16. 18. Col. 1. 24. *and in the plurall we read once* αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Χριστοῦ, Rom. 16. 16. *as we do of the Churches of God,* 1 Cor. 11. 16. 2 Theſſ. 1. 4. 2, 14. *yet* ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ *is frequently uſed, as* 1 Cor. 1. 2. 10, 32. 15, 9. 11, 22. 2 Cor. 1. 1, 13. 1 Tim. 3. 5, 15. *but* ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Χριστοῦ *not once named. And therefore we have no reaſon to alter it in this Text, or to phanſy it firſt written* χῦ, *and then made* θῦ, *when it is ſo often written* θεῦ, *not* Χριστοῦ. *Some MSS. repreſent* κυρίου ϗ θεοῦ, *which makes not at all againſt our argument; but, becauſe in this particular unuſuall, not like to be true. The Syriac tranſlating it* Chriſti, *gives rather an expoſition then a verſion.*

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* 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. *redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.* 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 Mediatourship; and *there is but one Mediatour between God and men*: and the Church is *sanctified* Heb. 10. 10. *through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attributed 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 ransome 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 then the Father. *Not by the* Heb. 9. 12. *blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entred in once into the holy place.* and whereas *the High priest entred 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 Aaronicall, who made atonement by the blood of others. But the Father taketh no priestly Office, neither could he be opposed to the legall Priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore whersoever the Father and the Son are described

† ἴδιον αἷμα is opposed to ἄιμα ἀλλότριον.

ſcribed together as working the ſalvation of man, the bloud by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the Father: as when S. *Paul* ſpeaketh of the *redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt, whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation through faith in his bloud, to declare his righteouſneſſe*; his, that is, his own righteouſneſſe, hath reference to God the Father; but his, that is, his own bloud, muſt be referr'd 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 bloud*, as that which cannot be attributed to the Father. Chriſt hath bleſſed us, and the Apoſtle ſaith, the Father hath bleſſed us: which is true, becauſe *he ſent his ſon to bleſſe 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 hath delivered us, and the Father is ſaid to *deliver us from the power of darkneſſe*; not that we are twice delivered, but becauſe the Father delivereth us by his Son. And thus theſe generall 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 'tis 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 both deliver us from ſin and death: but the Son *gave himſelf for our ſins, that he might deliver us*; 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 darkneſſe, and hath tranſlated us into the kingdome of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his bloud.*

Rom. 3. 25. ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ.

Eph. 1. 6. 7.

Act. 3. 26.

Eph. 1. 9.

Gal. 1. 4.

Col. 1. 13, 14.

Now this bloud is not onely the bloud of the new Covenant, and consequently, of the Mediatour: but the nature of this Covenant is such, that it is also a Testament, and therefore the bloud must be the bloud of the Testatour;

Heb.9.16. *for where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testatour.* But the Testatour which died, is not, cannot be the Father, but the Son, and consequently, the bloud is the bloud of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth therefore that God, who purchased the Church with his own bloud, is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or any other which is called God, but onely 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.

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 call'd Emmanuel, is named God by way of Excellency; for

Mat.1.23. that name, saith S. *Matthew, being interpreted, is God with us,* and in that interpretation the Greek † Article is

† καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.

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.* 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 call'd Emmanuel, but that he is not what he is called: as *Moses* built an Altar

Ex.17.15. *and call'd the name of it, Jehovah Nissi,* and *Gideon* another, *call'd Jehovah shalom*; and yet neither Altar was

Judg.6.24. Jehovah: as *Jerusalem* was call'd, *the Lord our righteousness,*

Jer.33.16. and yet that city was not the Lord. Because these two notions which are conjoyned in the name Emmanuel, are severally true of Christ. First, he is Emmanu,

that

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 alway, 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 Wonderfull, Counſellour, the Mighty God.* He then who is both properly called El, that is, God, and is alſo really Emmanu, 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 righteouſneſſe*, 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 Evangelicall interpretation, with an expreſſion of that excellency which belongeth to the ſupreme Deity.

Joh. 1. 14. *Mat.* 28. 20. ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί. *Iſ.* 9. 6. אל גבור *Ezek.* 48. 35.

Again, He to whom S. *Thomas* ſaid, *my Lord, and my God*, or rather, the Lord of me, and the God of me, he is that God, before whoſe name the Greek * Article is prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But S. *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 con-

Joh. 20. 28. * ὁ Κύριός μου, καὶ ὁ Θεός μου. *Either in theſe words there is an Ellipſis of* εἶ σύ, *Thou art my Lord, thou art my God; or an Antiptoſis, the Nominative caſe uſed for the Vocative, as* ἐλωΐ, ἐλωΐ, ὁ θεός μου, ὁ θεός μου, Mark 15. 34. ἀββᾶ ὁ πατὴρ, Mark 14. 36, *and* Χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Joh. 19. 3. *If it be an Ellipſis of the Verb* εἰ *ſo frequent in the Scriptures, and of the Perſon ſufficiently underſtood in the preceding Pronouns; then is it evident that* ὁ θεός *is attributed unto Chriſt, for then S.* Thomas *ſaid unto him,* Thou art ὁ θεός μου. *If it be an Antiptoſis, though the conſtruction*

require not a verb, yet the ſignification virtually requireth as much, which is equivalent; for he acknowledgeth him as much God while he calleth him ſo, as if he did affirm he is ſo. and being theſe words were an expreſſion of the Apoſtles 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 virtuall Propoſition. And in that Propoſition, ὁ Θεός muſt be the predicate, and Chriſt to whom theſe words are ſpoken muſt alſo be the ſubject. It cannot therefore be avoided, but that S. Thomas did attribute the name of God to our Saviour with an Article. Indeed to me there is no doubt but S. Thomas in theſe words did make as true and reall a confeſſion of his faith concerning the Perſon of Chriſt, as S. Peter did, when he anſwered and ſaid, Thou art Chriſt, the Son of the living God. Mat. 16. 16. *and conſequently, that ὁ κύριός and ὁ Θεός do as properly belong unto him, as S. Peter's ὁ Χριστός, and ὁ υἱός.*

feſſion of his faith; for our Saviour replied, *Thomas, becauſe thou haſt ſeen me, thou haſt believed.* And let him be the Lord of me, and the God of me, who was the Lord, and the God of an Apoſtle.

Nor have we only their required teſtimony of Chriſts ſupreme Divinity, but alſo an addition of verity aſſerting that ſupremacy. For he is not onely 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 Authours, hath alſo aſſured us that he is the true God. For, [a] *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 eternall life.* As therefore we read in the *Acts*, of the [b] *Word which God ſent unto the children of Iſrael, preaching peace by Jeſus Chriſt; he is Lord of all:* where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the pronoun [*] *he* joyned unto Jeſus Chriſt, 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 alledged why theſe laſt

a 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἥκει καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινόν· καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Hic agitur non ſolum de vero Deo, ſed de illo uno vero Deo, ut articulus in Græco additus indicat. *Catech. Racov.*

b *Act.* 10. 36. [*] Ὅς ἐστι *for* ὅς. *as* Act. 8. 16. ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Γάζαν, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος, quæ eſt deſerta.

laſt words ſhould not be referred to the Son of God, but only this, that in grammaticall conſtruction they may be aſcribed to the Father. As, when *another king aroſe which knew not Joſeph, the ſame dealt ſubtilly with our kindred*; 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 grammaticall 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 ſoleciſme in the ſyntax. Wherefore being Jeſus Chriſt is the immediate Antecedent to which the Relative may properly be referr'd; being the Son of God is he of whom the Apoſtle chiefly ſpeaketh; being this is rendred 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 S. *John* the conſtant title of our Saviour is eternall life; being all theſe reaſons may be drawn out of the text it ſelf, 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 leſſe, then that our Saviour is *the true God*, ſo ſtiled by way of eminency, with an Article prefixed. *Act.* 7. 18, 19.

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 expreſſe the ſupreme Majeſty. As when S. *Paul* doth magnifie the *Jewes, out of whom, as concerning the fleſh, Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever, Amen.* Firſt, it is evident that Chriſt is called † *God*, even he who came of the *Jewes*, though not *Rom.* 9. 5.

† *Though ſome would leave God out of the Text, upon this pretenſe; becauſe S.* Cyprian *Lib.* 2. *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

as

in their Copies, and both the MSS. which Pamelius *us'd acknowledge it. Secondly, becauſe* S. Cypr. *produceth the text to prove* Quod Deus Chriſtus; *and reckoneth it among the reſt in which he is call'd expreſly God. Thirdly, becauſe* Tertullian, *whoſe diſciple* S. Cyprian *profeſſed himſelf, did both ſo read it and ſo uſe it.* Solum autem Chriſtum potero Deum dicere, ſicut ideo Apoſtolus. Ex quibus Chriſtus, qui eſt, *inquit*, Deus ſuper omnia benedictus in ævum omne. Adv. *Praxeam. And again in the ſame Book:* Hunc & *Paulus* conſpexit, nec tamen Patrem vidit. Nonne inquit, vidi Jeſum? Chriſtum autem & ipſum Deum cognominavit. Quorum Patres, & ex quibus Chriſtus ſecundum carnem, qui eſt per (vel ſuper) omnia Deus benedictus in ævum. *Novatianus* de Trinitate *uſeth the ſame Argument. And another ancient Authour very expreſly;* Rogo te, Deum credis eſſe filium, an non? Sine dubio, reſponſurus es, Deum. quia eſſe negare volueris, ſanctis Scripturis convinceris, dicente Apoſtolo, Ex quibus Chriſtus ſecundum carnem, qui eſt ſuper omnia Deus benedictus in ſæcula. *So alſo* S. Aug. Non ſolum Pater Deus eſt, ſicut etiam omnes hæretici concedunt, ſed etiam Filius, quod velint nolint, coguntur fateri, dicente Apoſtolo, Qui eſt ſuper omnia Deus benedictus in ſæcula. *De Trin. l.* 2. *c.* 13. *& contra* Fauſtum. *l.* 16. *c.* 15. *As for the Objection, that* S. Chryſoſtome *doth not ſignifie in his Commentaries, that he read* θεὸς *in the Text: I anſwer that, neither does he ſignifie that he read* ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, *for in his expoſition he paſſeth over wholly* ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός· *but it doth not follow that he read not* ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων *in the Text. But when he repeats the words of the Apoſtle, he agrees wholly with the Greek Text,* ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητός. *and* Theodoret, *who lived not long after him, doth not only acknowledge the words, but give a full Expoſition of them.* Ἦρκει μὲν ἡ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα προσδήκη παραδηλῶσαι τὴν δεσπότου Χριστοῦ πρὸς θεότητα· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ εἰρηκὼς, τὸν γενόμενον ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, ἐπήγαγε, τὸν ὁρισθέντα υἱὸν θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει· ὅτως ἐνταῦθα εἰπὼν, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, προσέθεικε τὸ, ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. *As for the omiſſion of* D.us *in* S. Hilary *on the Pſalmes, 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, & ex quibus Chriſtus, qui eſt ſuper omnia Deus.* Non hic creatura in Deum deputatur, ſed creaturarum Deus eſt, qui ſuper omnia Deus eſt.

τὸ κατὰ σάρκα *oppoſed unto* τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα. *as* Rom. 1. 3.

as he came of them, that is, according to the fleſh, which is here diſtinguiſhed from his Godhead. Secondly, he is ſo called God, as not to be any of the many Gods, but the one ſupreme or moſt high God; *where* κατὰ σάρκα *is uſed without an article, becauſe* κατὰ πνεῦμα *to which it is oppoſed followeth, and ſo the oppoſition is of it ſelf apparent. But here being*

† for

κατὰ πνεῦμα is not to be expreſſed in the following words, the article τὸ, ſignifying of it ſelf a diſtinction or exception, ſheweth that it is to be underſtood.

† for he *is* God *over all*. Thirdly, he hath alſo added the title of *bleſſed*; which of it ſelf elſewhere ſignifieth the * ſupreme God, and was alwayes uſed by the *Jewes* to expreſſe that one God of *Iſrael*. Wherefore it cannot be conceived S. *Paul* ſhould write unto the Chriſtians, moſt of which then were converted *Jewes* or proſelytes, and give unto our Saviour not only the name of God, but alſo adde that title which they alwayes 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 alwayes in that manner and under that notion had adored. As therefore the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of a *the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is bleſſed for evermore*, of the Creatour, *who is bleſſed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth ſignifie the ſupreme Deity, which was ſo glorified by the *Iſraelites*; and doth alſo

† ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων. Vet in omnibus, as Erasmus, nor ſuper omnes, as Beza, with reference to the Fathers, which ſhould have been ὑπὲρ πάντων αὐτῶν; but as the Vulgar Tranſlation, & the Ancient Fathers before that, ſuper omnia, ὑπὲρ for ἐπάνω, as Joh. 3. 31. ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστί. which ſignifies no leſſe then עליון, the ordinary name of God, ὁ ὕψιστος, the moſt high: as it is taken for the ſupreme God by it ſelf, Act. 7. 48. and is deſcribed, Pſ. 97. 9. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ Κύριε ὁ ὕψιστος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, σφόδρα ὑπερυψώθης ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς θεούς. * As Mark 14. 61. Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the Bleſſed? where the vulgar attributes is taken for God himſelf, which is uſually added to the name of God; as 2 Cor. 11. 31. ὁ θεὸς, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. or any deſcription of him; as ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν. And theſe expreſſions of S. Paul are conſonant to the ancient cuſtome of the Iewes, who, when the Prieſt in the Sanctuary rehearſed the Name of God, were wont to anſwer, Bleſſed be his name for ever. Inſomuch as the Bleſſed one, did ſignifie in their language, as much as the Holy one, and both, or either of them, the God of Iſrael. Hence are ſo frequent in the Rabbins, הקדוש ברוך הוא the holy bleſſed one, and ברוך הוא, the Bleſſed one; that they are written by abbreviation הקב"ה, or הב"ה, and the infinite bleſſed one אם בה"ו Bleſſed be God for ever, Amen, and Amen. ביולאו, and יולאו. a 2 Cor. 11. 31. Rom. 1. 25.

teſtifie 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 ſtile, *who is over all, God bleſſed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth teſtifie the equality, or rather identity of his Deity. If we conſider the ſcope of the Apoſtle, which is to magnifie the *Iſraelites* by the enumeration of ſuch priviledges 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*, 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 eternall 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 ſtiled Alpha and Omega without any reſtriction or limitation; He who was truly ſubſiſting in the form of God, and equall with him, before he was in the nature of man; He who being man is frequently called God, and that in all thoſe wayes 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 eternall and indiviſible divine eſſence, by which he alwayes was truly, really, and properly God. But all 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

was not any created, but the divine eſſence; nor was he any Creature, but the true eternall God: which was our ſecond Aſſertion, particularly oppoſed to the * *Arrian* hereſy.

* *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 *the Biſhop of Alexandria in his Epiſtle extant in* Theodoret. Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἀναθεματιδέντες αἱρεσιῶται ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων μὲν Ἄρειος, ἀπὸ διακόνων δὲ, Ἀχιλλᾶς, Εὐζάϊος, Ἄρειος & ἕτερος, &c. *In the Epiſtle of the Arrians to Alexander, he is reckoned amongſt the Presbyters.* Ἄρειος, Ἀειθαλὴς, Ἀχιλλᾶς, Καρπώνης, Σαρματᾶς Ἄρειος, πρεσβύτεροι. *Of theſe two* Phœbadius *contra* Arrian. Patrem & Filium eſſe non unam perſonam, ut *Sabellius*, aut duas ſubſtantias, ut *Arrii*. c. 2. *The Hereſy is ſo well known, that it needs no explication: and indeed it cannot be better deſcribed then in the Anathematiſme of the* Nicene *Council.* Τὸς δὲ λέγοντας ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ Καθολικὴ καὶ Ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία. *thus tranſlated by S.* Hilary. Eos autem qui dicunt, erat quando non erat, & antequam naſceretur non erat, & quod de non extantibus factus eſt, vel ex alia ſubſtantia aut eſſentia, dicentes eſſe convertibilem & demutabilem Deum, hos anathematizat Catholica Eccleſia.

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 wiſdome power, and majeſty; that there can be but * one perſon originally of himſelf ſubſiſting in that infinite being, becauſe a plurality of more perſons ſo ſubſiſting would neceſſarily inferre a multiplicity of Gods; that the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is originally God, as not receiving his eternall 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 prov'd that he is truly and properly

* Ἕνα γὰρ οἴδαμεν ἀγέννητον, καὶ μίαν ἁπάντων ἀρχὴν τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. B ſil. Ep. 78 Ἕν ἀγέννητον ὁ πατήρ. Alex. Epiſt. apud Theodoretum.

perly the eternall God, he muſt be underſtood to have the Godhead communicated to him by the Father, who is not onely eternally, but originally God. *All things whatſoever the Father hath, are mine,* ſaith Chriſt; becauſe in him is the ſame fulneſſe of the Godhead, and more then 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, nor any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father. Chriſt is the true God and eternall life; but that he is ſo, is from the Father: for [a] *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. 'Tis true, our Saviour was ſo in the form of God, that he thought it no robbery to be equall with God: but when the *Jewes* ſought to kill him becauſe he [b] *made himſelf equall 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, ſhewing the reception of his eſſence; and by the acknowledgement of his power, profeſſing his ſubſtance from the Father. From whence he which was equall, even in that equality confeſſeth

Joh. 16. 15. Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ τὰ ἐμά ἐστιν, διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. Ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ τὰ ἐμά ἐστιν. Διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 2. de Filio.

a *John* 5. 26. Hoc dixit, vitam dedit filio ut haberet eam in ſemetipſo, tanquam diceret, pater qui eſt vita in ſemetipſo, genuit filium qui eſſet vita in ſemetipſo. Pro eo enim quod eſt *genuit*, volunt intelligi *dedit*, tanquam ſi cuiquam diceremus, dedit tibi Deus eſſe. S. *Aug. & paulo poſt.* Quid ergo filio dedit? dedit ei ut filius eſſet. Genuit ut vita eſſet, hoc eſt, dedit habere ei vitam in ſemetipſo, ut eſſet vita non egens vita, ne participando intelligatur habere vitam. Si enim participando haberet vitam non in ſemetipſo, poſſet & amittendo eſſe ſine vita: hoc in filio ne accipias, ne cogites, ne credas. Manet ergo Pater vita, manet & Filius vita. Pater vita in ſemetipſo, non à Filio: Filius vita in ſemetipſo, ſed à Patre. *So again* de Trinit. *l.* 1. *c.* 12. Plerumque dicit, dedit mihi Pater, in quo vult intelligi quod eum genuerit Pater; non ut tanquam jam exiſtenti & non habenti dederit aliquid, ſed ipſum dediſſe ut haberet, genuiſſe eſt ut eſſet.

b *John* 5. 18. 19. Tanquam diceret, quid ſcandalizati eſtis quia Patrem meum dixi Deum, quia æqualem me facio Deo? Ita ſum æqualis, ut non ille à me, ſed ego ab illo ſim. Hoc enim intelligitur in his verbis, Non poteſt Filius à ſe facere quicquam, &c. hoc eſt, quicquid Filius habet ut faciat, à Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet à Patre ut faciat? quia à Patre habet ut poſſit, quia à Patre habet ut ſit. Filio enim hoc eſt eſſe quod poſſe.

S. *Aug.* in locum. *paulo poſt*, Hoc eſt, Non poteſt Filius à ſe quicquam facere, quod eſſet, ſi diceret, non eſt Filius à ſe. Etenim ſi Filius eſt, natus eſt; ſi natus eſt, ab illo eſt de quo natus eſt.

confeſſeth a priority, ſaying, *The Father is greater then I.* The Son equall in reſpect of his nature, the Father greater in reference to the communication of the Godhead. [a] *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 our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath that eſſence of himſelf from none, Chriſt hath the ſame not of himſelf, but from him.

ἅπλουν ὅτι τὸ μεῖζον μέν ἐστι τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἴσον τῆς φύσεως. S. Greg Naz. *Orat. 2. de Filio.*

a *Joh.* 7. 29.

† *So* S. Aug. *hath obſerved.* Ab ipſo, inquit, ſum, quia Filius de Patre: & 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 lumen de lumine, Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, ſed tantum lumen. Ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixi, ab ipſo ſum. *From hence then did the* Nicene *Council gather thoſe words of their Creed,* Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. *but not immediately, for thy were partly in ſome of the Orientall Creeds before; as appeareth by that Confeſſion which* Euſebius *preſented to the Council, as containing what he had believed and taught ever ſince his Baptiſme, in which he had theſe words,* καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς. *And as* Euſebius *calls him life of life, ſo others power of power, and wiſdome of wiſdome.* Ideo Chriſtus virtus & ſapientia Dei, quia de Patre virtute & ſapientia etiam ipſe virtus & ſapientia eſt, ſicut lumen de Patre lumine, & fons vitæ apud Deum Patrem utique fontem vitæ. *S. Aug.* de Trin. *l. 7. c. 3. and not onely ſo, but eſſence of eſſence.* Pater & Filius ſimul una ſapientia, quia una eſſentia; & ſingillatim ſapientia de ſapientia, ſicut eſſentia de eſſentia.

And being the divine nature, as it is abſolutely immateriall and incorporeall, is alſo indiviſible, Chriſt cannot have any part of it onely communicated unto him, but the whole, by which he muſt be acknowledged

* ὁμοούσιος, *which is coessentiall or consubstantiall, is not to be taken of a part of*

* Coessentiall of the same substance with the Father, as the Council of *Nice* determin'd, and the ancient Fathers before them taught. Hence appeareth the truth of those words of our Saviour, which raised a second motion in

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. Οὐχ ὡς Οὐαλεντῖν& περβολὴν τὸ γέννημα τῦ Πατρὸς ἐδογμάτισεν· ὐδ' ὡς Μανιχαῖ& μέρος ὁμοούσιον τῦ Πατρὸς τὸ γέννημα εἰσηγήσατο. *as* Arius *in his Epistle to* Alexander. *By the interpretation of S.* Hilary. Nec ut *Valentinus* prolationem natum Patris commentatus est; nec, sicut *Manichæus*, partem unius substantiæ Patris natum exposuit. *de Trinit. l. 6.* Quod *Hilarius* ita Latine reddidit, tanquam ὁμοούσιον id significaret, quod *partem substantiæ* habet ex toto resectum, *sayes* Dionys. Petavius, *with ut any reason; for S.* Hilary *clearly translates* ὁμοούσιον *barely* unius substantiæ, *and it was in the Originall* μέρ& ὁμοούσιον, *which he expressed by* partem unius substantiæ. *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 reall composition and division in the Deity.* Εἰ τὸ ἐκ γαστρὸς, κ τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον, ὡς μέρ& τῦ ὁμουσίυ κ ὡς περβολὴ ὑπό τινων νοεῖται, ζωὴ δ& ἔσῃ ὁ Πατὴρ, κ διαιρετὸς, κ τρεπτός. *And S.* Hierome *testifies thus much not only of* Arius *and* Eunomius, *but also of* Origen *before them.* Habetur Dialogus apud Græcos *Origenis*, & *Candidi Valentinianæ* Hæreseos defensoris, Quos duos Andabatas digladiantes spectasse me fateor. Dicit *Candidus*, Filium de Patris esse substantia; certus in eo quod περβολὴν asserit: E regione *Origenes*, juxta *Arrium* & *Eunomium*, repugnat eum vel prolatum esse vel natum, ne Deus Pater dividatur in partes. *Apol.* 2. in *Ruffin.* *And therefore* Eusebius *Bishop of* Cæsarea *refused not to subscribe to the* Nicene *Creed, being so interpreted as that objection might be taken away.* Τὸ ἐκ τῆς ὐσίας ὡμολόγησε πρὸς αὐτῶν ἀλωτικὸν εἶναι τῦ, ἐκ μὲν τῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι, ὐ μὲν ὡς μέρ& ὑπάρχειν τῦ Πατρός. *Upon this Confession he subscribed to that clause, begotten of the substance of the Father, which was not in his own Creed. And again,* Οὕτω δὲ κ τὸ, ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῦ πατρὸς τὸν ὐὸν, ἐξετάζομενος ὁ λόγος ζυνίσησιν ὐ κατὰ σὼμάτων τρόπον, ὐδὲ τοῖς θνητῆς ζώοις παραπλησίως ὅτε γὰρ κατὰ διαίρεζιν τῆς ὐσίας, ὅτε κατὰ ἀποτομὴν, &c. *upon this acknowledgement he was perswaded to subscribe to the other clause also (added to that Creed which he himself gave in to the Council,) being of one substance with the Father: which clause was inserted by the Council, at the instance of* Constantine *the Emperour. Now as the* Manichees *made use of the word* ὁμοούσιος *to expresse their errours concerning the nature of God and the person of Christ; so the Ancient Fathers, before the* Nicene *Council, had used the same in a true Catholick sense to expresse the unity in essence of the Father and the Son; as appeareth by the confession of the same* Eusebius, Ἐπεὶ κ παλαιῶν λογίως τινὰς, κ θεοφανεῖς ὑποσκόπους, κ ζυγγραφέας ἴσμεν, ἐπὶ τῆς τῦ πατρὸς κ ὑῦ

the

θεολογίας τῷ τῦ ὁμουσίου συγχεησαμένους ὀνόματι. *Wherefore the other* Euſebius *of* Nicomedia, *underſtanding the ancient Catholick ſenſe, confeſſed that if they believed Chriſt to be the true begotten, and not created Son of God, they muſt acknowledge him* ὁμούσιον, *which the* Arians *endeavoured to make ſo odious; and therefore the Council in oppoſition to them determined it.* Quid eſt aliud cur Homouſion Patri nolint Filium dici, niſi quia nolunt verum Dei Filium? ſicut Author ipſorum *Euſebius Nicomediënſis* Epiſtola ſua prodidit, dicens, *Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium, & increatum dicimus, Homouſion cum Patre incipimus confiteri.* Hæc cum lecta eſſet Epiſtola in Concilio *Niceno*, hoc verbum in Tractatu fidei poſuerunt Patres, quod id viderunt adverſarijs eſſe formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipſis gladio ipſorum nefandæ caput hæreſis amputarent. *S. Ambroſ. l.* 3. de Fide, *c.* 7. De voce Ὁμούσιος, vide *Dionyſ. Petav. de* Trinit. *l.* 4. *c.* 6.

the *Jewes* to ſtone him; *I and the Father are one.* 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 Chriſt ſay, the Father is in me, and I in him; yet withall he ſaith, *I came out from the Father*: by the former ſhewing the divinity of his eſſence, by the later the origination of himſelf. We muſt not look upon the divine nature as * ſteril, but rather acknowledge and admire the fecundity, and communicability of it ſelf, upon which the † creation of the world dependeth; 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. *Joh.* 10. 30.

* ἀδυνατον γὰρ τὸν θεὸν εἶναι ἔρημον τῆς φυσικῆς γονιμότητος. Damaſc. *l.* 1. *c.* 8.

† Εἰ δὲ μὴ καρποφόρος ἐστὶν αὐτὴ ἡ θεία οὐσία, ἀλλ' ἔρημος κατ' αὐτὸν, ὡς φῶς ὢν φωτίζον, καὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς· πῶς δυνατὸν ἐνέργειαν αὐτὸν ἔχειν λέγοντες ἢ οὐκ αἰῶνον τινα; S. Athan. *Orat.* 2.

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 of himſelf, but from the Father, is the eternall Son of God. That God alwayes 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?* And it was the chief deſign of *Mahomet* to deny this truth, becauſe he knew it

was

was not otherwiſe poſſible to preferre himſelf before our Saviour. One Prophet may be greater then another, and *Mahomet* might perſwade his credulous diſciples that he was greater then any of the ſons of men; but while any one was believed to be the eternall Son of God, he knew it wholly impoſſible to preferre himſelf before him. Wherefore he frequently inculcates that blaſphemy in his * *Alcoran*, that God hath no ſuch Son, nor any equall with him: and his diſciples have corrupted the Pſalm of *David*, reading inſtead of *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, Thou art my Prophet, I have educated thee. The later ‖ *Jewes* acknowledging the words and the proper literall reading of them, apply them ſo unto *David*, as that they deny them to belong to Chriſt, and that upon no other ground, then that by ſuch an expoſition they may avoid the Chriſtians Confeſſion. But by the conſent of the ancient *Jewes*, by the interpretation of the bleſſed Apoſtles, we know theſe words

* *This is often repeated there, and particularly in the laſt chapter but one, called* Alechlas. *Eſt ipſe Deus unus, Deus æternus, qui nec genuit, nec genitus eſt, & cui nullus eſt æqualis. And*

the Saracenica ſet forth by Sylburgius, *mention this as the firſt principle of Mahumetaniſme.* Ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστι, ποιητὴς πάντων ὅλων, μήτε γεννηθεὶς, μήτε γεννήσας. *And* Joannes Siculus *and* Georgius Cedrenus *relate how* Mahomet *gave command,* Ἕνα μόνον προσκυνεῖν θεὸν, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν τιμᾶν ὡς λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μὲν, οὐχὶ υἱὸν δέ. *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 onely by men without any authority from him.* Ὅτι ἀνελθόντα τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἠρώτησεν ὁ θεὸς, λέγων, Ὦ Ἰησοῦ, σὺ εἶπας τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ὅτι υἱός μου εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεός. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς ὅτι οὐκ εἶπον ἐγὼ, ὑὸς δὲ αὐχήσομαι εἶναι δοῦλος σὸς· ἀλλ᾽ οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν ὅτι εἶπον τὸν λόγον τοῦτον. † Alfric Zabadius *in his* Kamuz. Dictum Dei omnipotentis ad Jeſum (cui propitius ſit & pacem concedat Deus) Tu es *Nabiya*, Propheta meus, ego *Walladtoca*, fovi te; at dixerunt Chriſtiani, Tu es *Bonaiya*, filius meus, Ego *Waladtoca*, te genui. Longe eſt ſupra hæc Deus. *And to the ſame purpoſe* Ebnol Athir. In Evangelio dixit *Iſa*, Ego *Walladtoci*, i. e. educavi te; at Chriſtiani dempta litera Lam altera, ipſum ex filium ſtatuerunt. Qui longe elatus eſt ſuperea quæ 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, were forced to corrupt the Text; and for that they pretend the eminency and excellency of the Godhead, as if it were beneath the Majeſty of God to beget a Son, or be a Father. And indeed whoſoever would bring in another Prophet greater then Chriſt, as he was then* Moſes, *muſt do ſo.* ‖ I ſay, the

belong

later Jewes *ſo attribute thoſe words to* David, *as if they belonged not to the* Meſſias. *but the ancient* Jewes *underſtood them of the Chriſt, as appeareth not onely 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* Jewes *themſelves, who have confeſſed no leſſe. So Rabbi* David Kimchi *in the end of his Commentaries on the ſecond* Pſalm, ויש מפרשים זה המזמור על גוג ומגוג והמשיח הוא מלך המשיח וכן פירש רבותינו זל. *Some interpret this Pſalm of* Gog *and* Magog, *and the anointed is* Meſſias *the King; and ſo our Doctours of happy memory have expounded it. And Rabbi* Solomon Jarchi *not onely confeſſeth that the Ancient* Rabbins *did interpret it of the* Meſſias, *but ſhews the reaſon why the later* Jewes *underſtood it rather of* David, *that thereby they might the better anſwer the Argument of the Chriſtians deduced from thence,* רבותינו דרשו את הענין על מלך המשיח ולפי משמעו ולתשובת המינים נכון לפותרו על דוד עצמו. *Our Doctours have expounded it of the* Meſſias: *but as to the literal ſenſe, and for the anſwering* Heretick*s (that is, in their language, Chriſtians) it is rather to be interpreted of* David *in his own perſon.*

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? 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. *Heb.* 1. 5.

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 vitall production of another in the ſame nature, with a full repreſentation of him from whom he is produced. Thus man begetteth a ſon, that is, produceth another man of the ſame humane 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 prolificall benediction, *Be fruitfull and multiply, Adam begat in his own likeneſſe, after his image*; and by the continuation of the ſame bleſſing the ſucceſſion of humane generations hath been con- *Gen.* 1, 29. 5. 3.

tinued. 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. But God the Father hath communicated to the 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 humane generations we may conceive two kinds of ſimilitude; one in reſpect of the internall nature, the other in reference to the externall form or figure. The former ſimilitude is eſſentiall and neceſſary, it being impoſſible a man ſhould beget a ſon, and that ſon not be by nature a man: the later accidentall, not onely ſometimes the child repreſenting this, ſometime the other parent, but alſo ofttimes 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 [a] *the image of God, the brightneſſe of his glory, and the expreſſe image of his perſon.*

* Κοινὸν ὑπάρχει πᾶσι καὶ αὐτοῦ διδασκαλον ὁμολόγημα, ὡς ἅπας υἱὸς τῆς αὐτῆς δεῖ τῷ γεννηκότι οὐσίας καὶ φύσεως. Phot. *Epiſt.* 1. *This is in the language of* Ariſtotle, τὸ ποιῆσαι ἕτερον οἷον αὐτὸ ζῶον μὲν ζῶον, φυτὸν δὲ φυτόν. *And S. Baſ. l.* 2. *contra* Eunomium. πατὴρ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν, ὁ ἑτέρῳ τῷ εἶναι κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν ἑαυτῷ ζωὴν τὴν ἀρχὴν παρεχών.

† Etiamſi filius hominis homo, in quibuſdam ſimilis, in quibuſdam ſit diſſimilis patri; tamen quia ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ eſt, negari verus filius non poteſt, & quia verus eſt filius, negari ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ non poteſt. *S. Aug.* contra *Maximin. c.* 13. [a] 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Heb.* 1. 3.

Nor is this communication of the divine eſſence onely the proper generation of the Son, but we muſt acknowledge it farre more proper then any naturall generation of the Creature, not onely 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

out any kind of defect, blemiſh, or impurity. In humane 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 corporeall, whereas the eſſence of God is incorporeall, ſpirituall and indiviſible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or deciſion, but by a totall and plenary communication. In naturall conceptions the Father neceſſarily precedeth the ſon, and begetteth one younger then himſelf: for being generation is for the perpetuity of the ſpecies, where the individualls 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 alwayes had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate; being alwayes Father, as alwayes God. " Animals when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolificall; in God eternall perfection ſheweth his eternall fecundity. And that which is moſt remarkable, In humane 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 prolificall benediction, *encreaſe 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 uncapable of multiplication; is ſo communicated as not to be multiplied; inſomuch that he

* πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἤδη τέλεια γεννᾷ· τὸ δὲ ἀεὶ τέλειον ἀεὶ καὶ ἀΐδιον γεννᾷ. Euſeb. *de Præp. Evang. ex* Plotino. Ἀνθρώπων μὲν γὰρ ἴδιον τὸ ἐν χρόνῳ γεννᾶν, διὰ τὸ ἀτελὲς τῆς φύσεως· θεῷ δὲ ἀΐδιον τὸ γέννημα, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ τέλειον τῆς φύσεως.

S. Athan. *Orat.* 2. *This was it which ſo much troubled the* Arrians, *when they heard the Catholicks conſtantly aſſerting,* ἀεὶ θεὸς, ἀεὶ υἱὸς, ἅμα πατὴρ, ἅμα υἱός.

which proceedeth by that communication hath not onely 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 eſſentiall ſimilitude of the ſon unto the father, by reaſon of the ſame nature 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 then can be found in humane 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 S. *Peter*'s Confeſſion, *Thou art the Son of the living God*; this the ground of our Saviours † diſtinction, *I go unto my Father, and to your Father*. Hence did S. *John* raiſe a verity, more then onely a negation of falſity, when he ſaid, we *are in the true Son*: for we which are in him are true, not falſe ſons, but ſuch ſons we are not as *the true Son*. Hence did S. *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 ſhewed, that the eternall communication of the divine eſſence by the Father to the Word, was a proper generation by which Chriſt Jeſus alwayes was the true and proper Son of God: which was our fourth Aſſertion.

† Multum diſtat inter dominationem & conditionem, inter generationem & adoptionem, inter ſubſtantiam & gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec paſſim dicitur, Aſcendo ad patrem noſtrum, aut Deum noſtrum; ſed ad Patrem meum, & Patrem veſtrum, ad Deum meum, & ad Deum veſtrum. Aliter enim illi Deus Pater eſt, aliter nobis. Illum ſiquidem natura coæquat, miſericordia humiliat: nos vero natura proſternit, miſericordia erigit. *Capr colus Carthag.* Epiſt.

The fifth and laſt Aſſertion followeth, that the Divine eſſence was ſo peculiarly communicated to the Word, that there was never any other perſon naturally begotten by

by the Father, and in that reſpect Chriſt is the *Onely-begotten* Son of God. For the clearing of which truth, it will firſt be neceſſary to enquire into the true notion of the *Onely-begotten*; and then ſhew 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 * Hereticks, who would have the reſtraining term (*onely*) to belong not to the Son, but to the Father; as if the Onely-begotten were no more then begotten of the Father onely. Which is both contrary to the language of the Scriptures, and the common cuſtome of men, who uſe it not for him who is begotten of one, but for him who alone is begotten of any. Secondly, we muſt by no means admit the expoſition of the † later Hereticks, who take the Onely-begotten to be nothing elſe but the moſt beloved of all the ſons; becauſe *Iſaac* was called the onely ſon of *Abraham*, when we know that he had *Iſhmael* beſide, and *Solomon*

* *This was the fallacy which* Eunomius *endeavoured to put upon the Church, as appeares by thoſe words of his delivered and anſwered by* S. Baſil; Διὰ τοῦτο γάρ, φησὶ, μονογενὴς, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ μόνου τοῦ ἀγεννήτου μόνον γεννηθεὶς καὶ κλιθεὶς τελειοτάτου γέγονεν υἱὸς. *As if* μονογενὴς *were onely* παρὰ μόνου, *and* unigenitus *were nothing elſe but* genitus ab uno. *This* S. Baſil *refuteth copiouſly: Firſt, from the language of the Scriptures and the uſage of mankind;* διὰ τὴν παντοίαν, ἣν περὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἀνακέκραγεν, παρά τε τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ζωὴν ἅπασαν, καὶ παρὰ τὴν εὐσεβῆ τῶν γεγραφῶν παράδοσιν λαμβάνων αὐτοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν. Μονογενὴς γὰρ οὐχ ὁ παρὰ μόνου γενόμενος, ἀλλ' ὁ μόνου γεννηθεὶς ἐν τῇ κοινῇ χρήσει μεταφορεύεται. *Secondly, by a retort peculiar to that Hereſy, which held the Son of God might be called* κλιθεὶς *as well as* γεννηθεὶς, *created as well as begotten, and conſequently might be as properly named* μονόκτιστος *as* μονογενής. Εἰ μὴ παρὰ τὸ μόνου γεγενῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ παρὰ μόνου μονογενὴς εἴρηται, πῶτο μὴ δεῖ καὶ σε τὸ ἀκτίσῳ τῷ γεγενῆσθαι τὸ οὐχὶ καὶ Μονόκτιστον αὐτὸν ὀνομάζειν; *Thirdly, by a particular inſtance ſhewing the abſurdity of ſuch an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be call'd* μονογενὴς, *becauſe not begotten of one, but two parents.* Μονογενὴς δὲ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς κατὰ γε τὸν ὑμέτερον λόγον, διὰ τὸ ἐκ ζωῆ δυοῖν πᾶσιν ὑπάρχειν τὴν γέννησιν. οὐδὲ ἡ Σάρρα μητρὸς μονογενοῦς ἦν παιδὸς, διότι οὐχὶ μόνου αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐτεκνώσατο.

† *The* Socinians *make very much of this Notion, and apply it ſo unto Chriſt, as that thereby they might avoid all neceſſity of an eternall generation. So the* Racovian *Catechiſme:* Cauſa cur Chriſto iſta attributa (ſc. proprium & unigenitum Dei Filium eſſe) com-

Petant, hæc eſt; quod inter omnes Dei filios & præcipuus ſit, & Deo chariſſimus: quemadmodum *Iſaac*, quia *Abrahamo* chariſſimus, & hæres extitit, unigenitus vocatus eſt, *Heb.* 11. 17. licet fratrem *Iſmaelem* habuerit; & *Solomon* unigenitus coram matre ſua, licet plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint. 1 *Paral.* 3. 1, 2, 3, &c. *And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed,* Schlitingius *hath inſerted it as a materiall obſervation;* Nam hic unicus ſeu unigena filius nominatur, qui cæteris longe charior eſt Patri, longeque præſtantior; *and confirmes 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 onely-begotten by vertue of his generation. And if ſo, then is he not the onely-begotten as* Iſaac *and* Solomon *were, that is, by the affection and relation of their Parents. Or if Chriſt were the Onely-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.*

ſaid to be the onely-begotten before his Mother, when *David* had other children even by the Mother of *Solomon.* For the onely-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 it ſelf. For though it be true, that the onely ſon is the beloved ſon, yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved becauſe the onely, not therefore the onely becauſe beloved. Although therefore Chriſt be the Onely-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, his unigeniture being the foundation of his ſingular love. Avoiding therefore theſe two expoſitions, as farre ſhort of the true notion of the onely-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 *onely* ſhall have relation not only to the * Father generating, but alſo to the Son begotten,

* Eunomius *would have it onely* παρὰ μόνου *in relation to the Father onely.* S. Baſil *ſhews that no way proper, and ſhews that* μονογενὴς *is not he which* παρὰ μόνου, *but* μόνου γεγέννηται. S. Cyril *addes*

and

theſe two τὸν μόνον *and* μόνου *together, in relation to the Father and the Son.* Μονογενὴς κατὰ φύσιν, ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ παιδὸς ὀνόμασαι λόγος, ὅτι μόνου ἐκ μόνου γεγέννηται τοῦ παιδός. *Epiſt.* 1. *ad* Regin. *as* Ruffinus *doth in* Unicus. Ideo ſubjungit Unicum hunc eſſe Filium Dei, Unus enim de uno naſcitur. *Expoſ. Symb.* S. Gregory Naz. *addes to theſe two a third, in reſpect of the manner.* Μονογενὴς δὲ, οὐχ ὅτι μόνον ἐκ μόνου ἦν μόνος, ἀλλ' ὅτι μονοειδέπως, οὐχ ὡς τὰ σώματα. *So he ſomething obſcurely and corruptly, but plainly enough in* Damaſcene, *who aimes often to deliver himſelf in the words of* Nazianzen. Λέγεται μονογενὴς, ὅτι μόνου ἐκ μόνου τοῦ παιδὸς μόνως ἐγεννήθη· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὅμοιόν ἐτέρῳ γέννησις τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ γεννήσει, οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστιν ἄλλος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

and to the manner of the generation. 'Tis true, the Father ſpake from heaven ſaying, *thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed:* and thereby we are to underſtand, that whoſoever of us are beloved by the Father, are ſo beloved in and through the Son. In the ſame manner Chriſt is the *Onely-begotten* Son of God; and as 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 a farre more near relation the naturall and eternall Son.

Having thus cleared the interpretation of the word, that properly, as primogeniture conſiſteth in prelation, ſo unigeniture in excluſion; and that none can be ſtrictly called the *Onely-begotten*, but he who alone was ſo begotten; we ſhall proceed to make good our Aſſertion, ſhewing 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 ſhewing 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 Onely-begotten; or it was not communicated, and then there is no ſuch communication neceſſary to found ſuch a filiation: the other alledging that the ſame divine eſſence may be communicated to another beſide

the

the Word, and not onely that it may, but that it is ſo, to the Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt: whence either the Holy Ghoſt muſt be the Son of God, and then the Word is not the onely-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.

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:* we confeſſe that thoſe whom S. *Paul hath begotten through the Goſpel,* may well be term'd the *begotten of God, whoſe ſeed remaineth in them*; but withall we affirm that this our regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the Generation of the Son. We are firſt † generated, and have our naturall being; after that regenerated, and ſo receive a ſpirituall renovation, and by vertue thereof an inheritance incorruptible: whereas the Generation of Chriſt admits no regeneration, he becoming at once thereby God, and Son, and Heir of all. The ſtate of ſonſhip which we come into is but of Adoption, ſhewing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphoricall: whereas Chriſt is ſo truly begotten, ſo properly the naturall Son of God, that his * generation clearly excludeth the name of Adoption; and not onely ſo, but when he becometh the

Heb. 2. 11.

1 Cor. 4 15. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα.

1 *Joh.* 3. 9. πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει. *And more expreſly* 1 *Joh.* 5. 1. Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννήσαντα ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν γεγεννημένον ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Quiquis credit Jeſum eſſe Chriſtum illum, ex Deo genitus eſt; & quiſquis diligit eum qui genuit, diligit etiam eum qui ex eo genitus eſt. † Nos genuit Deus, ut filii ejus ſimus, quos fecerat ut homines eſſemus. Unicum autem genuit, non ſolum ut Filius eſſet, quod Pater non eſt, ſed etiam ut Deus eſſet, quod & Pater eſt. *S. Aug.* de Conſ. Evangel. *l.* 2. *c.* 3. * *Firſt, it is moſt certain that the Word of God, as the Word, is not the adopted, but the naturall Son of God.* Non eſt Dei Filius Deus falſus, nec Deus adoptivus, nec Deus nuncupativus, ſed Deus verus.

ſon

S. Hilar. de Trin. *l.* 5. *Hic etiam Filius Dei natura eſt Filius, non adoptione. Concil. Toleta.* 11. Τὸν τῦ θεῦ ὄτι φύσει, καὶ ὐ θέσει γεγνηθὲς ἐκ πατρός. *S. Cyril. Hieroſoly.* Catech. 1. *and again,* Οὐκ ἐκ τῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν παρήγαγεν, ὐδὲ τὸν μὴ ὄντα εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἤγαγεν· ἀλλ' ἀΐδιος ὢν ὁ πατὴρ, ἀϊδίως ἐγέννησε καὶ ἀνεκφράστως υἱὸν ἕνα μόνον, ἀδελφὸν ὐκ ἔχοντα. *This hath been ſo generally confeſſed, that* Felix *and* Elipandus, *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 & credimus Deum, Dei Filium, ante omnia tempora ſine initio ex Patre genitum, coæternum & conſubſtantialem, non adoptione, ſed genere. *Secondly, it is alſo certain, that the Man Chriſt Jeſus taken perſonally, is the naturall, not the adopted Son of God: becauſe the man Chriſt Jeſus is no other perſon then the Word, who is the eternall and naturall Son, and by ſubſiſting in the humane nature could not leave off to be the naturall Son. The deniall of this by* Felix *and* Elipandus *was condemned as Hereticall in the Council of* Frankford; *and their Opinion was thus expreſſed, partly in the words of* S. Auguſtine, *partly in their own additions.* Confitemur & credimus eum factum ex muliere, factum ſub lege, non gentre 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* Hildephonſus, *as the* Roman *by* Gregory. *In the Maſſe* de Cœna Domini, Qui per adoptivi hominis paſſionem, dum ſuo non indulſit corpori. *And in the Maſſe* de Aſcenſione Domini, Hodie Salvator noſter per adoptionem carnis, ſedem repetivit Deitatis. *To this the Synod oppoſed their determination in* Sacroſyllabo. Quod ex te naſcetur ſanctum vocabitur filius Dei, non adoptivus, ſed verus, non alienus, ſed proprius. *And again,* Porro adoptivus dici non poteſt, niſi is qui alienus eſt ab eo à quo dicitur adoptatus: & gratis ei adoptio tribuitur, quoniam non ex debito, ſed ex indulgentia tantummodo adoptio præſtatur: ſicut nos aliquando cum eſſemus peccando filii iræ, alieni eramus à Deo, per proprium & 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 perſonæ quæ eſt in Dei filio & filio Virginis, adoptionis tollit injuriam.

ſon of man, even in his humanity refuſeth the name of an adopted ſon. For *when the fulneſſe 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.* 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, *Gal.* 4. 4, 5.

ſometimes his beloved, but * never his adopted Son, he who by thoſe proper and peculiar appellations is † diſtinguiſhed from us, who can claim no higher filiation then that which we receive by the priviledge of adoption, he is truly the Onely-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 naturall and eternall generation, whereas onely the grace of God is conveyed unto us in our Adoption. Indeed, if we were begotten of the ſubſtance of God, as Chriſt was, or he were onely by the grace of God ‖ adopted, as we are, then could he by no propriety of ſpeech be called the Onely Son, by reaſon of ſo many brethren: but being we cannot aſpire unto the firſt, nor he deſcend unto the later, it remaineth, we acknowledge him, notwithſtanding the firſt difficulty, by vertue of his naturall and peculiar generation, to be the *Onely-begotten Son.*

* Legi & relegi Scripturas, Jeſum filium Dei nuſquam adoptione inveni. *Ambroſiaſter* Com. in Ep. ad *Rom.* Dices mihi, Cur times adoptivum Chriſtum Dominum nominare? Dico tibi, quia nec Apoſtoli eum ſic nominarunt, nec ſancta Dei & Catholica Eccleſia conſuetudinem habuit ſic eum appellare. Synod. Epiſt. Concil. *Francofurd. 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, quæ legitis, & nolite nova & incognita nomina fingere, ſed quæ in S. Scriptura inveniuntur, tenete, &c.

† *S.* Aug. *hath obſerved, that S.* Paul *made uſe of* ὑοθεσία, *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 genuit, ſicut unicum Filium, ſed utique dilectione adoptavit. Quo verbo Apoſtolus ſæpe uti non ob aliud intelligitur, niſi ad diſcernendum Unigenitum. De Conſenſ. Evang. *l.* 2. *c.* 3. *And S.* Ambroſe *takes notice, that the name of true deſtroyeth that of adopted.* Adoptivum filium non dicimus filium eſſe natura, ſed cum dicimus natura eſſe filium, qui verus eſt filius. De Incarn. Sacr. *c.* 8.

‖ *Si* unicus, quomodo adoptivus, dum multi ſunt adoptivi filii? Unicus itaque de multis non poteſt dici. Concil. *Francof.* Quod ſi etiam Unigenitus Filius factus dicitur ex gratia, non vere genitus ex natura, proculdubio nomen & veritatem Unigeniti perdidit, poſtquam fratres habere jam cœpit: privatur enim hujus veritate nominis, ſi in Unigenito non eſt de Patre veritas naturalis. *Fulgentius* ad *Thraſim. l.* 3. *c.* 3. *Si* divina illa Filii ſempiternæque nativitas, non de natura Dei Patris, ſed ex gratia creditur ſubſtitiſſe, non debet Unigenitus vocari, ſed tantummodo genitus. Quoniam ſicut ei nomen geniti largitas adoptionis paternæ contribuit, ſic

But

eum ab Unigeniti nomine nobis quoque tributa communio paternæ adoptionis excluſit. Unigenitus enim non vocatur, quamvis genitus poſſit vocari, cum geniti. *Ib. c.* 4.

But though neither men nor Angels be begotten of the ſubſtance of God, or by vertue of any ſuch naturall 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 onely 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 * every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet every thing which proceedeth is not begotten. Wherefore, in the language 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 call'd the Son, but the gift of God. *Eve* was produced out of *Adam*, and in the ſame nature

* Non omne id quod procedit, naſcitur, licet omne id quod naſcitur procedat. *S. Aug.* contra *Max. l.* 3. *c.* 14.

who gives the ſame ſolution to the ſame Argument. Quæris à me, ſi de ſubſtantia Patris eſt Filius, de ſubſtantia Patris eſt etiam Spiritus Sanctus, cur unus filius ſit, & alius non ſit filius? Ego reſpondeo, ſive capias, ſive non capias; De Patre eſt Filius, de Patre eſt Spiritus S. ſed ille genitus eſt, iſte procedens.

† Nunquam fuit non Pater, à quo Filius natus, à quo Spiritus Sanctus non natus, quia non eſt filius. *Gennad.* De Eccleſ. Dogm. Deus Pater innaſcibilis non ex aliquo, Deus Filius unigenitus ex aliquo, hoc eſt, ex Patre, Spiritus S. innaſcibilis ex aliquo, hoc eſt, ex Patre. *Iſaac.* lib. Fidei. Quod neque natum neque factum eſt, Spiritus S. eſt, qui à Patre & Filio procedit. *S. Ambr.* in Symb.

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 naturall 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 eternall generation, as pertaining ſolely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt had a reall 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 *Onely-begotten*, diſtinguiſhed from the Holy Ghoſt, as Son, from the Adopted children, as the Naturall Son.

The neceſſity of the belief of this part of the Article, that Jeſus Chriſt is the proper and naturall Son of God, begotten of the ſubſtance of the Father, and by that ſingular way of generation, the *Onely Son*, appeareth firſt in the confirmation of our Faith concerning the Redemption of mankind. For this doth ſhew ſuch an excellency and dignitie in the perſon of the Mediatour, as will aſſure us of an infinite

infinite efficacy in his actions, and value in his ſufferings. We know *it is not poſſible that the bloud of bulls and goats ſhould take away ſins*: and we may very well doubt, how the bloud of him who hath no other nature then that of man, can take away the ſins of other men; there appearing no ſuch difference as will ſhew a certainty in the one, and an impoſſibility in the other. But ſince we may be *bought with a price*, well may we believe the bloud of Chriſt ſufficiently *precious*, when we are aſſured that it is the *bloud of God*: nor can we queſtion the efficacy of it in purging *our conſcience from dead works*, if we believe Chriſt *offered up himſelf through the eternall Spirit*. 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 proportionably to the dignity of the part 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 encreaſe proportionably 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 rendred 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, then by a belief in ſuch a Mediatour as is the Onely-begotten Son

Heb. 10. 4.

1 *Cor.* 6. 20. 7, 23. 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. *Act.* 20. 28. *Heb.* 9. 14.

of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

Secondly, The belief of the eternall 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 judgement unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* As it was represented to S. *John* in a vision, when he *heard every creature which 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 Lambe, for ever and ever.* Again, we are commanded *to fear the Lord our God, and to* † *serve him*; and that with such an emphasis, as by *him* we are to understand him alone, because *the Lord our God is one Lord.* From whence, if any one arose among the *Jewes*, teaching under the title of a Prophet to worship any other beside him for God, the judgement of the * Rabbins 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 onely must be worshipt, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon this precept as valid onely under the Law, as if then there were onely one God to be worshipt, but since the Gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commended it to our observation, by making use of it against the Devil in his temptation, saying, a *get thee hence Satan, for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve.* If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel onely; if we be also commanded to give

Job. 5. 23.

Rev. 5. 13.

Deut. 6. 13, 4.

† The emphasis appeares in this, that it is not barely ויתעבדון & servies ei, but ואתו תעבד. & ipsi servies, with such a peculiar restriction as is expressed by the LXX. καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. and approved by our Saviour, Matt. 4. 10.

* Moses Maim. Præfat. in Sedet Zeraim.

a Matt. 4. 10.

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*; but then the ſame Scripture calleth that firſt begotten *Jehovah, and the Lord of the whole earth.* For a man to worſhip that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and groſſe Idolatry; to worſhip that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not in 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 give unto the Son of God that divine honour which we are all oblig'd to give unto him, we ſhould fall into that ſin which of all others we ought moſt to abhorre, it is no leſſe then neceſſary, that we ſhould believe that Son to be that eternall God, whom we are bound to worſhip, and whom onely we ſhould ſerve. *Heb.* 1. 6. *Pſal* 97. 6, 7.

Thirdly, our belief in Chriſt, as the eternall Son of God, is neceſſary to raiſe us unto a thankfull acknowledgement of the infinite love of God appearing in the ſending of his onely-begotten Son into the world to die for ſinners. This love of God is frequently extoll'd and admired by the Apoſtles. *God ſo loved the world*, ſaith S. *John*, *that he gave his onely-begotten Son. God commendeth his love towards us*, ſaith S. *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.* *In this*, ſaith S. *John* again, *was manifeſted the love of God toward us, becauſe that God ſent his onely-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.* If we look upon all this as nothing elſe, but that God ſhould cauſe a man to be born after another manner then other men, and when he was ſo born after a peculiar *Jo.* 3. 16. *Rom.* 5, 8. 8, 32. 1 *Joh.* 4. 9, 10.

liar manner, yet a mortall 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 then would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. 'Tis 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; and conſidering the miſery from which we are redeemed, and the happineſſe to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the ſingular love of God even in the act of Redemption it ſelf: but yet the Apoſtles have rais'd that conſideration higher, and placed the choiceſt mark of the love of God, in the chuſing ſuch means, and performing in that manner our reparation; by ſending his *onely-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 Gods 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 to 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 dignity of the Perſon and nature of our Saviour before he ſuffered, is ſo farre to undervalue the love of God, and conſequently, to come ſhort of that acknowledgement 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 thankfulneſſe ſomeway 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 is it abſolutely neceſſary to believe that Chriſt is ſo the onely-begotten Son of the Father, as to be

be of the ſame ſubſtance with him, of glory equall, of Majeſty coeternall.

By this diſcourſe in way of explication, every Chriſtian may underſtand what it is he ſayes, and expreſſe his mind how he would be underſtood when he maketh this brief confeſſion, I believe in Chriſt *the onely Son* of God. For by theſe words he muſt be thought to intend no leſſe then this: I do profeſſe to be fully aſſured of this Aſſertion, as of a moſt certain, infallible, and neceſſary truth, that Jeſus Chriſt the Saviour and Meſſias is the true, proper, and naturall 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 the Son, ſo do I alſo exclude all other perſons from that Sonſhip, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and naturall 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 onely by adoption, as 'tis naturall. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jeſus Chriſt his *Onely Son*.

Our Lord.

After our Saviour's Relation founded upon his eternall generation followeth his Dominion, 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 onely 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 compar'd to him, muſt not be look'd 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 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*.

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, inſomuch that the Angels obſerve that dialect, * *Come ſee the place where the Lord lay*. Now for the true Notation of the word, it will ‖ not be ſo neceſſary to enquire into the uſe or origination of the Greek, much leſſe into the Etymology of the correſpondent Latine, as to ſearch into the Notion of the *Jewes*, and the language of the Scriptures, according unto which the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles ſpake and wrote. And firſt, it cannot be denied, but that the word which we tranſlate the *Lord* was uſed by the Interpreters

† *Mar.* 16. 19, 20. *Luk.* 12, 42. 24, 34. *Jo.* 4, 1. 6, 23. 11, 2. 20, 2, 18, 20, 25. 21, 7. *Act.* 9, 1. 16, 10, 11. 15, 17, 27, 31. 42. 11, 16, 24. 13, 47. &c. Κύριος.

* *Mat.* 28. 6.

‖ *For whoſoever ſhall conſider the ſignification of* Κύριος *in the Scriptures, I think will ſcarce find any footſteps of it 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 Authours.* Julius Pollux, *whoſe buſineſſe is to obſerve what words and phraſes may be properly made uſe of in that language, tells us the Gods may be called* Θεοὶ *or* Δαίμονες, *but* Κύριος *is neither proper, nor any name of God with them at all. Nor did they anciently uſe it in their* OEconomicks, *where their conſtant termes were not* Κύριος, *but* Δεσπότης *and* Θεράπων, *and they had then another kind of notion of it, as appeares by the complaint of the ſervant in* Ariſtophanes; Τῷ Δήμῳ γὰρ οὐκ ἐᾷ τὸν κύριον καλεῖν ὁ Δῆμων, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐωνημένον. *Which words if they were interpreted by the Scripture uſage,* Κύριος *would ſignifie the Maſter, and* ἐωνημένος *the perſon bought, that is the ſervant; whereas the place requires an interpretation wholly contrary, for* ἐωνημένος *is not here* ὑπρεσιμένος, *but* ἀγορασας, *or* ὠνησάμενος, *as the Scholiaſt* 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*

preters

they had rightly interpreted him without any authority, yet Phrynichus will ſufficiently ſecure us of this ſenſe. Ἔτυχον ἐωνημένος οἰκέτην ἢ ἀγοράν. ὀρθῶς δὲ ἐν ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς τῶν πράξεως μέρεσι τὸ ἐωνημένος δοκίμιον. Ἐωνημένος *then here is to be 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 appeares by that obſervation of an ancient Authour preſerved by* Euſtathius *in Odyſſ.* Ξ. Κύριος γυναικὸς καὶ υἱῶν ἀνὴρ καὶ πατὴρ, δεσπότης δὲ ἀξιωματικῶν.

preters of the Old Teſtament ſometimes for * men, with no relation unto any other then humane dominion. And as it was by the Tranſlatours of the Old, ſo is it alſo by the Pen-men of the † New. But it is moſt certain that Chriſt is called Lord in another notion then that which ſignifies any kind of humane dominion, becauſe as

* *As* אדון *is generally tranſlated* κύριος, *when it ſignifieth Lord or Maſter in reſpect of a ſervant or inferiour. So* Sarah *calleth her husband, Gen.* 18. 12. 1 *Pet.* 3. 6. *ſo* Eleezer *his maſter,* Abraham, *Gen.* 24. *frequently. Thus* Rachel *ſaluteth her Father* Laban, *Gen.* 31. 35. *and* Jacob *his brother* Eſau, *Gen.* 33. 8. Potiphar *is the* κύριος *of* Joſeph *whom he bought, Gen.* 32. 2, &c. *and* Joſeph *in power is ſo ſaluted by his brethren, Gen.* 42. 10. *and acknowledged by his ſervant,* 44. 5. *the generall name in the law of* Moſes *for ſervant and Maſter is* παῖς *and* κύριος, *Ex.* 21. 2, 4. *It is indeed ſo plain that the ancient* Jews *uſed this word to ſignifie no more then humane power, that we find* אדם *the name of man ſo tranſlated, as* 1 *Sam.* 17. 32. אל יפל לב אדם עליו. μὴ δὴ ζυμπιπτέτω καρδία τῷ κυρίῳ μου ἐπ' αὐτόν. † *For* κύριος *is uſed with relation, and in oppoſition to* παιδίσκη *Act.* 16. 16. *in the ſenſe which the later, not the ancient Greeks uſed it.* Παιδίσκη, τοῦτο ὁπὸ τῆς θεραπαίνης οἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων· οἱ δὲ ἀρχαῖοι ὁπὸ τῆς νεάνιδος, *as* Phrynichus *obſerves. As it is oppoſed to* οἰκέτης *Lu.* 16. 13. *according to that of* Etymol. Κύριος ἁπλῶς πᾶς τις ἐστὶν, ἔχει δὲ πρὸς τὸν οἰκέτην. το δοῦλος, *Mat.* 10. 24. 18, 25, &c. *And in the Apoſtolicall rules pertaining to Chriſtian* Œconomicks, *the maſter and ſervant are* δοῦλος *and* κύριος. *As alſo by way of addition* κύριος τῆ σαββάτου, *Mat.* 9. 38. κύριος τῆ ἀμπελῶνος, *Mat.* 20. 8. κύριος τῆς οἰκίας, *Mar.* 13. 35. *Inſomuch as* κύριε *is ſometimes uſed by way of addreſſe or ſalutation of one man to another, (as it is now generally among the later Greeks, and as* Dominus *was anciently among the Latines,* Quomodo obvios, ſi nomen non occurrat, Dominos ſalutamus. *Sen.*) *not onely of ſervants to maſters, as Mat.* 13. 27. *or ſons to parents, as Mat.* 21. 30. *or inferiours to men in authority, as Mat.* 27. 63. *but of ſtrangers, as when the Greeks ſpake to* Philip, *and deſired him ſaying,* Κύριε θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν *Joh.* 12. 21. *and* Mary Magdalene *ſpeaking unto Chriſt, but taking him for a gardener,* Κύριε εἰ σὺ ἐβάστασας αὐτόν. *Joh.* 20. 15. *And it cannot be denied but this title was ſometimes given to our Saviour himſelf, in no higher or other ſenſe then this; As when*

the Samaritan woman saw him alone at the well, and knew no more of him then that he appeared to be one of the Jewes, she said, Κύριε, οὐτλημα οὐκ ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ. Jo. 4. 11. *And the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, when he wist not who it was, said unto him,* Κύριε, ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω. Joh. 5. 7. *The blind man to whom he had restored his sight, with the same salutation maketh confession of his ignorance, and his faith,* Τίς ἐστι Κύριε; *and* πιστεύω Κύριε, Joh. 9. 36, 38.

1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. Eph. 4. 5. Colos. 3. 22. 1 Cor. 2. 8. 15, 47. 2 Rev. 10. 6.

so, *there are many Lords*, but he is in that notion *Lord*, which admits of no more then *one*. They are only *masters according to the flesh*, he the *Lord of glory*, the *Lord from heaven*, a *King of Kings*, and *Lord of all other Lords*.

Not 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 Translatours long before our Saviour's birth, had most appropriated the name of *Lord*, not only by way of explication, but distinction & particular expression. As when we read, *thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth*, & 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 to 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

Ps. 83. 18.

Ex. 6. 3.

† *I know it is the vulgar opinion that* κύριος *properly answereth unto* אדני *and the reason why it was also used for* יהוה *is no other then because the Jewes were wont to read Adonai in the place of Jehovah. Of which observation they make great use who deny the Divinity of Christ.* Quia enim Adonai pro Jehovah in lectione Hebræorum verborum substitui consuevit, ideo illius etiam interpretatio huic accommodatur, *sayes* Crellius de Deo & Attr. c. 14. *But first it is not probable that the* LXX *should think* κύριος *to be the proper interpretation of* אדני, *and give it to Jehovah only in the place of Adonai; for if they had, it would have followed,*

God,

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 it ſelf it did not belong. Whereas we read not only אדני יהוה, *tranſlated* Κύριε Κύριε, Gen. 15. 2, 8. *and* יהוה האדון ὁ δεσπότης κύριος Σαββαὼθ, Iſ. 1. 24. *but alſo* יהוה אדנינו κύριε τὸ ὄνομα ἡμῶν. Nehem. 10. 29. *Secondly, the reaſon of this aſſertion is moſt uncertain, for though it be confeſſed that the* Maſoreths *did read* אדני *where they found* יהוה, *and* Joſephus *before them expreſſes the ſenſe of the* Jewes *of his age, that the* τετραγράμματον *was not to be pronounced, and before him* Philo *ſpeaks as much; yet it followeth not from thence, that the* Jewes *were ſo ſuperſtitious above 300 yeares 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* Jewes *ſhould ſo confound the names of God, ſo were it now very irrationall in ſome places to read* אדני *for* יהוה. *As when God ſaith, I appeared unto* Abraham, *unto* Iſaac, *and unto* Jacob, באל שדי ושמי יהוה לא נודעתי להם, *though the vulgar Tranſlation renders it,* in Deo omnipotente, & 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 Adonai, or that it were any thing to the preſent intendment, which was to encourage* Moſes *and the* Iſraelites *by the interpretation of the name Jehovah) yet we have no reaſon to believe that the* LXX *made any ſuch heterogeneous tranſlation, where we read* καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου Κύριος οὐκ ἐδήλωσα αὐτοῖς. *Tous again, where God ſpeaks unto* Moſes, Οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοῦτό μοι ὄνομα αἰώνιον, Ex. 3. 15. *whoſoever thinks* Κύριος *ſtands for Adonai, does injury to the Tranſlatours, 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. I confeſſe the Ancient Fathers did together with the* Jewes *read Adonai for Jehovah in the Hebrew Text, as appeareth by thoſe words of* Epiphanius de Ponderibus. Ἀδωναὶ, ἠλωὰ, γαειδὶ, Ἰσμαὴλ, ἰσβαὼθ ἀδωναὶ *which very corruptly repreſent part of the firſt verſe of the* 141 *Pſalm,* יהוה קראתך חושה לי האזינה קולי, *but plainly enough render* יהוה *Adonai. 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 in the margin the Tetragrammaton it ſelf,* יהוה, *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* Commelinus *with the Commentary of* Procopius, *and* S. Hierome *gives an account of it in the Greek Copies of his age.* Nonum τετραγράμματον quod ἀνεκφώνητον, id eſt ineffabile putaverunt, quod his literis ſcribitur יוד ה vau ו he ה. quod quidam non intelligentes propter elementorum ſimilitudinem, cum in Græcis libris repererint, pipi legere conſueverunt. *Ep.* 136. *Neither did the Greeks only place this* ΠΙΠΙ *in the margin of their Tranſlations, but when they deſcribed the He-*

brew Text in Greek Characters they uſed the ſame IIIII *for* יהוה, *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 Tranſlatours, in the Library of the moſt eminent Cardinal* Barberin; *where at the* 13 *verſe of the ſecond Chap. of* Malachy *theſe words are written after the Tranſlation of* Aquila, Symmachus, *and* Theodotion *out of the Hebrew Text, after the manner of* Origens Hexapla, *of which there is an excellent example in that MS.* Ουζαθ, ενιαθ, θεζε, χαωεθ, Δεμι, εθμαζβην, (l. βηκ)ιηιη, βιχλ, ναναης, μιην, ωδ, φεγγωθ, ελ, αμμιανα, ηλαχαθ, εχαιαν, μεσθηχαμ. *Which are a very proper expreſſion of theſe following Hebrew words, according to the punctation and reading of that age.* וזאת שניתם תעשו כסות דמעה את מזבח יהוה בכי ואנקה מאין עוד פנות אל המנחה ולקחת רצון מידכם. *By which 'tis evident that* Origen *in his* Hexapla, *from whence undoubtedly that ancient Scholiaſt took his various Tranſlations, did not read Adonai in that place, but kept the Hebrew characters, which they who underſtood them not, formed into thoſe Greek letters ιηιη. And certainly the preſerving of the name Jehovah in the Greek Tranſlations was very ancient, for it was deſcribed in ſome of them with the ancient Characters, as S.* Hieſome *teſtifieth.* Et nomen Domini Tetragrammaton in quibuſdam Græcis voluminibus uſque hodie antiquis expreſſum literis invenimus. Ep. 106. *Being then we cannot be aſſured that the* LXX *read* אדני *for* יהוה, *being they have uſed* Κύριος *for Jehovah, when they have made uſe of the generall word* Θεὸς *for Adonai, being 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.*

God, they had made an interpretation contrary to the manifeſt 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 experimentall and perſonall ſenſe of the fulfilling of his promiſes, his name *Iehovah* was not known unto him: for though God
Gen. 13, 15. 26, 3. ſpake expreſly 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 S. *Steven* confirmeth us,
Act. 7. 5. *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 *Iehovah*, the interpretation

pretation of no other name can make good that expreſſion: and therefore we have reaſon to believe the word which the firſt Greek Tranſlatours, and after them the Apoſtles uſed, may be appropriated to that notion which the Originall requires; as indeed it may, being derived from a verb of the ſame ſignification with the † Hebrew root, and ſo denoting the eſſence or exiſtence of God, and whatſoever elſe may be deduc'd from thence, as revealed by him to be ſignified thereby.

† *It is acknowledged by all that* יהוה *is from* הוה *or* היה, *and God's own interpretation proves no leſſe* אהיה אשר אהיה Ex. 3. 14. *and though ſome contend, the futurition is eſſentiall to the name, yet all agree the root ſignifieth nothing but eſſence or exiſtence, that is,* τὸ εἶναι, *or* ὑπάρχειν. *Now as from* יהוה *in the Hebrew* יהוה, *ſo in the Greek* ἀπὸ τοῦ κύρειν κύριος. *And what the proper ſignification of* κύρειν *is, no man can teach us better then* Heſychius, *in whom we read* Κύρει, ὑπάρχει, τυγχάνει. *Hence was* κύρει *by the Atticks uſed for* ἔστι; *ſo I take it from the words of the Scholiaſt upon Sophocles,* τὸ κυρῶ σχεδιαπομένως φασὶν οἱ Συνήθεια καὶ Ἀττικοὶ, ὃν δὲ ἐυκτικοῖς Καρώνων αὐτὸ Ἀττικοὶ μετὰ ὀλιγότητος τοῦ υ, κύρει λέγοντες ἀντὶ τοῦ κυρεῖν. *Not that they uſed it by an apocope, taking υ from* κυρεῖν, *but that* κύρει *was taken in the ſenſe of* κυρεῖν *or* κυρεῖτο *from* κύρω, ὑπάρχω, κύρει, εἶη *or* ὑπάρχοι. *Neither know I better how to render* κυρεῖς *then by* ὑπάρχεις *in that place of* Æſchylus *his* Prometheus,

Ζηλῶ σ' ὃ δ' ἔστι· ἐκτὸς αἰτίας κυρεῖς,
Πάντων μετ' ἀρχὴν καὶ τετολμηκὼς ἐμοί.

As the Arundelian Scholiaſt upon the Septem Thebana κυρεῖ, ὑπάρχει, *and in the ſame Tragedy in* ἀσπίδος κυρεῖν, *is rendred by the more ancient Scholiaſt,* εἶναι ἢ πῆξις ἀσπίδος; *as in the* Perſæ, σεσωσμένος κυρεῖ, *is by the ſame Interpreter explained* κυρεῖ καὶ ὑπάρχει σεσωσμένος. *And no other ſenſe can be imagined of that verſe in* Sophocles, φονέα σε φημὶ τανδρὸς ὃν ζητῶν κυρεῖν, *then by rendring it* εἶναι *or* ὑπάρχειν; *or of that in* Euripides *his* Phœniſſæ,

ὃν, τίς ὁ σύλλεκτος δωμάτων κυρεῖ·

This originall interpretation appeareth farther in the frequent uſe of κυρέω *for* τυγχάνω *as it ſignifieth no more then* ſum; *as in* Sophocles ἐυδύνων κυρεῖς *for* ἐυδύνεις. μιζῶν κυρῶν, *for* μισῶν, ἐπειπάζων κυρῶ, *for* ἐπειπάζω, ὧν κυρεῖς, *for* εἶς, ἠκατημένος κυρῶ *for* ἠκάτημαι, εἰρηκὼς κυρεῖ, *for* εἴρηκεν; *and in* Euripides ἔχων κυρεῖ, *for* ἔχει, ἠδικημένην κυρῶ, *for* ἀδικηθῶ, *or* ἀδικηθεῖσαν, *as the Scholiaſt. From all which it undeniably appeareth, that the ancient ſignification of* κύρω *or* κυρῶ *is the ſame with* εἰμὶ *or* ὑπάρχω, ſum, *I am, and therefore* κύριος *immediately derived from thence muſt be* ὁ ὤν, *or* ὁ ὑπάρχων; *and conſequently the proper interpretation of* יהוה *deſcending from the root* הוה *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, rendring* אהיה ὁ ὤν Ex. 3.

Being

14. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ὤν, *and again,* ὁ Ὤν ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς ὑμᾶς. *From whence conſidering the name* יהוה *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* ὁ Ὤν. *We have no reaſon then to conceive either that they ſo tranſlated it out of the ſuperſtition of the* Iewes, (*as ſome would perſwade us, whom we have already refuted*) *or becauſe they had no letters in the Greek language by which they could expreſſe 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, becauſe reducible to the ſame ſignification. For even they which are pretended to have read* Adonai *for* Iehovah, *as* Origen, &c. *do acknowledge that the Heathens and the ancient Heretics deſcending from the* Iewes, *had a name by which they did expreſſe the Hebrew* Iehovah. *We know that Oracle preſerved by* Macrobius, Saturnal. *l.* 1. *c.* 18. Φοβεῖσθε τὸν πάντων ὕπαρχον θεὸν ἅμμεν Ἰαώ. *and* Diodorus *hath taught us from whence that name firſt came, mentioning* Moſes *in this manner,* παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσῆν τὸν Ἰαὼ ὀνομαζόμενον θεόν. *and* Theodoret *more expreſly,* Quæſt. 15. *in* Exod. Καλεῖται δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ Σαμαρεῖται μὲν Ἰαζέ, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἰαύ. Porphyr. *l.* 4. contra Chriſtian. *tells us* Sanchoniathon *had his relations of the* Iewes παρὰ Ἱερομβάλου τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ θεοῦ, τοῦ Ἰαυώ. Euſebius (*as we formerly mentioned*) *ſaid* Ἰαυώ ἐστιν Ἰαὼ σωτηρία. Heſychius, Ἰωάδαμ ἰαὼ βοηθεία, *taking* ἰαὼ *in compoſition for the contraction of* ἰαώ. *As* Ἰωνᾶς ἑρμηνεύεται ὑψις πονηροῦ. *and the* LXX *Jer.* 23. 6. *have rendred* יהוה צדקנו Ἰωσεδὲκ, id eſt Dominus Iuſtus, *ſaith S.* Hieronie. *And as the Heathens and the firſt Chriſtians, ſo the Heretics had among them the pronunciation and expreſſion of the name* יהוה. *As the* Valentinian *was baptized* ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰαώ. Iren. *l.* 1. *and the* Ophiani *had their ſeverall Gods among the reſt,* ἀπὸ μὲν μαγγάνης τὸν Ἰαλδαβαὼθ, καὶ τὸν ἀκταῖον, καὶ τὸν ἀφέσιον, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν γραμμάτων τὸν Ἰαὼ Ἰαὲ παρ' Ἑβραίοις ὀνομαζόμενον. Orig. contra Celſum. *l.* 6. *So I read it, not as it is in the Edition of* Hæſchelius, Ἰαωΐα *in one word, or* Ἰαωΰα, *as our learned Countryman* Nicolaus Fullerus *hath endeavoured in vain to rectifie it, but* Ἰαὼ Ἰά, *that is, the* Ophiani *took the name* Ἰαὼ *from the* Iewes, *among whom it ſignifies the ſame who is called* Iah. *For that it ought ſo to be read, appeareth by the former words of* Origen, Οἴονται τὸν διαλύοντα τὸν Ἰαλδαβαὼθ καὶ φθάσαντα ὅτι τὸν Ἰὰ δεῖν λέγειν, Σὺ δὲ κρυπτομένων μυστηίων αὖ καὶ παλαιῶν ἀρχὼν νυκτοφανὴς λύτορι Ἰαώ. *In the printed Copy indeed it is* Ἰαδεῖν, *and in the Latine* Iadin, *but without ſenſe; but dividing the words, the ſenſe is manifeſt, and the reaſon of the former emendation apparent. Being then there were ſo many among the Greeks which did in all ages expreſſe the Hebrew name, it can be no way probable that the* LXX *ſhould avoid it as inexpreſſible in their language.*

Being then this Title *Lord* thus ſignifieth the proper name of God Jehovah, being the ſame is certainly attributed unto Chriſt, in a notion farre ſurpaſſing all other Lords,

Lords, which are rather to be looked upon as ſervants unto him, it will be worth our enquiry next whether, as it is the Tranſlation of the name *Iehovah*, it belong to Chriſt; or whether, though he be Lord of all other Lords, as ſubjected under his authority, yet he be ſo inferiour unto him whoſe name alone is *Iehovah*, as that in that propriety and eminency in which it belongs unto the ſupreme God, it may not be attributed unto Chriſt.

This doubt will eaſily be ſatisfied, if we can ſhew the name *Iehovah* it ſelf to be given unto our Saviour; it being againſt all reaſon to acknowledge the originall name, and to deny the interpretation in the ſenſe and full importance of that originall. Wherefore if Chriſt be the *Iehovah*, as ſo called by the Spirit of God, then is he ſo the *Lord*, in the ſame propriety and eminency in which *Iehovah* is. Now whatſoever did belong to the *Meſſias*, that may and muſt be attributed unto Jeſus, as being the true and onely Chriſt. But the *Jewes* themſelves acknowledge that *Iehovah* ſhall be known clearly in the dayes of the *Meſſias*, and not only ſo, but that it is the * name which properly belongeth to him. And if they cannot but confeſſe 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 *Iehovah, the Lord of hoſts* to be the name of the *Meſſias, who was* to them *for a ſtone of ſtumbling and a rock of offence*, how can we poſſibly be ignorant of it, who are taught by S. *Paul*, that in Chriſt this prophecy was fulfilled, *as it is written*, a *Behold, I lay in Sion a ſtumbling ſtone and rock of offence, and whoſoever believeth on him ſhall not be aſhamed*? It was no other then *Jehovah* who ſpake thoſe words, b *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*. Where not only he who is deſcribed

* *As* Midraſh. Tillim *on* 21. *Pſal.* Echa Rabati *Lam.* 1. 6.

Iſ. 8. 14.

a *Rom.* 9. 33.

b *Hoſ.* 1. 7. *where it is further obſervable that the Chaldee Paraphraſt hath* במימרא דיי *for* ביהוה *by the word of* Iehovah *for* Iehovah.

bed as the originall and principall cauſe, that is, the Father who gave his Son, but alſo he who is the immediate efficient of our ſalvation, & that in oppoſition to all other meanes or inſtrumentall cauſes, is call'd *Jehovah*; who can
Act. 4. 12. be no other then our Jeſus, becauſe *there is no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we muſt be ſaved.*
Zech. 10. 12. 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;) where he which ſtrengtheneth is one, and he by whom he ſtrengtheneth is another, clearly diſtinguiſhed from him by the perſonall pronoune, and yet each of them is *Jehovah*, and *Jehovah*
Deut. 6. 4. *our God is one Jehovah.* Whatſoever † objections may

† *Two Adverſaries we have to the expoſition of this place, the Jew and the Socinian; onely with this difference, that we find the leſſe oppoſition from the* Jew, *from whom indeed we have ſo ample a conceſſion as will deſtroy the others contradiction. Firſt* Socinus *anſwers, the name belongeth not to Chriſt but unto* Iſrael; *and that it ſo appeares by a parallel place in the ſame Prophet,* Jer. 33. 15, 16. Socin. refut. *Jac. Wieki.* cap. 6. Catech. *Racov.* de Perſ. Chriſti, *c.* 1. *Crell.* de Deo & Attr. *l.* 1. *c.* 11. *To this we firſt oppoſe the conſtant interpretation of the* Jewes, *who attribute the name* Jehovah *to the* Meſſias *from this one particular Text. As in the* Sepher Ikkarim. *l.* 2. *c.* 8. ויקרא הכתוב שם המשיח ויי צדקנו. *The Scripture calleth the name of the* Meſſias Jehovah *our righteouſneſſe. And in* Midraſch Tillim. *on* Pſal. 21. וקורא למלך המשיח בשמו ומהו שמו יהוה שני יהוה איש מלחמה יהוה שמו ובמלך המשיח כתיב חה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו. *God calleth the* Meſſias *by his own name, and his name is* Jehovah, *as it is ſaid* (Ex. 15. 2.) *The Lord is a man of warre,* Jehovah *is his name. And it is written of the* Meſſias, (Ier. 23. 6.) *And this is the name which they ſhall call him,* Iehovah *our righteouſneſſe. Thus* Echa Rabati, *Lam.* 1. 6. מה שמו של משיח אלי אבא יהוה שמר שני חה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו. *What is the name of the* Meſſias? *R.* Abba *ſaid,* Iehovah *is his name. As it is ſaid.* (Ier. 23. 6.) *And this is the name which they ſhall call him,* Iehovah *our righteouſneſſe. The ſame he reports of Rabbi* Levi. *The Rabbins then, though enemies to the truth which we deduce from thence, conſtrained by the literall importance of the text, did acknowledge that the name* Iehovah *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 inforce the ſame interpretation. For whereas in the* 23, 6. *of* Ieremiah *it is expreſly ſaid,* יהוה שמו *this is the name, in the* 33. *it is onely* יהוה *without any mention of a name; and ſurely that place cannot prove* Iehovah *to be the name of* Iſrael, *which ſpeaks not one word of the name of* Ieruſalem; *for where we read in* Crellius, *hoc ſcilicet nomen eſt, all but hoc is not*

be

Scripture, but the gloſſe of Crellius, *and* hoc *it ſelf cannot be warranted for the interpretation of* זה, *nor* quo *for* אשר; *the ſimpleſt interpretation of thoſe words* יהוה אשר יקראלה, *being* iſte qui vocabit eam, *he which calleth* Ieruſalem *is the Lord our righteouſneſſe, that is,* Chriſt. *And thus the firſt anſwer of* Socinus *is invalid, which he eaſily foreſeeing, hath joyned with the Jewiſh Rabbins in the ſecond anſwer, admitting that* Iehovah *our righteouſneſſe is the name of the* Meſſias, *but withall denying that the* Chriſt *is that* Iehovah. *To which purpoſe they aſſert thoſe words,* Iehovah our righteouſneſſe, *to be delivered by way of propoſition, not of apoſition; and this they endeavour to prove by ſuch places of Scripture as ſeem to inferre as much. As* Moſes *built an altar, and called the name of it* Iehovah niſſi, *Ex.* 17. 15. Gideon *built an altar unto the Lord, and called it* Iehovah Shalom. *Judg.* 6. 24. *And the name of the City in the laſt words of* Ezekiel *is* Iehovah Shammah. *In all which places it is moſt certain that the name* Iehovah *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 righteouſneſſe *can be no otherwiſe underſtood of Chriſt then as a Propoſition, and that we by calling him ſo according to the Prophets prediction, can underſtand no more thereby then that God the Father of Chriſt doth juſtifie us, is moſt irrationall. 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* Iehovah *without addition, cannot be* Iehovah *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* Iehovah *is ſometimes given to the Angels repreſenting God, muſt acknowledge that it may be given unto Chriſt whom they confeſſe to be above all Angels, and farre 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 beares 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 it ſelf, it could neither be by apoſition, and conſequently, even in this reſpect, it was neceſſary to make the name a Propoſition. But our righteouſneſſe may undoubtedly be predicated of him who is here called by the name of* the Lord our righteouſneſſe, *for the Apoſtle hath expreſly taught us that he is made righteouſneſſe unto us.* 1 Cor. 1. 30. *and if it may be in it ſelf, there can be no repugnancy in its predication by way of apoſition. Thirdly, that addition of our righteouſneſſe 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 call'd* Jehovah *but to that Chriſt alone. For he alone is* the end of the law for righteouſneſſe to every one that believeth. Ro. 10. 4. *and when he is ſaid to be* made unto us righteouſneſſe, 1 Cor. 1. 30. *he is thereby diſtinguiſhed from God the Father. Being then Chriſt is thus peculiarly called our righteouſneſſe under the Goſpel, being the place of the Prophet forementioned ſpeaketh of this as a name to be uſed under the Goſpel, being no other perſon called* Jehovah *is ever expreſly call'd our righteouſneſſe in the Goſpel, it followeth not onely that Chriſt may be ſo called, but that the prophecy cannot otherwiſe be*

fulfilled, then by acknowledging that Christ is the Lord our righteousnesse: and consequently that is his name, not by way of proposition, but of apposition and appropriation; so that being both Jehovah *and* our righteousnesse, *he is as truly* Jehovah *as* our righteousnesse.

be fram'd against us, we know Christ is the *righteous branch raised unto David; the King that shall reign and prosper, in whose dayes Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely*; we are assured that *this is his name whereby he shall be called, the* Lord *our* Righteousnesse, the Lord, that is, *Jehovah*, the expression of his supremacy; and the addition of *Our righteousnesse* can be no diminution to his Majesty. If those words in the Prophet, *Sing and rejoyce, O daughter of Sion, for lo I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee saith the* Lord (Jehovah,) 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 joyned 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*; for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but Christ?

Jer. 23. 6.

Zach. 2. 10, 11.

And as the originall *Jehovah* was spoken of Christ by the holy Prophets, so the title of *Lord*, as the usuall interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the Apostles. In that signall 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 deliver'd*; and S. *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 confesse with our mouth the* Lord *Jesus, we shall be saved*. 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

Joel 2. 32.

Rom. 10. 9, 11, 13.

to

to Christ depend upon that other promise, whosoever shall call on the name of the *Lord* shall be saved; 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 S. *Pauls* 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 then *Jehovah*, as appeareth by the Prophet *Joel* from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New Testament is called *Lord*, as that name or title is the interpretation of *Jehovah*. 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 the 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 S. *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 wayes*; where Christ is certainly *the Lord*, and *the Lord* * undeniably *Jehovah*.

Mat. 11. 10. *Malach.* 3. 1. *Mat.* 3. 3. *Luk.* 1. 76.

* *I say therefore undeniably, because it is not only the undoubted translation of the name* יהוה *in the Prophet, (which of it self were sufficient) but also is delivered in that manner which is, (though unreasonably) required to signifie the proper name of God,* κυριακῶς ὅταν μὴ μετὰ ἄρθρου λέγηται Κύριος, *not* τῷ Κυρίῳ, *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 fundamentall Doctrine, maintained as such ever since the Apostles times by the whole Catholick Church, must be examined, censur'd and condemned by* ὁ, ἤτις. *Socinus first makes use of this observation against* Wiekus, *and after him* Coelius *hath laid it as a grave and serious foundation, and spread it out into its severall corners, to uphold the fabrick of his superstructions. First,* Vox *Jehovah* magis quam cætera Dei nomina propriorum naturam

ſequitur, ideo etiam Græca κύριος cum pro illa ponitur, propriorum indolem, qua licet, æmulatur. *Secondly*, Propriis nominibus articulus libentius ſubtrahitur, licet eum etiam ſæpe concinnitatis potius quam neceſſitatis causâ admittant. Idem fit in voce κύριος cum pro *Jehovah* ponitur. *Thirdly*, Hæc eſt cauſa cur in novo Teſtamento, maximè apud *Lucam* & *Paulum*, vox κύριος cum Deum ſummum deſignat, articulo libentius careat; At cum de Chriſto ſubjectivè uſurpatur, raro articulus omittitur. *What ſtrange uncertainties are theſe to build the deniall of ſo important an Article as Chriſts divinity upon? He does not ſay abſolutely* Jehovah *is the proper name of God, but onely that it doth more follow the nature of proper names then the other names of God: and indeed it is certain that ſometimes it hath the nature of an appellative, as* Deut. 6. 4. יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד, *the Lord our God is one Lord; and yet if it be not alwayes 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 onely that* libentius ſubtrahitur, *rather omitted then affixed; which yet is farre 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 th Law at his Circumciſion.* καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, Luc. 2. 21. *and yet whoſoever ſhall read the Goſpel of S.* 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 Attick ſtile, S.* Paul *is often ſtiled* ὁ Παῦλος, *then ſimply* Παῦλος. *So* Balaam, Gallio *&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, Balac, *&c. Thirdly,* ὁ Κύριος *is ſo often uſed for that God who is the Father with an Article, and* Κύριος *for the Son without an Article; For the Father,* Mat. 1, 22. 2, 15. 5, 33. 22, 44. *Mar.* 12, 36. *Luk.* 1, 6, 9, 15, 25, 46. 2, 15, 22, 23. 20, 42. *Act.* 2, 25, 34. 3, 20. 17, 27. *Ro.* 15, 11. 1 *Cor.* 10, 26. 16. 7. 2 *Cor.* 5, 11. *Eph.* 5, 17, 19. *Col.* 3, 16, 20, 23. 2 *Theſſ.* 3, 3. 2 *Tim.* 1, 16. *Heb.* 8, 2, 11. 12, 14. *Ja.* 4, 10, 15. 1 *Pet.* 2, 3. *For the Son, Mat.* 3, 3. 22, 43, 45. *Mar.* 1, 3. *Lu.* 1, 76. 2, 11. 3, 4. 20, 44. *Joh.* 1, 23. *Act.* 2, 36. 10, 36. 11, 16, 21. 15, 11. *Ro.* 1, 7. 10, 9, 12. 14, 6, 8, 14. 16, 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 22. 1 *Cor.* 1, 3, 4, 16. 7, 22, 25, 39. 9, 1, 2. 10, 21. 11, 11. 12, 3. 14, 37. 15, 58. 16, 10, 19. 2 *Cor.* 1, 2. 2, 12. 4, 5. 10, 17. 11, 17. 12, 1. *Gal.* 1, 3. 5, 10. *Eph.* 1, 2. 2, 21. 4, 1, 5, 17. 5, 8. 6, 1, 4, 10, 21, 23. *Phil.* 1, 2, 14. 2, 11, 19, 24 29. 3, 1, 20. 4, 1, 2, 10. *Col.* 1, 3. 3, 17, 18, 24. 4, 1, 7, 17. 1 *Theſſ.* 1, 1. 3, 8. 4, 1, 15, 17. 5, 2, 12. 2 *Theſſ.* 1, 1, 2. 2, 13. 3, 4. 1 *Tim.* 1. 1. 2 *Tim.* 2, 24. *Tit.* 1 4 *Philem.* 3, 16, 20. *Ja.* 1, 1. 2 *Pet.* 3, 8, 10. 2 *Joh.* 3. *Jud.* 14. *Rev.* 14, 13. 19, 16. *I ſay, they are thus ſo often us'd, that though they equall not the number of their contrary acceptions, yet they come ſo near as to yield no ground for any ſuch obſervation, as if the Holy Ghoſt intended any ſuch Article-diſtinction. Nay it is moſt evident that the ſacred pen-men intended no ſuch diſtinction, becauſe in the ſame place ſpeaking of the ſame perſon, they uſually obſerve the indifferency of adding or omitting the Article; As* Ja. 5. 11. Τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰὼβ ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ τέλος Κυρίου εἴδετε, ὅτι πολύσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος καὶ οἰκτίρμων. 2 *Tim.* 1. 18. Δῴη αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος εὑρεῖν ἔλεος παρὰ Κυρίου ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. 1 *Cor.* 7. 17. Ἐμέρισεν ὡς κέκληκεν ὁ Κύ-

ριος,

ειος, οὕτω πεισματείτω. 22. ὁ γὰρ ὢν Κυρίῳ κεκλημένος δοῦλος, ἀπελεύθερος Κυρίου ἐστί. *See* Ro. 14.6,7,8. *Wherefore being* Jehovah *is not affirmed absolutely to be a proper name; being, if it were, yet it appeares that it is not the custome of the New Testament to use every Proper Name of inser without an Article then with one; being* ὁ Κύριος *is so often taken for him whom they acknowledge God, and* Κύριος *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 pen-men were not curious, and the Transcribers have been very carelesse; 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,* Revel. 1. 8. *hath* λέγει ὁ κύριος *onely, the Complutensis* λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς, Plantine λέγει ὁ κύριος ὁ θεὸς, *against the* Socinian *Rule, who will have an accession by* ὁ *to* θεὸς, *and a diminution by* ὁ *from* κύριος. *As* Rev. 4.11. Ἄξιος εἶ κύριε λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν. *In other Mss* Ἄξιος εἶ ὁ Κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἅγιος λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν. 1 Cor. 11. 27. τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως· *Others with an addition,* τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου. 1 Cor. 14.37. *The vulgar Edition* ὅτι τοῦ Κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολαί. *the Complutense* ὅτι Κυρίου. *So where we usually read* Χριστὸς, *divers ancient MSS. have* Κύριος. *Lastly it is observable that even in these words of the Creed which we now expound,* Κύριος *is spoken expresly of Christ without an Article; for so we read it,* Καὶ εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Κύριον ἡμῶν.

Nor is this the onely Notation of the name or title *Lord*, taken in a sense divine, above the expression of all mere humane 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 originall, *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 Prophecy, *The* Lord *whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in.* Ps. 110.1. † *Chal. Paraph.* *Malac.* 3. הָאָדוֹן

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 onely agree with that other notion of *Jehovah*, but presuppose it, as following and flowing from it. For He who

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 every thing 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 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 shew, how, and in what respect Christ is *the* Lord.

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, by which he is the Lord the Maker of all things, the other, by which he is made the Lord of all things.

*Joh.*1.1,3. As 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 any thing made that was made*; we must acknowledge, that whosoever is the creatour of all things, must have a direct dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creatour who made all things. Therefore the *Word*, that is, Christ as God, hath the supreme and universall dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting but believing *Thomas*, *My Lord, and my God.* *Joh.*20.28.

As

As for the ſecond, it is alſo certain that there was ſome kind of Lordſhip given or beſtowed on Chriſt, whoſe very unction proves no leſſe then an imparted dominion: as S. *Peter* tells us, that he was *made both Lord and Chriſt*. What *David* ſpake of man, the Apoſtle hath applied peculiarly to him, *thou crownedſt him with glory and honour, and didſt ſet him over the works of thine hands, thou haſt put all things in ſubjection under his feet.* *Act.* 2. 36. *Heb.* 2. 7, 8.

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 humane 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 judgement, becauſe he is the Son of man*; and by 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.* Part of the ſame Dominion is the power of forgiving ſins, as pardoning no leſſe then 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.* 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 then the Temple*, ſhewing that *the Son of man was Lord even of the Sabbath day.* *Joh.* 5. 27. *Mat.* 16. 27. *Mat.* 9. 2, 6. *Mat.* 12. 8.

This Dominion thus given unto Chriſt in his humane 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 ob- *Joh.* 13. 3.

ſervable that in the ſame place it is written that he likewiſe knew *that he was come from God, and went to God*, 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 onely 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.* After his reſurrection he ſaid to the Diſciples, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* He *drunk of the brook in the way, therefore he hath lift up his head.* Becauſe *he humbled himſelf and became obedient unto death even the death of the croſſe, 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 confeſſe that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* Thus for and after his death, he was inſtated in a full power and dominion of all things, even as the Son of man, but exalted by the Father, *who raiſed him from the dead, and ſet him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, farre 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.*

Rom. 14.9.

Mat. 28.18.
Pſ. 110.7.

Philip. 2.8,9, 10,11.

Eph. 1.20,21, 22.

Now as all the power given unto Chriſt as man had not the 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 Oeconomicall, aiming at a certain end, ſhall then ceaſe and terminate, when that end for which 'twas given ſhall be accompliſhed: part being either due upon the union of the humane nature with the divine, or upon covenant as a reward for the ſufferings endured in that nature, muſt be coevall with that union and that nature which ſo ſuffered, and conſequently muſt be eternall.

Of

Of the first part of this Dominion did *David* speak, when by the spirit of prophecy he call'd his Son his Lord. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy foot-stool*: where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged untill their finall and totall subjection. *For he must reign, till he hath put all things under his feet.* And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdome 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 kingdome 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.

Psal. 110. 1.

1 *Cor.* 15, 25.

1 *Cor.* 15. 24, 28.

Psal. 110, 2.

But we must not look upon Christ onely in the nature of a Generall, who hath received a Commission; or of an Embassadour, with perfect instructions; but of the onely Son of God, impowred and employed to destroy the enemies of his Fathers Kingdome: and though thus empowred and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the onely Son and the heir of all things in his Fathers house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath purchased with his own bloud, 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 immarcessable crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternall, then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath alwayes reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings, but so that he con-

tinue ſtill for ever High Prieſt, and King of kings.

The certainty of this eternall 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 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 expreſly to *David*. *Thy houſe and thy kingdome ſhall be eſtabliſhed for ever before thee, thy throne ſhall be eſtabliſhed for ever.* And although that terme *for ever* in the Hebrew language may ſignifie ofttimes no more then 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 Oeconomicall Dominion or Kingdome of Chriſt may be thought ſufficiently to fulfill that promiſe, becauſe it ſhall certainly continue ſo long as the nature of that Oeconomy 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 farre 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 wombe, *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 kingdome there ſhall be no end.* Nor is this clearer in *Gabriel's* explication of the promiſe, then 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 dayes,*

Ezek. 34. 23, 24.

2 Sam. 7. 16. עד עולם

Lu. 1. 32, 33.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

dayes, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdome, that all people and languages ſhould ſerve him: his dominion is an everlaſting dominion, which ſhall not paſſe away, and his kingdome that which ſhall not be deſtroyed.

Thus Chriſt is *Lord* both by a naturall and independent Dominion, as God, the Creatour, 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 Oeconomicall, 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 humane nature, that it muſt be coevall with it, that is of eternall duration.

The third part of our Explication is the due conſideration of the object of Chriſts Dominion, enquiring 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 S. *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 implyeth not a contradiction. *For he hath put all things under his feet, but when he ſaith all things are put vnder him, it is manifeſt that he is excepted which did put all things under him.* God onely then excepted, whoſe originall 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 farre 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 cer-

Act. 10.36.

1 *Cor.* 15.27.

Heb. 1.6.

Pſ. 2.8.

tainly *our Lord* becauſe he is the Lord of all, and when all things were ſubjected to him, we were not excepted.

But in the midſt of this Univerſality of Chriſt's Regall authority, it will be further neceſſary to find ſome propriety of dominion, by which he may be ſaid to be peculiarly *our Lord*. 'Tis true he made us, and not we our ſelves, 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 cloatheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beſide his originall 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.

† *For the right underſtanding of this double title involved in the word Redemption, it will be neceſſary to take notice of the wayes by which Humane Dominion is acquired, and ſervitude introduced.* Servi aut naſcuntur, aut fiunt, *ſaith the Civilian.* Iuſt. l. 1. tit. 3. *but in Theology we ſay more,* Servi & naſcuntur, & fiunt. *Man is born the ſervant of God his maker, man is made the ſervant of his redeemer. Two wayes in generall they obſerv'd, by which they came to ſerve, who were not born ſlaves.* Fiunt aut jure gentium, id eſt, captivitate, aut jure civili, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad pretium participandum ſeſe vœnundari paſſus eſt. *Two wayes then alſo there were by which Dominion over thoſe ſervants was acquired, by conqueſt or by purchaſe, and both theſe were alwayes accounted juſt.* Dionyſius Halicarnaſſæus, *an excellent Hiſtorian, a curious obſerver of the* Roman *cuſtomes, and an exact judge of their actions, being a* Grecian, *juſtifieth the right which the Maſters in* Rome *claimed over their ſervants upon theſe two grounds.* Ἐπύγχανον δὴ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις αἱ ἐκ δορατήτων κλήσεις κατὰ τὰς δικαιοτάτας γινόμεναι τρόπους· ἢ γὰρ ἀνηλωμένοι παρὰ τῶ δημοσίω τὰς ὑπὸ δόρυ πωλυμένας ὑπ' αὐτῆς λαφύρων, ἢ τὸ στρατηγῶ συγχωρήσαντι & ἅμα ταῖς ἄλλαις ὠφελείαις καὶ δουλεύοντες τοῖς λαβοῦσιν ἔχειν, ἢ φρεάμενοι παρ' ἑτέρων κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τρόπους κυρίων γενομένων ὠνήκηντο τὰς δούλας. Hiſt. l. 4. *where it is alſo further to be obſerved, that the ſame perſons were made ſlaves by conqueſt, and poſſeſſed by purchaſe, by conqueſt to the City of* Rome, *by purchaſe to the* Roman *Citizen. The Generall firſt took and ſaved them, and ſo made them his, that is, reduced them to the will and power of the State from which he received his Commiſſion, and in whoſe name, and for whoſe intereſt he fought: This State expos'd their intereſt to ſale, and ſo whatever*

We

right had been gained by the conquering ſword, was devolved on the Roman *Citizen for a certain ſumme of money paid to the State to defray the charges of that warre. Thus every Lord or Maſter of a ſlave ſo taken, had full power over him, and poſſeſſion of him, by right of purchaſe, unto which he was firſt made liable by conqueſt. And though not exactly in that manner, yet by that double right is Chriſt become our Lord, and we his ſervants.*

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 ſhew of them openly triumphing over them.* But contrary to the cuſtome of triumphing Conquerours, 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 Croſſe as his triumphant chariot he ſhed that precious bloud which bought us, and thereby became our *Lord*, by right of *Redemption*, both as to conqueſt, and to purchaſe. Ro.6.16. Col.2.15.

Beſide, he hath not onely bought us, but provideth for us; what e're we have, we receive from him as the Maſter of the family; we hold of him all temporall and eternall 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*. Act.3.15. 1 Cor.2.8.

Laſtly, men were not anciently ſold alwayes by others, but ſometimes by themſelves, and whoſoever of us truly believe in Chriſt, have given up our names unto him. In our baptiſmall vow we bind our ſelves unto his ſervice, that *henceforth we will not ſerve ſin, but yield our ſelves unto God, as thoſe that are alive from the dead, and our members as inſtruments of righteouſneſſe unto God*: that *as we have yielded our members ſervants to uncleanneſſe, and* Ro.6.6,13,19.

and to iniquity: even ſo we ſhould *yield our members ſervants to righteouſneſſe, unto holineſſe.* And thus the ſame Dominion is acknowledged by compact, and confirm'd by Covenant, and ſo Chriſt becomes *our* Lord by right of *Obligation.*

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 poſſeſſions, nor our actions. 1 Cor. 6. 19, 20. *Know ye not,* ſaith S. Paul, *that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price.* 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 our ſelves, but to him, for in this the difference of † ſervice and freedome doth properly conſiſt: we cannot do our ‖ own wills, but the will of him whoſe we are. Chriſt took up-

* Δοῦλος κτῆμά τι ἔμψυχον· καὶ ὥσπερ ὄργανον πρὸ ὀργάνων πᾶς ὁ ὑπηρέτης. Ariſto. Pol. l. 1. c. 4. Τό, τε γὰρ σῶμα ὅτιν ὄργανον ψυχῆς, καὶ τῇ δεσπότῃ ὁ δοῦλος, ὥσπερ μέρος καὶ ὄργανον ἀφαιρετόν, τὸ δ' ὄργανον ὥσπερ δοῦλος ἄψυχος. Idem. Eth. l. 8. c. 9. *and again more expreſſly,* Τὶς μὲν οὖν ἡ φύσις τοῦ δούλου, καὶ τὶς ἡ δυνάμις, ἐκ τούτων δῆλον. Ὁ γὰρ μὴ αὐτοῦ φύσει, ἀλλ' ἄλλου, ἄνθρωπος δέ, ὅτος φύσει δοῦλός ὅτιν, ἄλλου δ' ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἂν κτῆμα ᾖ, ἀνθρωπος ὤν. *So that the definition of a ſervant according to* Ariſtotle, *is he, who being a man, is notwithſtanding the poſſeſſion of a man. And although all Relatives be predicated of each other in* obliquo, *as* pater eſt filii pater, & filius patris filius; dominus eſt ſervi dominus, & ſervus domini ſervus: *Yet he obſerves a difference in this, that a ſervant is not onely* ſervus domini, *but ſimply* domini, *but the maſter is not ſimply* ſervi, *but* dominus ſervi. Ὁ μὲν δεσπότης τοῦ δούλου δεσπότης μόνον, ἐκείνου δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μόνον δεσπότου δοῦλός ὅτιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλος ἐκείνου. *The ſervant then is ſo wholly in the poſſeſſion and for the uſe of his maſter, that he is nothing elſe but a living tool or inſtrument; inſomuch ſayes he, that if all tooles were like thoſe of* Dædalus, *or the* Tripodes *of* Vulcan, *which the Poets fained to move of themſelves, Artificers would need no under workmen, nor maſters ſervants.* † So Ariſtotle Ethic. 4. πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν δουλικόν. *and in the firſt of his* Rhetoricks *on the contrary,* ἐλευθέρου τὸ μὴ πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν. ‖ τὸ ζῆν ὡς βούλεταί τις τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἔργον, ὅπερ τοῦ δούλου ὄντος, τὸ ζῆν μὴ ὡς βούλεται. Ariſt. Pol. 6. 2. Quid eſt liberas? poteſtas vivendi ut velis. *Cicero* Parad.

on

on 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 doe mine own will, but the will of him that ſent me.* Joh.6.38. 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.* Ro.14.7,8.

Secondly, the ſame is neceſſary both to inforce, and invite us to obedience; to inforce us, as *the Lord*, to invite us, as *Chriſt the Lord.* If we acknowledge our ſelves to be his ſervants, we muſt *bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Chriſt.* 2 Cor.10.5. He which therefore died, and roſe and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death & 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 Authour of eternall ſalvation unto all them that obey him.* Heb.5.8,9. 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 oblig'd 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 will hear it & do it.* Deut.5.27. If they interpreted it ſo great a favour to receive the law by the hands of *Moſes*; if they made ſo ready and chearfull 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 chearfully 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 readineſſe of mind, ſubmit our ſelves 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 joyn 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, the people which they rule is not their own, but the Subjects of a greater prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this S. *Paul* doth ground his admonition

Col. 4. 1. to *Maſters give unto your ſervants that which is juſt and equall, 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

Lev. 25. 42. the interdiction, *For they are my ſervants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, they ſhall not be ſold as bondmen.* What tenderneſſe 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 humane ordination, becauſe in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the ſame proportion and ſtand in the ſame relation to their Governours, with ſervants to their Maſters: and S. *Paul*

Col. 3. 22, 23, 24. 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

ye ſerve the Lord Chriſt. Neither do we learn from hence onely 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 alwayes 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.* 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 untill all his enemies be made his footſtool. Great is the power of the luſts of our fleſh which warre 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 undergoe 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. Rom. 10. 12.

After this Explication, every Chriſtian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the Article, and expreſſe 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 doe aſſent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himſelf, that Jeſus Chriſt the onely Son of God is the true *Jehovah*, who hath that being which is originally and eternally of it ſelf, and of which

all other beings doe essentially depend; that by the right of emanation of all things from him, he hath an absolute, supreme, and universall Dominion over all things, as God; that as the Son of man he is invested with all power in heaven and earth; partly Oeconomicall, 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 eternall, as belonging to that kingdome 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 further right of promotion, which, considering the Covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligation; and thus I believe in Christ *our Lord*.

ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, born of the Virgin Mary.

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 made no ſuch diſtinction, but without any particular expreſſe mention of the conception, had it onely in this manner,* *who was born by the Holy Ghoſt of 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 onely of the operation of the Holy Ghoſt in Chriſts conception, and of the manner of his birth, leave out moſt part of that which was anciently underſtood under that one term of being *born* of the Holy Ghoſt, and of the Virgin *Mary*.

* Qui natus eſt de Spiritu Sancto ex *Maria* Virgine. *Ruffinus* in Symb. *S. Aug.* Ench. ad *Laurent.* c. 34 37. & 38. Natus de Spiritu *S.* & *Maria* Virgine, *as alſo the Council of* Franckford *in* Sacroſyllab.

S. Aug. de Fide & Symb. Natus eſt per Spiritum S. ex Virgine *Maria*. *S. Leo.* Epiſt. 10. c. 2. *Maximus Taurin. Chryſol. Etherius Uxam.* Author Symbol. ad Catechum. Qui natus eſt de Spiritu *S.* ex *Maria* Virgine. *So alſo* Venantius Fortunatus. *From whence* Fulgentius de Fide ad *Petrum Diaconum*. Natum de Spiritu *S.* ex *Maria* Virgine, in Symbolo acceptum, & corde ad juſtitiam credit, & ore ad ſalutem *S.* Eccleſia confitetur. *And* Aleuinus l. 3. de Trinit. c. 1. Dicitur in Symbolo Catholicæ fidei, quod Chriſtus de Spiritu *S.* & ex *Maria* Virgine ſit natus. *In the Ancient MSS. tranſcribed by the learned Archbiſhop of* Armagh, τὸν 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* Cyzicum *in the Council of* Chalcedon, Οἱ ἁγιοι πατέρες οἱ μετὰ τοῦτο, τὸ ἐξακούσθη, ὅ ἐστιν οἱ ἁγιοι

ἐν Νικαίᾳ πατέρες, ὁμοούσιον ἐπίστευσαν εἰπόντες, ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. *In the several expositions among the sermons* de Tempore, *falsly attributed to S.* Aug. Qui conceptus est de Spiritu S. natus ex Virgine *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.

That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to expresse the full intent, and to comprehend the utmost signification of this Article, we shall consider three Persons mentioned, so farre as they are concerned in it. The first is He who was conceived and born; the second, He by whose energie or operation he was conceived; the third, She who did conceive and bear him.

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 onely Son of God. And being we have already demonstrated, that this onely 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 vertue of its connexion, can import no lesse then this most certain but miraculous truth, that * He which was begotten by the Father before all worlds, was now in the fulnesse 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 humane nature of our Saviour therefore the same Relative considered with the words which follow it, can speak no lesse then 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 S. *John, The Word was made flesh.*

* Huic, quem dudum de Patre natum ineffabiliter didicisti, nunc à Sp. S. templum fabricatum intra secreta uteri Virginalis intellige. *Ruff.*

Indeed this Pronoun hath relation not onely unto this but to the following Articles, which have their necessary connexion with, and foundation in this Third: for He who

was

was *conceived* and *born*, and ſo made man, did in that humane 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 joyning the humane nature with the Divine. But then we muſt take heed leſt we conceive, becauſe the Divine nature belongeth to the Father, to which the humane is conjoyned, that therefore the Father ſhould be incarnate, or conceiv'd 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 humane nature was conjoyned with the Divinity, which is the nature common to the Father and the Son, yet was that union made onely in the perſon of the Son. Which Doctrine is to be obſerved againſt the Hereſy of the * *Patripaſſians*, which was both very ancient and farre diffus'd; making the Father to be

* *The Hereſy of the* Patripaſſians *ſeems onely to have relation to the ſuffering of our Saviour, becauſe the word ſignifies no more then the Paſſion of the Father. But it is founded in an errour 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* 130 *yeares before him, and when he was queſtioned for it he denied it.* Διὰ τὸ μηδένα πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἐξεμέσαι ταυτην τὴν πλεῖαν. *But certainly this Hereſy was ancienter then* Noetus; *for the* Patripaſſiani *are named by* S. Cyprian, *Epiſt.* 73. *and* Tertullian *his Maſter chargeth it upon* Praxeas: Duo negotia Diaboli *Praxeas Romæ* procuravit, Prophetiam expulit, & Hæreſim intulit; Paracletum fugavit, & Patrem crucifixit. Adv. *Prax.* c. 1. *And expreſſing the abſurdity of that opinion,* Itaque poſt tempus Pater natus & Pater paſſus, ipſe Deus Dominus Omnipotens Jeſus Chriſtus prædicetur. c. 2. *And* De Præſc. adv. Hærer. Poſt hos omnes etiam *Praxeas* quidam Hæreſim introduxit, quam *Victorinus* corroborare curavit. Hic Deum Patrem omnipotentem Jeſum Chriſtum eſſe dicit, hunc crucifixum paſſumque contendit; mortuum præterea ſeipſum ſibi ſedere ad dexteram ſuam cum profana & ſacrilega temeritate proponit. c. 53. *After* Praxeas Noetus *taught the ſame,* ἐτόλμησε λέγειν τὸν πατέρα πεπονθέναι, *ſayes* Epiphanius, *and being queſtioned for it, he anſwered,* τί γὰρ κακὸν πεποίηκα; ἵνα θεὸν δοξάζω, ἵνα ὁμολογῶ, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλον πλὴν αὐτὸν γεγεννηκέναι, πεπονθότα, καὶ ἀποθανόντα. *He thought the Father and the Son to be the ſame Perſon, and therefore if the Son, the Father to be incarnate.* Τὸν πατέρα τὸν Χριστὸν ἐδίδαξε, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Epi. h. Anaceph. *After the* Noetiani *followed the* Sabellians. *So* Philaſtrius, Sabellius diſcipulus

incarnate,

ejus, qui similitudinem sui Doctoris itidem secutus est, unde & *Sabelliani* postea sunt appellati, qui & *Patripassiani*, & *Praxeani* à *Praxea*, & *Hermogeniani* ab *Hermogene*, qui fuerunt in *Africa*, qui & ista sentientes abjecti sunt ab Ecclesia Catholica. *So S.* Aug. *Sabelliani* dicti sunt quidam Hæretici, qui vocantur & *Patripassiani*, qui dicunt ipsum Patrem passum esse. Tract. 36. in *Joh. This I confesse is denied by* Epiphanius, *who acknowledges* Sabellius *to have followed* Noetus *in many things, but not in the Incarnation or Passion of the Father.* Σαβελλιανοὶ οἱ τὰ ὅμοια ἀνοήτως (i. ἀνοήτοις id est Νοητοῖς, vel ἀνοήτῳ, id est, Νοητῷ, *as* S. Aug. Novato.) δοξάζοντες, ὡς ἀπὸ τούτου μόνου λέγειν δὲ μὴ πατρὸς πεπονθέναι τὸν πατέρα. *This* S. Augustine *wonders very much at in* Epiphanius, *Sabellani*, inquit, similia Noeto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum; quomodo de *Sabellianis* intelligi potest, cum sic innotuerint dicere Patrem passum, ut *Patripassiani* quam *Sabelliani* sæpius nuncupentur? *Aug.* Hær. 41. *Indeed the Latine Fathers generally call the* Sabellians Patripassians, *and not onely so, but* Theodoret *doth so describe them, as professing one Person,* ἐν μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ, ὡς πατέρα νομοθετοῦντα, ὃν δὲ τῇ καινῇ, ὡς ὑὸν ἀνθρωποῦντα. l. 2. c. 9. *After the* Sabellianí *succeeded in the same Heresy the* Priscillianistæ, *as appeareth by Pope* Leo, *who shews they taught but one Person of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* Quod blasphemiæ genus de *Sabellii* opinione sumpserunt, cujus discipuli etiam *Patripassiani* merito nuncupantur, quia si ipse est Filius qui & Pater, erux Filii Patris est passi, & quicquid in forma servi Filius Patri obediendo sustinuit, totum in se Pater ipse suscepit. Ep. 93. c. 1. *Thus the* Patripassian *Heresy beginning from* Praxeas *and* Hermogenes, *was continued by* Noetus, Sabellius, *and* Priscillianus, *and mingled with all their severall Heresies: the summe and substance of which, is thus well set down by* Victorinus. *Patripassiani* Deum solum esse dicunt, quem nos Patrem dicimus; ipsum solum existentem & effectorem omnium, & venisse non solum in mundum, sed & in carnem, & alia omnia quæ nos Filium fecisse dicimus.

incarnate, and becoming man to be crucified. But this very Creed was * alwayes thought to be a sufficient confutation of that fond opinion, in that the Incarnation is not subjoyned 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 onely Son our Lord, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost.

* *It appeareth plainly that* Tertullian *confuted* Praxeas, *by reducing him to these words of the Creed For when he had first declared,* Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus *(which was the objection of* Praxeas*)* sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam οἰκονομίαν dicimus, ut unici Dei sit & Filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, & sine quo factum est nihil. *Then he subjoyneth,* Hunc missum à Patre in Virginem, & ex ea natum hominem & Deum, filium hominis, & filium Dei, & cognominatum Jesum Christum, Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepultum secundum Scripturas, & resus-

First

citatum à Patre, & in cœlos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos. *And that we may be assured that he used these words out of the Creed, it followeth,* Hanc Regulam ab initio Evangelii decucurrisse, &c. *This is yet further evident out of* Epiphanius *who tells us the Eastern Doctours confuted* Noetus *in the same manner, by reducing him to the words of the Creed.* Ἵνα δὲ δοξάζωμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ, (*just as* Tertullian, nos unicum quidem Deum credimus) ἀλλ' ὡς οἴδαμεν δικαίως δοξάζειν καὶ ἵνα χειρὸν ἤχωμεν, ἀλλ' ὡς οἴδαμεν ἵνα χειρὸν ὑὸν θεοῦ, παιδίνλα ὡς ἔπαθεν, συμβιώντα καθὼς ἀπέθανεν, ἀναστάντα, ἀνελαβόνλα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ὄντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. *And when the Argument of* Tertullian *against* Praxeas, *and the Greeks against* Noetus *drawn from the Creed, did not sufficiently convince the* Patripassians, *the Church of* Aquileia *to exclude them wholly, added these two words to the first Article,* Invisibilem, *and* Impassibilem. Invisibilem, *to shew he was not incarnate,* Impassibilem, *to shew he was not crucified. So* Ruffinus *in the conclusion of his exposition upon these words* Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, *addeth,* His additur invisibilem & impassibilem: *and then gives the reason,* Sciendum quod duo isti sermones in Ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habentur. Constat autem apud nos additos hæreseos causa Sabellii, illius profectò quæ à nostris *Patripassiana* appellatur, id est, quæ Patrem ipsum vel ex Virgine natum dicit, & visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne. Ut ergo excluderetur tanta impietas de Patre, videntur hæc addidisse majores, & invisibilem Patrem atque impassibilem dixisse. Constat enim Filium, non Patrem, in carne & ex carne natum, & ex nativitate carnis Filium visibilem & passibilem factum.

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 onely begotten Son. And when we say that Person was *conceived* and *born*, we declare he was made really and truly man, of the same humane nature, which is in all other men, who by the ordinary way of generation are conceived and born. For the *Mediatour between God and man, is the man Christ Jesus.* That since by *man came death*, by *man* also should come *the resurrection of the dead.* As sure then as the first *Adam*, and we who are redeem'd are men, so certainly is the second *Adam* and our Mediatour man. He is therefore frequently called the *Son of man*, and in that nature he was alwayes promised: first to *Eve*, as her *seed*, and consequently her son; then to *Abraham*, *in thy seed shall all the*

1 *Tim.* 2. 5.
1 *Cor.* 15. 21.
Gen. 3. 15.
Gen. 22. 18.

Gal. 3. 6. *nations of the earth be blessed*, and that *seed is Christ*, and so he is the Son of *Abraham*. Next to *David* as his Rom. 1. 3. *son to sit upon his throne*, and so he is *made of the seed of* Mat. 1. 1. *David according to the flesh*, the *son of David, the son of Abraham*, 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*; Heb 2. 17. *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*, and so became not an Angel, but a man.

As then man consisteth of two different parts, Body and Soul, so doth Christ; He assumed a body at his conception, Heb. 2. 14. of the blessed Virgin. *Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and bloud, he also himself likewise took part of the same.* The verity of his body stands upon the truth of his † nativity; and the actions and passions of his life shew the nature of his flesh.

† *Marcion ut carnem Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem; aut ut nativitatem negaret, negavit & carnem, scilicet ne invicem sibi testimonium redderent, & responderent nativitas & caro. quia nec nativitas sine carne, nec caro sine nativitate. Tertull. de Carne Christi. c. 1.*

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 farre from being sustained without 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 plowers never doubted of the true nature of his flesh, who *plowed upon his back, and made long furrows.* The thornes which pricked his sacred temples, the nailes which penetrated through his hands and feet, the spear which pierced his sacred side, give sufficient testimony of the naturall tenderneſse and frailty of his flesh. And lest his fasting forty dayes together, lest his walking on the waters and trayersing the seas, lest his suddain standing in the midst of his disciples when the doores were shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh; he confirmed first his own Disciples, *feel and see,* Lu. 24. 39. *that a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have.*

As

As therefore we believe the coming of Christ, so must we confesse him to have come in the verity of our humane nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it alwayes 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 Apostolicall doctrine, and Christ who is both God and man, was as soon denied to be man, as God. † *Simon Magus* the Arch-heretick first began, and many after followed him. 1 Jo.4.2,3.

† Simon Magus *first made himself to be Christ, and what he feigned of himself, that was attributed by others unto Christ.* Dixerat se in monte *Sina* legem *Moysi* in Patris persona dedisse *Judæis*, tempore *Tiberii* in Filii persona putative apparuisse. S. *Aug.* So S. Cyril *represents him*, οὐκ ὂν Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ δοκῶν εἶς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν φαντάσια. *Catech. 6. From this* δοκησις *of his invention arose the Heresy of the* Δοκηται. For Saturnilus, or Saturninus, *followed him with his* putative tantum hominem, *as* Irenæus; *and in* phantasmate tantum venisse, *as* Tertullian *speaks. After him* Valentinus, *and his followers*, Epiphanes, Isidorus, *and* Secundus: *then the* Marcosians, Heracleonitæ, *and* Ophitæ, Cerdon, Marcion, Lucanus, *and generally the* Maniches. *These were the* Δοκηται *or* Φαντασιαζοι, *all conspiring in this, that Christ was not really what he appeared, nor did truly suffer what he seemed to endure.*

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 encreased in wisdome and stature*, one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Wisdome belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, encrease: he then whose knowledge did improve together with his yeares, must have a subject proper for it, which was no other then a humane soul. This was the seat 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 affe- Luk.2.52. Luk.22.42.

ctions and paſſions which ſo manifeſtly appeared in him; nor ſpake he any other then a proper language, when before his ſuffering he ſaid, *My ſoul is exceeding ſorrowfull, even unto death.* This was it which on the croſſe before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father, teaching us in whoſe hands the ſoules 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 vitall union of that ſoul with the body. So that he which was *perfect God, was alſo perfect man, of a reaſonable ſoul and humane fleſh ſubſiſting.* Which is to be obſerved and aſſerted againſt the * ancient Hereticks, who taught that Chriſt aſſumed humane fleſh, but that the Word or his Divinity was unto that body in the place of an informing ſoul.

Mat. 26. 38.

Luk. 23. 46.

* *Of this kind two ſeverall ſects were moſt remarkeable, the* Arians, *and the* Apollinarians. Arius *taught that Chriſt had nothing of man but the fleſh, and with that the Word was joyned.* Ἄρειος δὲ σάρκα μόνην πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογεῖ. ἀντὶ δὲ τῆ ἔσωθεν ὀνήμῶν ἀνθρώπε, τυτέστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν Λόγον ἐν τῇ Σαρκὶ λέγει γεγονέναι. *Athan.* de Adv. Chriſti. Eunomius *followed him in this particular.* Ἄρειος δὲ καὶ Εὐνόμιος σῶμα μὲν αὐτὸν ἔφασαν ἀνληφέναι, ἄνθρωπα δὲ ψυχῆς ὀνηγυκέναι τὸ θεῖον. *Theodo.* l. 5. cont. Hær. c. 11. Apollinarius *diſtinguiſhed between the ſoul and the mind, the* ψυχὴ *and the* νῦς, *and acknowledged that the Word aſſumed the body and the ſoul or* ψυχὴ *of man, but not the mind or ſpirit, or the* Νῦς, *but the Word it ſelf was in the place of that.* Apollinariſtas Apollinaris inſtituit, qui de anima Chriſti ab Eccleſia Catholica diſſenſerunt, dicentes ſicut *Ariani*, Deum Chriſtum carnem ſine anima ſuſcepiſſe. In quæſtione teſtimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem qua rationalis eſt anima hominis, non fuiſſe in anima Chriſti, ſed pro hac ipſum Verbum in ea fuiſſe dixerunt. *This was then the clear difference betwixt the* Arian *and* Apollinarian *Hereſy.* Apollinariſtæ quidem carnis & animæ naturam ſine mente aſſumpſiſſe Deum credunt, *Ariani* vero carnis tantummodo. *Facundus* l. 9. *So that two things are to be obſerved in the* Apollinarians, *their philoſophy and their Divinity; their Philoſophy in making man conſiſt of three diſtinct parts, the body, the ſoul, and the mind; their Divinity in making the humane nature of Chriſt to conſiſt but of two, the body and the ſoul, and the third to be ſupplied by the Word. Which is excellently expreſſed by* Nemeſius, de Nat. Hom. *in reſpect of his Philoſophy.* Τινὲς μὲν, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Πλωτῖνος, ἄλλην εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν,

Thus

καὶ ἄλλον τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν δογματίζοντες, ὁπότερον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ζωοποιῆσαι βέλοντα, σώματος, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ νοῦ. Οὗτος ἀκολούθησε καὶ Ἀπολλιναρίου ὁ τῆς Λαοδικείας γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος, τοῦτον γὰρ πεξάμενος τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς οἰκείας δόξης, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ συγκροδόμησε κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς δόγμα. and by Theodoret in respect of his Divinity, Σαρκωθῆναι δὲ τὸν θεὸν λόγον, σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην οὐ τὴν λογικὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄλογον καὶ φυσικὴν, καὶ ζωτικὴν, τινὲς ὀνομάζουσι. τὸν δὲ νοῦν ἄλλο τι φασὶ τῆς ψυχῆς εἶναι λέγων, οὐκ ἔφησεν ἀνθρωπίνην, ἀλλ' ἀρχέτυπε τὴν θείαν φύσιν εἰς τὸ πληρῶσαι τὸν νοῦ τὴν χρείαν.

Thus the whole perfect and complete nature of man was 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 humane nature which he then assumed. And thus this third Article from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no lesse, then the two natures really distinct in Christ incarnate.

For if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by the conversion and transubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixtion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these wayes can consist with the Person of our Saviour, or the Office of our Mediatour. For if we should conceive such a mixtion and confusion of substances as to make an union of natures, we should be so farre from acknowledging him to be both God and Man, that thereby we should professe him to be neither God, nor Man, but a Person of a nature as different from both, as all mixt bodies are distinct from each element which concurres 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 Divini-

ty 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.

† Abſit ita credere, ut conſimili quodam genere duas naturas in unam arbitremur redactas eſſe ſubſtantiam, hujuſmodi enim commixtio partis utriuſque corruptio eſt. Deus enim qui capax eſt non capabilis, penetrans non penetrabilis, implens non implebilis, qui ubique ſimul totus, & ubique diffuſus eſt per infuſionem potentiæ ſuæ, miſericorditer naturæ mixtus eſt humanæ, non humana natura naturæ eſt mixta divinæ. *Leporius* Libel. Emend.

Again, as the confuſion, ſo the converſion of natures is impoſſible. For firſt, we cannot with the leaſt ſhew of probability conceive the divine nature of Chriſt to be tranſubſtantiated into the humane nature; as thoſe whom they call * *Flandrian Anabaptiſts* in the Low Countryes 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 immateriall, indiviſible, and immortall Godhead cannot be divided into a ſpirituall and incorruptible ſoul, and a carnall and corruptible body, of which two humanity conſiſteth. There is no other Deity of the Father then 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, and for three dayes there was no living God. We muſt not therefore ſo farre 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*.

* Teſte Epiſcopio Inſt. Theolog. l. 4. c. 8.

* *In that propoſition* ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο *there hath been ſtrange force uſed by men of contrary judgements, and for contrary ends, as to the word* ἐγένετο. *The* Socinians *endeavouring to prove, it can have no other ſenſe then ſimply* ſuit, *the word was fleſh. Theſe* Flandrian Anabaptiſts *ſtretching it to the higheſt ſenſe of* factum eſt. *The Word was made fleſh. It is confeſſed that the verb*

Secondly,

γινεδ 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 Syriack rendred it ומלתא בסרא הוא Et verbum caro fuit. *The Ancient Latine,* 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 Syriack does here.* Mat. 10. 16. γινεδε ἓν φρονιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, Estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes. *and* 25. Ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτῦ, Sufficit discipulo ut sit sicut magister ejus. *From whence 'tis evident that they placed not the force in the signification of the word* γινεδ, *but in the circumstance of the matter in which 'twas used. However neither of these interpretations prove either of these opinions; for if it be acknowledged that the Word was flesh, and it hath been already proved, and presupposed by S.* 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 evacuate that nature in which he did before subsist. And so the* Flandrian *interpretation is of no validity.*

Secondly, we must not on the contrary invent a conversion of the humane 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 inimaginable 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 transubstantiated. Vain therefore was that old conceit of *Eutyches*, who thought the Union to be made

† *This was the proper opinion of* Eutyches, *as appeareth by his own confession in the Council of* Chalcedon. Ὁμολογῶ ὃτι δύο φύσεων γενομένων τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μιᾶν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ. *Act.* 1. *Two distinct natures he confessed at first, but when the union was once made, he acknowledged but one. But when that union was made he expressed not, nor could his fol-*

so

lawers agree, some attributing it to the conception, some to the resurrection, others to the Ascension. Howsoever when they were united, his opinion clearly was, that the humane nature was so absorpt into the divine, so wholly made the same, that it ceased wholly to be what it was, and so there was but one, that is the divine nature remained. This is sufficiently expressed by S. Leo who was the strongest opposer of him, and speaketh thus of his opinion. Ser. 8. de Nativ. Hic autem recentioris sacrilegii profanus asserter, unitionem quidem in Christo duarum confessus est naturarum; sed ipsa unione id dixit effectum, ut ex duabus una remaneret, nullatenus alterius existente substantia. *And the* Eranistes *in the Dialogue of* Theodoret *disputing in his name, being urged to declare whether in that union one nature was made of them both, or one remaining the other did not so; Answered plainly,* Ἐγὼ τὴν θεότητα λέγω μεταπεπλάσθαι, καταποθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ ταύτης τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

so in the natures, that the humanity was absorp'd and wholly turn'd into the Divinity, so that by that transubstantiation the humane nature had no longer being. And well did the Ancient Fathers, who oppos'd this Heresy, make use of the Sacramentall union between the bread and wine, and the body and bloud of Christ, and thereby shewed, that the humane nature of Christ is no more really converted into the divinity, and so ceaseth to be the humane nature; then the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and bloud, and thereby cease to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable, that the Church in those dayes understood no such doctrine as that of * Transubstantiation.

* *There can be no time in which we may observe the Doctrine of the Ancients so clearly, as when they write professedly against an Heresy evidently known, and make use generally of the same Arguments against it. Now what the Heresy of* Eutyches *was, is certainly known, and the nature of the Sacrament was generally made use of as an Argument to confute it.* Gelasius *Bishop of* Rome *hath written an excellent book against* Eutyches De duabus naturis in Christo. *In which he propoundeth their opinion thus.* Eutychiani dicunt unam esse naturam, id est, divinam. *And* sola existente Deitate, humanitas illic esse jam destitit. *That then which he disputes against, is the Transubstantiation of the humane nature into the divine. The Argument which he makes use of against it, is drawn from the Eucharist.* Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi divina res est, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ: & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis eviden-

Being

ter oſtenditur, hoc nobis ipſo Chriſto Domino ſentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, & ſumus, ut ſicut in hanc, ſcilicet, in divinam tranſeant; S. Spiritu perficiente ſubſtantiam, permanentes tamen in ſuæ proprietate naturæ, ſic illud ipſum myſterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veracitet repreſentant, ex quibus conſtat propriè permanentibus, unum Chriſtum quia integrum verumque permanere demonſtrant. *In which words 'tis plain he affirmes the union of the Humane nature of Chriſt to be the principall myſtery, the repreſentation of that myſtery to be in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; he concludes from thence, that as in the repreſentation, the ſubſtance of the bread and wine remaineth in the propriety of their own nature, ſo the humane nature of Chriſt in the greater myſtery doth ſtill remain. In the margin of this place in the* Bibliotheca Patrum *there is printed* Cautè, *as if there could be any danger in obſerving the ſenſe of the Fathers, when they ſpeak ſo expreſly and conſiderately. In the ſame manner we find a Diſputation between an Heretick and a* Catholick *in the ſecond Dialogue of* Theodoret, *where* Eranistes *as an Heretick aſks* Orthodoxus, *by what names he calls the bread and wine after conſecration, who anſwers, the Body and Bloud of Chriſt; From whence* Eranistes *argues,* Ὥσπερ τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμά ἐστι καὶ αἷμα, ἀλλὰ μὲν οἱ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐπίκλησιν μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται, οὕτω τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν, εἰς τὴν ὕσιαν μεταβλήθη τὴν θείαν. *As the Symbols of the body and bloud of Chriſt are one thing before conſecration, and after that change their name and become another, ſo the body of Chriſt after his aſcention is changed into the divine ſubſtance. To this* Orthodoxus *anſwers,* Ἑαλως αἷς ὕφαινες ἁρπυίαις. *You are taken in your own nets.* Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας φύσεως ἐξίσταται, μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τῷ σχήματι καὶ τῷ εἴδει, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. *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,* καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ σῶμα τὸ μὲν πρότερον εἶδος ἔχει καὶ σχῆμα καὶ περιγραφήν, καὶ ἁπλῶς οἰκεῖον, τὸν τῆς σώματος ὅλου. *The body of Chriſt hath the ſame form, figure and ſhape, and indeed the ſame bodily ſubſtance. And when* Eranistes *ſtill objects, that the bread is called the body and not bread,* Orthodoxus *anſwers that he is miſtaken.* Οὐ γὰρ σῶμα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄρτος ζωῆς ὀνομάζεται, ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος σεσημείωται, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ σῶμα θεῖον ὀνομάζομεν σῶμα. *For it is not onely called the body, but alſo bread of life, and the body it ſelf we call the divine body. Who ſees not then that* Theodoret *believed no more that the bread is converted into the body, then that the body is converted into the divinity of Chriſt? Who perceives not that he thought the bread to be as ſubſtantially and really bread after the conſecration, as the body of Chriſt is really a body after his aſcenſion? The ſame Argument is uſed by S.* Chryſoſtome *upon the ſame occaſion againſt the* Apollinarians *in his Epiſtle ad* Cæſarium, *not yet publiſhed in Greek, and by* Ephraimus *in* Photii Bibliotheca *againſt the* Eutychians. *As therefore all the μεταστοιχειώσεις of the Sacrament all elements maketh them not ceaſe to be of the ſame nature which before they were, ſo the humane nature of Chriſt joyned to the divine looſeth not the nature of humanity, but continueth with the Divinity as a ſubſtance*

in it ſelf diſtinct, and ſo Chriſt doth ſubſiſt not onely ex *but in* duabus naturis, *as the Council of* Chalcedon *determined againſt* Eutyches.

Being then He which is *conceived* was the *onely Son of God*, and that *onely 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 aſſum'd an humane 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 onely 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 onely ſhould reſult; but onely ſo, that to one Perſon no other ſhould be added.

Nor is this Union only a ſcholaſtick ſpeculation, but a certain & neceſſary truth, without which we cannot have one Chriſt, but two Chriſts, one Mediatour, but two Mediatours; without which we cannot joyn 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 dayes of *Herod* born of a woman; He which preached in the dayes of *Noah*, began to preach in the reign of *Tiberius*, being at that time about thirty yeares 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 Croſſe, raiſed him from the dead who died ſo, being *put to death through the fleſh, and quickened by the Spirit*; He was *of the fathers according to the fleſh*, who was *God over all bleſſed for ever*. 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 confeſſe the identity of the Perſon

1 Pet. 3. 18.

Rom. 9. 5.

in

in whom they are conjoyned, againſt the ancient Hereſy of the † *Neſtorians*, condemned in the Council of *Epheſus*.

† *This Hereſy doth moſt formally contradict theſe words of the Creed, becauſe it immediately denies this truth, that the eternall 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. S. Cyril had well objected the ſeries, order and conſequence of that Confeſſion.* Ἔφη ἢ ἀλλα ϗ μεγάλη Σωσλϑ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ φύσιν υἱὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ Θεῦ ἀληθινῦ Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐκ τῦ φωτὸς, τὸν δ' ἕ τὰ πάντα ποιήσαντα ὁ Πατὴρ, κατελθόντα, σαρκωθέντα τε ϗ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ϗ ἀνελθόντα εἰς ἀρανές. *The ſtrength of this objection lies in this, that Chriſt the onely-begotten Son, begotten of the Father before all worlds, was incarnate. The anſwer of* Neſtorius *was in this manner.* Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν μὲν αὐτῦ τὸν μονογενῆ σκόπησον ὅπως Ἰησῦς, Χριστὸς, ϗ μονογενὴς, ϗ υἱὸς πρότερον λέγεται, τὰ κοινὰ τῆς θεότητος ϗ ἀνθρωπότητος, ὡς θεμελίου, ὀνόματα. τότε τὴν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως, ϗ τῶν ἄθλων, ϗ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐποικοδομῦσι θεολογίαν. *And the ſtrength, or rather the weakneſſe thereof is this: that firſt the Council placed the name of Jeſus, Chriſt, and the onely-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 onely-begotten a terme common to the humanity and divinity, yet the Council clearly expounds it of the eternall generation, adding immediately,* begotten of his Father before all worlds; *neither is there any word betwixt that expoſition and the Incarnation, but ſuch as ſpeak wholly of Chriſt as God. Therefore that onely-begotten Son, who was* begotten of his Father before all worlds, *deſcended from heaven and was incarnate. Thus S.* Cyril *in his ſecond Epiſtle to* Neſtorius, *and* Neſtorius *in his ſecond to him. Which miſtake of his ſeemes yet more ſtrange to me, when I conſider in the ſame Epiſtle of* Neſtorius *that fundamentall truth aſſerted, which of it ſelf ſufficiently, nay fully, confutes his Hereſy. For he acknowledgeth the name Chriſt to be* ἀπαθῆς ϗ παθητὸς οὐσίας ἐν μοναδικῷ σεσημειωμένον σημαντικὸν, *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 ſeverall nativities, he had thoſe ſeverall 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 onely-begotten Son was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, and born of the Virgin* Mary.

BY THE HOLY GHOST.

HAving thus dispatch'd the consideration of the first Person concerned in this Article, and the actions contained in it so farre 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 onely mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another Article where it is propounded directly. And for the Conception it self, 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 conceive*. *Luk.* 1. 31. There remaineth therefore nothing proper and peculiar to 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*.

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.

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 excludeth first all men, and then her self; all men by that assertion, *I know not a man*, her self by the question, *how shall* *Luk.* 1. 34.

ſhall this be, ſeeing it is ſo? Firſt, our *Melchizedeck* had no father on earth, in generall, not any man, in particular, not *Joſeph*. 'Tis true *his mother Mary was eſpous'd to Joſeph*, but 'tis as true, *before they came together, ſhe was found with child of the Holy Ghoſt*. We read in S. *Luke*, that *the parents brought the child Jeſus into the Temple*, but theſe Parents were not the Father and Mother, but as it followeth, *Joſeph and his Mother marvelled at thoſe things which were ſpoken of him*. 'Tis 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 onely the reputed father of Chriſt, he being onely *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 prov'd that *Joſeph* came from *David*, it is denied that Chriſt came from *Joſeph*? And that not onely in S. *Luke* where *Joſeph* begins, but alſo in S. *Matthew* where he ends the Genealogy. [a]*Jacob begat Joſeph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jeſus who is called Chriſt*. Howſoever then the Genealogies are deſcrib'd, whether one belong to *Joſeph*, the other to *Mary*, or both to *Joſeph*, it is from other parts of the Scriptures infallibly certain, not onely that Chriſt deſcended lineally from *David* according to the fleſh, but alſo that the ſame Chriſt was begotten of the Virgin *Mary*, and not by *Joſeph*.

Mat. 1. 18. *Luk.* 2. 27. *Lu.* 2. 33. *Joh.* 1. 45. *Lu.* 2. 48. *Lu.* 3. 23.

[a] *Mat.* 1. 16. *Indeed in our tranſlation* whom *may relate to both as well as one, and to* Joſeph *as well as* Mary, *but in the Originall it evidently belongs to* Mary. τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς.

Secondly, as the Bleſſed Virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly *Joſeph*, to whom ſhe was then eſpouſed, by her aſſertion, ſo did ſhe exclude her ſelf by the man-

ner of the queſtion, ſhewing that of her ſelf ſhe could not cauſe any ſuch conception. Although ſhe may be thought the *root of Jeſſe*, yet could ſhe not germinate of her ſelf; 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 fruitfull 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.

Gen.1.28.

Luk.1.37.

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 Scriptures are very generall: 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 generall, that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot preciſely be diſtinguiſhed from the concurrence of the Virgin, much leſſe ſhall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late diſtinction made

Luk.1.35.

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

* *As* conceptus de Spiritu S. natus ex *Maria* Virgine.

S. Aug. *indeed hath delivered a diſtinction between* De *and* Ex, *after this manner, ſpeaking to theſe words of the Apoſtle,* Quoniam ex ipſo, & per ipſum, & in ipſo ſunt omnia. Ex 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 cœlum & terra, quia ipſe fecit ea; non autem de ipſo, quia non de ſubſtantia ſua. Sicut aliquis homo ſi gignat filium, & faciat domum; ex ipſo filius, ex ipſo domus; ſed filius de ipſo, ſicut domus de terra & ligno. De Nat. Boni. adv. *Manich.* c. 27. *This diſtinction having no foundation in the Latine 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* ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, *ſo alſo of the Holy Ghoſt,* εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, *and* τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου. *It is therefore ſaid as well* ἐκ πνεύματος *as* ἐκ Μαρίας. *Again, the Vulgar obſerveth no ſuch difference, as rendring for the one* de qua natus eſt Jeſus, *and for the other* in utero habens de Spiritu S. *Correſpondently in the Greek Creeds* ζωοποιοῦντα ἐκ πνεύματος, γεννώμενα ἐκ Μαρίας, *or as in the* Nicene, ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας. *And the Latine not onely* de Spiritu S. ex *Maria* Virgine, *but ſometimes* de Sp. S. & Maria Virgine, *and* de *Maria* Virgine. *Chryſol. and S. Aug. often* de Trinitate. *Wherefore in vain have the Schools firſt accepted of S.* Auguſtines *diſtinction, and then applied it to Chriſts conception; firſt taking the prepoſition* de *to ſignifie no leſſe then a proceſſion from the ſubſtance of the cauſe, and then acknowledge Chriſt ſo begotten of the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe the eternall Son who was ſo begotten, was of the ſame ſubſtance with the Holy Ghoſt. Thus* Thomas Aquinas *has delivered the ſubtilty.* Sum. *p.* 3. *q.* 32. *a.* 2. In Spiritu S. duplex habitudo conſideratur reſpectu Chriſti. Nam ad ipſum Filium Dei qui dicitur eſſe conceptus, habet habitudinem conſubſtantialitatis; ad corpus autem ejus habet habitudinem cauſæ efficientis. Hæc autem præpoſitio *De* utramque habitudinem deſignat, ſicut cum dicimus hominem aliquem eſſe de ſuo patre. Et ideo convenienter dicere poſſumus Chriſtum eſſe conceptum de Sp. S. hoc modo quod efficientia Sp. S. referatur ad corpus aſſumptum, conſubſtantialis vero ad perſonam aſſumentem. *But this diſtinction of conſubſtantiality and effective cauſality can make nothing for the propriety of the Phraſe; for the Prepoſition* De *ſignifieth the materiall*

by

cauſe as well as the efficient, it muſt do ſo in reſpect of that which is the effect; if require that the thing which is made, be made of the ſubſtance of that de quo eſt, then muſt Chriſt according unto that which is made, be made of the ſubſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; or to ſpeak in the words of the Scripture, Quod in ea natum eſt, de Spiritu Sancto eſt. *Where either that which was conceived in the Virgin muſt be acknowledged of the ſubſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, or elſe the Preposition* De *muſt not be taken in S. Auguſtine's ſenſe. Howſoever being there is but one Preposition in common to both in the Originall Greek; being the Vulgar Tranſlation uſeth* De *indifferently for either; being where they have diſtinguiſhed* De *and* Ex, *they have attributed* Ex *which doth not ſignifie conſubſtantiality, to the Virgin, of whom they confeſſe he did aſſume the ſubſtance of his body; and* De, *which ſignifieth, (as they ſay conſubſtantiality) to the Holy Ghoſt, of whoſe ſubſtance he received nothing: it followeth, that the difference in the Prepoſitions can no way declare the different concurrence of the Spirit and the Virgin in Chriſt's conception.*

by that concurrence of the Virgin which muſt be acknowledged with it. For if ſhe were truly and properly 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 wombe; and conſequently, no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit, then 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 naturall procreation, deſcribing the *ſons of God as begotten not of blouds, 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 fleſh, we deny all will of man concurring, but as the blouds in the language of the *Hebrews* did ſignifie that ſubſtance of which the fleſh was formed in the wombe, ſo we acknowledge in the generation of Jeſus Chriſt, that he was made of the ſubſtance of his Mother.

Joh. 1. 13.

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

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.

† *As* Chryſologus *Serm.* 57. Ubi Spiritus generat, Virgo parturit, totum divinum geritur, nihil humanum. & *Serm.* 62. Stupenti mundo ſolus ſuperi quid eſt, quod Spiritus generat, Virgo concipit, Virgo parit.

Again, as the Holy Ghoſt did not frame the humane 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 then 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 Onely-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 conjoyned 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.

† Deus ipſemet ad ſanguinem *Mariæ* addidit aliam materiam, ex quibus deinde Chriſtus conceptus & natus eſt. *Smalcius* De vero & Naturali Dei Filio, *c.* 2. Verum manet generationem & hanc dici poſſe, quatenus in Deum ea cadere poteſt, ſi ad ſanguinem *Mariæ* addita ſit ex parte Dei materia, ex qua cum ſanguine *Mariæ* juncta natus ſit Chriſtus. *Ib. c.* 3. *What this was thus added to the ſubſtance of the Virgin, he elſewhere explaines:* Nos Dei virtutem in Virginis uterum aliquam ſubſtantiam creatam vel immiſiſſe aut ibi creaſſe affirmamus, ex qua, juncto eo quod ex ipſius Virginis ſubſtantia acceſſit, verus homo generatus fuit. *This he doth not onely, without any authority, affirm, but ground upon it the Sonſhip of Chriſt. For ſo it follows,* Alias enim homo ille Dei Filius à conceptione & nativitate proprie non fuiſſet. *And again,* Neceſſitas magna fuit ut Chriſtus ab initio vitæ ſuæ eſſet Deo Filius, qualis futurus non fuiſſet, niſi ei virtute aliquid creatum fuiſſet, quod ad conſtituendum Chriſti corpus una cum *Mariæ* ſanguine concurrit. *Thus while they deny the eternall generation of the Son they eſtabliſh a temporall in ſuch manner as is not conſonant with that Word which they pretend wholly to follow, and have made a body of Chriſt partly deſcending from the Fathers, partly not: and whereas as man he is like to us in all things, ſin onely excepted,*

they have invented a body partly like ours, partly not, and ſo in no part totally like. Indeed ſome of the Ancients did ſpeak ſo as to make the Holy Ghoſt the ſemen Dei: as Tertullian; Ergo jam Dei filius ex Patris Dei ſemine, *i. e.* Spiritu, ut eſſet hominis filius, caro ei ſola erat ex hominis carne ſumenda ſine viri ſemine. Vacabat enim viri ſemen apud habentem Dei ſemen. De carne Chriſti *c.* 18. *And S.* Hilary *calls it* Sementivam ineuntis Spiritus efficaciam, *l.* 2. de Trin. *But in this they onely underſtood the Operation of the Spirit,* loco ſeminis. *And whoſoever ſpake of any proper ſemen, they abhorr'd; as appeares by the* 190 *Sermon* de Tempore. Nec, ut quidam ſceleratiſſimi opinantur, Spiritum S. dicimus pro ſemine fuiſſe, ſed potentia & virtute Creatoris operatum. *I know not whether be the greateſt folly; to make the Holy Ghoſt the Father, as theſe men have done, by creating part of his body by way of ſeminall conjunction; or to make the ſame Spirit Mother of Chriſt, as the* Nazareans *did.* In Evangelio Hebræorum quod lectitant *Nazarei*, Salvator inducitur loquens, *Modo me arripuit Mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus. There is onely this difference, that one is founded upon no authority of Scripture, the other upon the authority of a pretended, but no Scripture: the one maketh the H. Ghoſt a partiall, the other a totall mother.*

The belief of this is neceſſary to prevent all fear or ſuſpicion of ſpot in this Lamb, of ſin in this Jeſus. Whatſoever our originall 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 undefil'd Redeemer, out of an unclean and defiled nature? He whoſe name is holineſſe, whoſe operation is to ſanctifie, the Holy Ghoſt. Our Jeſus was like unto us in all things, as born of a woman; ſin onely excepted, as *conceived by the Holy Ghoſt.* This originall and totall ſanctification of the humane nature was firſt neceſſary to fit it for the perſonall 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 ſinfull 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

† Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum in loco & habitu tantæ felicitatis admiſſum eſt, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ita dixerim, radicaliter totum genus humanum damnaretur, non ſolvitur ac diluitur, niſi per unum Mediatorem Dei & hominum, hominem Chriſtum Jeſum, qui ſolus potuit ita naſci, ut ei opus non eſſet renaſci. *S. Aug.* Ench. *c.* 48.

the

the fountain of our impurity, ſo the ſecond *Adam* ſhould alſo be the pure fountain of our righteouſneſſe. *God ſending his own ſon in the likeneſſe of ſinfull fleſh, condemned ſin in the fleſh*; which he could not have condemned, had he been ſent in ſinfull fleſh. *The Father made him to be ſin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the righteouſneſſe of God in him*; which we could not have been made in him, but that he *did no ſin*, and *knew no ſin*. For whoſoever is ſinfull wanteth a Redeemer, and he could have redeemed none, who ſtood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed *with the precious bloud of Chriſt*: therefore precious, becauſe *of a Lambe without blemiſh, and without ſpot*. Our atonement can be made by no other high Prieſt, then by him who is *holy, harmeleſſe, undefiled, and ſeparate from ſinners*. We cannot *know that he was manifeſted to take away our ſins*, except we alſo know, that *in him is no ſin*. Wherefore, being it is ſo neceſſary to believe the originall holineſſe of our humane nature in the perſon 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.

Rom. 8. 3. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. 1 *Pet.* 2. 22. 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. *Heb.* 7. 26. 1 *Joh.* 3. 5.

In quo non eſt peccatum, ipſe venit auferre peccatum. Nam ſi eſſet in illo peccatum, auferendum eſſet illi, non ipſe auferret. S. *Aug.*

Again, it hath been * obſerved, that by this manner of Chriſt's conception is declared the freedome of the grace of God. For as the Holy Ghoſt is God, ſo is he alſo called the gift of God: and therefore the humane nature in its firſt originall, † without any precedent merit, was

* By S. Auguſtine. Ex hoc, quod de Sp. S. eſt ſecundum hominem nativitas Chriſti, quid aliud, quam ipſa gratia, demonſtratur? *Encb. c.* 37. † Modus iſte quo natus eſt Chriſtus de *Sp. S.* non ſicut filius, & de *Maria* virgine ſicut filius, inſinuat nobis gratiam Dei, qua homo nullis præ edentibus meritis, in ipſo exordio naturæ ſuæ quo eſſe cœpit, verbo Dei copularetur in tantam Perſonæ unitatem, ut idem ipſe eſſet filius Dei qui filius hominis, & filius hominis qui filius Dei: ac ſic in humanæ naturæ aſſumptione fieret quodammodo ipſa gratia naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum poſſet admittere. Quæ gratia propterea per *Sp. S.* fuerat ſignificanda, quia ipſe propriè ſic eſt Deus, ut etiam dicatur Dei Donum. *Id. c.* 40.

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 connaturall with it. The Myſtery of the Incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy, and goodneſſe of God. *Through the tender mercy of our God the day-ſpring from on high hath viſited us.* In this *the kindneſſe and love of God* our Saviour toward man *appear'd.* And though theſe and ſuch other Scriptures ſpeak properly of the love of God and mercy to man alone, offer'd unto him in the Incarnation of our Saviour, and ſo directly exclude the merits of other men onely; yet becauſe they ſpeak ſo generally with reference to Gods mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all merit univerſally. Eſpecially conſidering the impoſſibility of * merit in Chriſt's humanity, in reſpect of his conception; becauſe all deſert neceſſarily precedeth its reward, and Chriſt was not man before he was conceived, nor can that merit which is not.

Luk. 1, 78. Tit. 3. 4.

Thirdly, whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy: by this we learn from what fountain this holineſſe muſt flow. We bring no ſuch purity into the world, nor are we ſanctified in the wombe: 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 a *born not of blond, nor of the will of the fleſh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* The ſame overſhadowing power which formed his humane nature, reformeth ours; and the † ſame Spirit aſſureth us a remiſſion of our ſins, which caus'd in him an exemption from all ſin. He which was born for us upon his incarnation, is born ‖ within us upon our regeneration.

* Cum ad naturam Dei non pertineat natura humana, ad perſonam tamen unigeniti Filii Dei per gratiam pertinet humana natura; & tantam gratiam, ut nulla ſit major, nulla prorſus æqualis. Neque enim illam ſuſceptionem hominis ulla merita præceſſerunt, ſed ab illa ſuſceptione merita ejus cuncta cœperunt. S. *Aug.* Tract. 82. in *Joban.*

a *Joh.* 1. 13.

† Eâ gratiâ ſic ab initio fidei ſuæ homo quicunque Chriſtianus, quâ gratiâ homo ille ab initio ſuo factus eſt Chriſtus. De ipſo Spiritu & hic renatus, de quo eſt ille natus. Eodem Spiritu fit in nobis remiſſio peccatorum, quo Spiritu factum eſt ut nullum haberet ille peccatum. S. *Aug.* de Prædeſt. Sanct. c. 15. ‖ Nolite deſperare; quod ſemel natum eſt ex *Maria*, quotidie & in nobis naſcitur. *Hiero.* Comm. in *Pſal.* 84. 17.

All

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 profeſſe, and expreſſe 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 onely-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 humane nature, conſiſting of a ſoul and body, and conjoyning 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 wombe of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by carnall copulation, not by the common way of humane propagation, but by the ſingular, powerfull, 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 profeſſe to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt*.

Born of the Virgin Mary.

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*.

The Evangeliſt relating the Annuntiation, taketh particular notice of this name: for, ſhewing how an Angel was

Lu. 1. 27. sent unto a *Virgin espoused to a man*, he first observeth that his *name was Ioseph*, and then that the *Virgins name was Mary*. Not for any peculiar excellency in the name it self, or any particular application to the Virgin arising from the origination of it, † as some have conceiv'd; but onely to denote that singular person, which was then so well known to all men, being espoused unto *Ioseph*, as appeareth

† *For some have thought the dignity of the Virgin to be denoted in her name. As* Greg. Nyss. *(or rather his Interpolator)* Hom. in Natal. Christi: Ἐπειδὴ ἐτέχθη τὸ παιδίον, ἀνόμασε μὲν αὐτὴν Μαρίαν, ὡς ἂν ἐκ διὰ τῆς ἐπωνυμίας τὸ ἀξιόλογον διασημανθείη τῆς χάριτος. *Mistaking, as I conceive, the origination of* Mary *for that of* Anne, *her mother,* חנה. *Thus he though: Grace, others Dominion, to be conteined in her name.* Ἡ Μαρία ἑρμηνεύεται κυρία, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐλπίς. Κύριον δὲ ἔτεκε τὴν ἐλπίδα τῶ παντὸς κόσμου Χριστόν. Auctor Hom. de Laud. B. Mariæ, sub nomine Epiphanii. Τίκτει τοιγαροῦν ἡ χάρις (τοῦτο δὲ ἡ Ἄννα ἑρμηνεύεται) τὴν κυρίαν· τοῦτο δὲ σημαίνει τῆς Μαρίας τὸ ὄνομα. *Damasc.* Orthod. Fid. l. 4. c. 15. S. *Hieron.* de Nom. Hebraicis, Sciendum quod Maria sermone Syro Domina nuncupatur. *So Chrysologus*, Dignitas Virginis annunciatur ex nomine. Nam *Maria* Hebræo Sermone, Latine Domina nuncupatur. Vocat ergo Angelus Dominam, ut dominatoris genitricem trepidatio deseret servitutis, quam nasci & vocari Dominam ipsa sui germinis fecit & impetravit autoritas. Serm. 142. Sermone Syro *Maria* Domina nuncupatur, & pulchre, quia Dominum genuit. *Isidor. Hispal.* Orig. l. 7. c. 10. *The same* Isidore *with others gives another Etymology.* Maria illumina rix, sive stella maris, genuit enim lumen mundi. *And* Bernard. *Homil. 2. super* Missus est, Loquamur pauca & super hoc nomine, quod interpretatum maris stella dicitur, & matri Virgini valde convenienter aptatur. Ipsa namque apissime syderi comparatur: quia sicut sine sui corruptione sydus suum emittit radium, sic absque sui læsione Virgo parturit filium. *So farre not amisse. But when from a bad Etymology he makes worse Divinity, calling her the Starre of* Jacob, *and attributing unto her the light of our minds, the life of our graces, and extirpation of our vices, (the work of the Spirit of Christ) when in the midst of all our temptations, horrors of conscience, and depths of despaire, he adviseth us immediately to a* Respice Stellam, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca; *his interpretation can warrant no such devotion. This etymology also descendeth from* S. Hierome, *who in his Interpretation of the names in* Exodus, *as from* Philo, Maria illuminatrix mea, vel illuminans eos, aut smyrna maris, vel stella maris. *And again on the names in* S. Matthew, Mariam plerique existimant interpretari, illuminant me isti, vel illuminatrix, vel smyrna maris; sed mihi nequaquam videtur. Melius autem est ut dicamus sonare eam stellam maris, sive amarum mare. Ἑρμηνεύεται πάλιν ἡ Μαρία Ζμύρνα θαλάσσης. Homil. de Laudibus B. Mariæ. Dicta sunt & ante Mariæ multæ: nam & Maria soror Aaron dicta fuit, sed illa Maria amaritudo maris vocabatur. S. *Ambros.* in Psalm. Virg. c. 5. *Indeed that* ab amaritudine, *without the adjection of* mare, *is the Etymology observed by*

by

the Iewes, as appears by the Author of the Life of Moſes, who relating how Amram *took* Iochebed *to wife, and of her begat a daughter, addeth,* ותקרא שמה מרי כי בעת ההיא החלי המצריי בני חם למרוד חיי בני ישראל *ſhe was called* Miriam, *becauſe at that time the Egyptians, who were the offſpring of* Cham, *made the lives of the Sons of Iſrael bitter. And in the like manner* Seder Olam, נקרא שמה מרי על שם מירור.

by the queſtion of his admiring countrymen, *Is not this the Carpenters 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 *Iames* and *Ioſes*, to the wife of *Cleophas*, to the mother of *Iohn* whoſe ſurname was *Mark*, to her which was of *Magdal* in Galilee, to her who beſtowed much labour on S. *Paul*. Nor is there * any originall diſtinction between the name of theſe and of the Mother of our Lord. For as the name

Mat. 13, 55. *Io.* 11, 1. *Matt.* 27, 56. *Io.* 19, 25. *Act.* 12, 12. *Luk.* 8, 2. *Ro.* 16, 6.

* *This is to be obſerved, by reaſon of ſome learned men, who make the name of the Virgin different from that of others called* Mary *in the Goſpell, upon two grounds, in reſpect of the accent, and the termination; the one being* Μαριὰμ, *the other* Μαρία: *the firſt with an Hebrew termination, indeclinable, and the Accent in ultima, the latter with a Greek termination, declinable, and the Accent in penultima. As,* ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ, *Lu.* 1, 27. *in the nominative;* ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριάμ, *Lu.* 2, 5 *in the Dative;* μὴ φοβηθῇς παραλαβεῖν Μαριάμ, *Mat.* 1, 20. *in the Accuſative;* καὶ μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ. *Lu.* 1, 30. *in the Vocative caſe. All which belong to the Virgin, who is never nam'd* Μαρία: *as none of the reſt by any of the Evangeliſts is ever called* Μαριάμ. *But notwithſtanding this obſervation, we find the ſame Virgin's name declined:* as μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας, *Mat.* 1, 16. *and* σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ Μαρίᾳ τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, *both which muſt come from the Greek termination* Μαρία *in recto. And on the contrary, that* Mary *which S.* Paul *mentioneth hath the ſame Hebrew termination with the Virgin,* ἀσπάσασθε Μαριὰμ ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, *Ro.* 16, 6. *Beſide, the Syriac Tranſlation makes no difference between the name of theſe and of the Virgin:* as מרים מגדליתא ומרים אמה דיעקוב *Mar.* 15, 40. *So again* מרים מגדליתא ומרים אחרתא. *Mat.* 28, 1. *And therefore there can be no ſufficient foundation for any ſuch diſtinction.*

of Ieſus was the ſame with *Ioſuah*, ſo this of *Mary* was the ſame with * *Miriam*. The firſt of which name re-

* *For whereas we firſt read* Ex. 15, 20. מרים הנביאה. *the* LXX. *tranſlate it* Μαριὰμ ἡ προφῆτις, *and the*

corded

Vulgar Lat. Maria prophetiſſa. *The Hebrew firſt was* מִרְיָם *Mirjam; the Syriac altering the pronunciation, not the letters,* מַרְיָם *Marjam, as for* מַגְדֹּל מַגְדוֹל, *And becauſe the Greek language admitteth no Jod Conſonant, they pronounc'd it* Magidμ. *Though ſometimes indeed even the Greeks did uſe the barbarous pronunciation in the barbarous words, as* Lucian *with the Latines makes* Ἰωσαῖος *of three ſyllables.*

Ἰωσαῖος ἕτερον μωρὸν ἐξέδυτε λαβών.

Again, becauſe no Greek word endeth in μ, *to make it currant in that language, it was neceſſary to alter the termination, according to their cuſtome; as for* Annibal Ἀννίβας, Aſdrubal Ἀσδρούβας, Amilcar Ἀμίλκας, *and* Kδῖν, Kδῖς. *This was to be done ſometimes by addition, as* Νῶχ Νῶχος. Ἄβελ Ἄβελος, Λαμὲχ Λάμεχος, Ἰαρὲδ Ἰάρεδος, Ἐνὼς Ἔνως, Σὴθ Σήθος, Ἀδὰμ Ἄδαμος, Ἀβραὰμ Ἄβραμος, & Ἀβραάμης. *And ſo for* Μαριὰμ, Μαριάμμη, *or* Μαειάμνη. Ioſephus, Μαειάμη τὴν πεδὸς ἀδελφὴν, *of* Miriam *the Siſter of* Moſes; *whom in another place he calls* ἀδελφὴν αὐτῦ Μαριάμνην. *Therefore he thought the name of* Mariamne *to be the ſame with* Miriam. *And as the Greeks were wont to adde their own terminations to exotick words; ſo did they at other times leave out the exotick terminations, if thereby their own were left. As for* אביה & חנה, Ἀβία & Ἄννα, *for* אסר & זרח, Ἀσὰ & Ζαρὰ, *for* תחש Θαρὰ, *for* Μαριὰμ Μαρία. *Wherefore from the Hebrew* Miriam, *came by variety of pronuntiation at firſt the Syriac* Marjam; *and from the Syriac* Marjam, *at firſt, onely by variation of pronunciation* Μαειὰμ, *then, for the propriety of termination,* Μαρία.

corded was the daughter of *Amram*, the ſiſter of *Moſes* and *Aaron*, a Propheteſſe; to whom the bringing of Iſrael out of Egypt is attributed, as well as to her brethren.

Mic. 6, 4. *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.* 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 bloud hath wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type: and even with the confeſſion of the lowlineſſe of an handmaid ſhe ſeems to bear that † exaltation in her name.

† *For though that* Interpretation Domina *may ſeem to come conveniently enough from* מרא, *yet that being rather from the Chaldees, cannot ſo well agree with* Miriam; *nor is the* ם *ſo properly added at the end, as to the* Be-

beginning of an Hebrew word, where it is usually in words of simple signification Hicmantically. Again, though מר ים *may signifie* Smyrna maris, *or* Illuminatrix, *which* S. Hierome *rejected, and* Stella *(or rather* stilla, *which is properly* מר) maris, *or* amarum mare, *which he rather embraced; yet these compositions are not so proper, or probable at all, especially in a name dissyllable. Though the Jews themselves deduce it from* מרר, *to signify the bitterness of the Egyptian bondage, as we read in Midrash* ויושע *beside the two Authors before quoted,* נקראת מרים שמרדו המצרים את חיי הם; *yet still the addition of the final Mem is not proper, or if that should stand for* הם, *there were no good Account to be given of the Fod. Whereas if we deduce it from the Radix* רום, *with the addition of the Hicmantick Mem, the notation is evident, and the signification clear, as of one exalted above others.*

Beside this name of the blessed Virgin little hath bin discover'd 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 describ'd the city, family, and genealogy of *Joseph*, make no expresse mention of her relations, onely of her *cosin Elizabeth*, who was of the tribe of *Levi*, *of the daughters of Aaron*. Although it be of absolute necessity to believe, that he which was born of her descended from the tribe of *Judah*, and the family of *David*; yet hath not the Scripture clearly expres'd so much of her, nor have we any more then an † obscure tradition of her parents *Ioacim* and *Anna*. Where-

† *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 informes us, who speaking of* Ioseph *sayes he knew thus much.* Γυναῖκα μὲν ἔσχε αὐτὴν τῇ μάσει, ᾗ θέλησε τῇ φύσει, καὶ ὁπ μητρὸς Ἄννης καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωακείμ. Hæres. 78. *Again,* Εἰ δ' ἦλθες προσκυνεῖσθαι ὑ θέλω, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὴν ἀπὸ Ἄννης γεγεννημένην, τὴν ἐκ τῦ Ἰωακὶμ τῇ Ἄννᾳ δεδωρημένην? Hæres. 79. *Where he makes mention of the History of* Mary, *and the traditions concerning her nativity.* Η' τῆς Μαρίας ἱστορία, καὶ ποῖα δόσεις ἔχουσιν, ὅτι ἐρρίφη τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῦ Ἰωακὶμ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὅτι ἡ γυνὴ ἔν συνελήφθη, &c. *What this History of* Mary *was, or of what authority those traditions were, we cannot learn out of* Epiphanius. *What the Interpolator of* Gregory Nyssen's *Homily produceth, he confesseth taken from Apocryphall writings. And divers of the like relations descended from the*

prime and ev ntest Heretieks. The Gnosticks had a book among them, which was called Γέννα Μαείας, Epiph. *Haeres.* 25. *Amongst the Manichees* Seleucus *wrote the History of the Virgin. And the* Protevangelium Jacobi *deceived many in relations of this nature. Among which, many being certainly false, it is not now easie (if at all possible) to distinguish what part of them or particular is true.* Quod de generatione Mariæ Faustus posuit, quod patrem habuerit ex tribu Levi sacerdotem quendam nomine Ioachim, quia Canonicum non est, non me constringit, *saith S.* Austin, *l.* 23. *contra Faustum, c.* 9.

† Τίς ποτε, ἢ ἐν πόῃ ῥωσῇ τετίλμηκε καλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα Μαείας τῆς ἁγίας, ᾗ ἐρωτῶμεν & ἂν εὐθὺς ἐπίνευγκε τὸ παρθένον. Ἐξ ἀυτῆς δὲ τῆς ἐπιθέτου ὀνομάτων ᾗ τῆς αἰρέσεως ἀποφαίνει τὰ τεκμήρια. Ἀξιώματα μὲν δὲ ὀνομασιῶν ἐπλήφασιν ὁι δίκαιοι ἐνάρῳ πρεπόντως, ᾗ ὡς ἤρμοζε. Καὶ τῷ μὲν Ἀβραὰμ προσετέθη τὸ, φίλος Θεῦ, ᾗ ὁ διαλυθήσεται· τῷ δὲ Ἰσκὼβ τὸ Ἰσραὴλ καλεῖσθαι, ᾗ ἂν ἄλλοι ωθήσεται· ᾗ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις τὸ βοανεργὲς, Ἰουτίσιν ὑὶ βροντῆς, ᾗ ὃυκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται· ᾗ τῇ ἁγίᾳ Μαρίᾳ τὸ παρθένος, ᾗ ὁ τεκόυσα. Epiph. *Hær.* 78.

Wherefore the title added to that name maketh the distinction: for as divers characters are given to severall persons by which they are distinguish'd from all others of the same common nomination, as *Iacob* is called *Israel*, and *Abraham* the friend of God, or Father of the faithfull; so is this *Mary* sufficiently characteriz'd by that inseparable companion of her name, *the Virgin*. For the full explication whereof more cannot be required, then that we shew 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 continued for ever in the same Virginity, according to the Tradition of the Fathers, and the constant doctrine of the Church.

The obdurate Jew, that he might more easily avoid the truth of the second, hath most irrationally denyed the first; resolved rather not to understand *Moses* and the Prophets, then to acknowledge the interpretation of the Apostles. It will therefore be necessary, from those Oracles which were committed unto them, to shew the promised *Messias* was to be born after a miraculous manner,

to

to be the Son of a woman, not of a man. The firſt promiſe of him ſeems to ſpeak no leſſe, *The ſeed of the woman ſhall bruiſe the ſerpents head*: for as the name of *ſeed* is not generally or collectively to be taken for the generation of mankinde, 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.

According to this firſt Evangelicall promiſe followed that prediction of the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman ſhall compaſſe a man.* That new creation of a man is therefore *new*, and therefore a *creation*, becauſe wrought in a woman onely, without a man, compaſſing a man. Which interpretation of the Prophet is ancient, † literall and clear, and whatſoere the Iewes have invented to elude it is frivolous and forc'd. For while they force the phraſe of *compaſſing a man* in the latter part of the prediction to any thing elſe then a conception, they do not onely wreſt the Scripture, but contradict. R. Iudah *has obſerved but one interpretation of this Verb* כולם ענין אחר; *and* Kimchi *teſtifieth, that all words which come from the root* סבב *ſignifying oppoſing or circuition. Therefore thoſe words* נקבה תסובב גבר *muſt literally import no leſſe then that a woman ſhall encompaſſe 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 Bereſhi Rabba Parſh. 89. where ſhewing that God doth heal with that with which he wounds, he ſaith, is 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 compaſſe a man. *By the teſtimony of* R. Huna *in the name of* R. Idi, *and* R. Ioſuah *the ſon of* Levi, זה מלך המשיח שנ' היום ילדתיך *This is Meſsiah the King, of whom it is written (Pſal. 2. 7.) This day have I begotten thee. And again in Midrash Till mi upon the 2. Pſ.* R. Huna *in the name of* R. Idi *ſpeaking of the ſuffe ings of the Meſsiah, ſaith, that when his hour is come, God ſhall ſay,* וכן הוא אומר אני עלי לבראתו בריות חדשה היום ילדתיך *I muſt create him with a new creation And ſo (by virtue of that new creation) he ſaith, this day have I begotten thee.*

† *For it is not to be denyed that the proper ſignification of* סבב *is* circundare, *or* cingere.

From whence it appeareth that this ſenſe is of it ſelf 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 profeſſe, that Jeſus was born of a Virgin, and therefore is the Chriſt.

tradict the former part of the promiſe, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being eaſie to perform.

Iſ. 7. 14. But if this prophecy of *Ieremy* 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 Iews, † immediately upon the promulgation of the Goſpel, underſtanding well how near this place did preſſe them, gave three ſeverall anſwers to this Text: firſt denying that it ſpake of a † Virgin at all; ſecondly, afferting that it could not belong to " Ieſus; thirdly, affirming that it was fully completed in the perſon of ‖ *Ezechias.* Whereas the Originall word was tranſlated

† *How ſoon theſe Objections were made uſe of by the Iewes will appear by* Iuſtine Martyr, *the firſt Writer which made any conſiderable explication and defence of the Chriſtian religion; who in his Dialogue with* Trypho *the Iew, ſhews us what were the Objections of the Rabbins:* Ἐπεὶ ὑμῶν οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν τολμᾶτε λέγειν, μηδὲ αἰσθάνεσθε ἐν τῇ προφητείᾳ τῇ Ἡσαΐᾳ, εἰδὲ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, ἀλλ', εἰδὲ ἡ νεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν. *And* Tertullian, *whoſe works are full of the Divinity of* Iuſtine, Si quando ad dejiciendos aliquos ab hac divina prædicatione, vel convertere ſingulos ſimplices quoſque geſtiris, mentiri audetis, quaſi non *virginem*, ſed *juvenculam* concepturam Scriptura contineat. *Adverſ. Iudæos c.* 9. *& adverſ. Marcionem, lib.* 3. *cap.* 13. *And as they ſoon began, ſo did they go on with this Objection,* Hodie, toto jam credente mundo, argumentantur Iudæi, Eſaia docente de Maria & virginitate ejus, *Ecce virgo in utero concipiet, & pariet filium*, in Hebræo juvenculam ſcriptum eſſe, non virginem, id eſt, *halma*, non *bethula.* " Dicunt Iudæi, provocemus iſtam prædicationem Eſaiæ, & taciamus comparationem, an Chriſto qui jam venit competat illi primo nomen quod Eſaias prædicavit, & inſignia ejus quæ de eo nuntiavit. Equidem Eſaias prædicat eum Emmanuelem vocari oportere, dehinc virtutem ſumpturum Damaſci & ſpolia Samariæ adverſus regem Aſſyriorum. Porro, inquiunt, iſte qui venit, neque ſub ejuſmodi nomine eſt dictus, neque re bellica functus. *Tertul. adv. Judæos.* ‖ *So* Iuſtine *teſtifieth of the Iews, ſpeaking to* Trypho, *and in him to them:* ἐξηγεῖσθε τὴν προφητείαν ὡς εἰς Ἐζεκίαν τὸν γενόμενον ὑμῶν βασιλέα. *And* Trypho *replies again to* Iuſtine, "Ἴσμεν ὡς ἐκεῖνον εἰς Χριστὸν τὸν μέλλοντα ὑπὸ πάντων κηρύσσεσθαι, ἡμεῖς γὲ εἰς Ἐζεκίαν αὐτὴν λέγομεν πεπροφητεῦσθαι.

a *Virgin,*

a *Virgin*, by such ‖ Interpreters as were Jews themselves, some hundred yeares before our Saviour's birth. And did not the notation of the word, and frequent use thereof in the Scriptures perswade it, the wonder of the *signe* given by the *Lord himself* would evince as much. But as for that conceit, that all should be fulfill'd in *Hezekiah*, it is so manifestly and undoubtedly false, that nothing can make more for the confirmation of our faith. For this signe was given, and this promise made (*A Virgin shall conceive and bear a son,*) at some time in the reign of *Ahaz*. This a *Ahaz reigned but sixteen yeares in Jerusalem*; and *Hezekiah* his son who succeeded him b *was twenty and five yeares old when he began to reign*, and therefore born severall yeares before *Ahaz* was King, and consequently not now to be conceived when this signe was given. Thus while the ancient Jews name him onely to fulfill the prophesy, in whom it is impossible it should be fulfilled, they plainly shew 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 belong'd unto the *Messias*, as divers of the ancient Rabbins thought and confessed; and is yet more evident by their monstrous errour, who therefore expected † not *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 onely to prove that the *Messias* promised by God, and expected by the people of God before and under the Law, was to be conceiv'd and born of a Virgin.

‖ *The* LXX. Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται. *'Tis true, the rest of the Interpreters, concurring with the Objection of the Jews, translated it,* ἰδοὺ ἡ νεᾶνις, *i.e.* adolescentula *or* juvencula. *But as their antiquity, so their authority is farre short of the* LXX. *especially in this case. I shall not need to shew how the Origination of* עלמה *from* עלם *proves no lesse. We know the affinity of the Punick tongue with the Hebrew, and by the testimony of* S. Hierome, quæ de Hebræorum fontibus manare dicitur, propriè virgo *alma* appellatur. Lingua Punica,

Secondly,

a 2 *Kin.* 16. 2. b 2 *Kin.* 18. 2. † *It is the known saying of* Hillel, *recorded in* Sanhedrin c. *Chelek,* אין להם משיח לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי חזקיהו *There is no Messias to the Israelites, because they have already injoyed him in the dayes of* Hezekiah. *Divers of the later Rabbins endeavour to mollifie these words of* Hillel *by their severall expositions, but in vain. And* R. 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. *Howsoever 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 fulfill'd in him: which Proposition was false. From thence he inferred, that the Israelites, were not to expect a Messias after Hezekiah: which Conclusion was also false.*

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 the 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 S. *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 S. *Matthew*: For when she was *espoused unto Ioseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.* That she was a Virgin not onely 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 was her act of parturition more contradictory to virginity, then that former of conception.

Luke 1. 27.

Matt. 1. 18.

Verse 23.

Thirdly,

† Hæc est Virgo quæ in utero concepit, virgoque peperit filium. Sic enim scriptum est, *Ecce Virgo in utero accipiet, & pariet filium.* Non enim concepturam tantummodo Virginem, sed & parituram Virginem dixit. S. *Ambros.* Epist. 7. ad Siricium. *So he argued from the Prophecy and S. Aug. from the Creed;* Si vel per nascentem corrumperetur ejus integritas, non jam ille de Virgine nasceretur: eumque falso, quod absit, *de Virgine natum* tota conhteretur Ecclesia, quæ, imitans ejus matrem, quotidie

quotidie parit membra, & Virgo eſt. *Euchir. c.* 34. *As alſo S.* Ambroſe *in the ſame Epiſtle,* quæ potuit Virgo concipere, potuit Virgo generare, quam ſemper conceptus præcedat, partus ſequatur. Sed ſi doctrinis non creditur ſacerdotum, credatur oraculis Chriſti, credatur monitis Angelorum, credatur Symbolo Apoſtolorum, quod Eccleſia Romana intemeratum ſemper cuſtodit & ſervat. *And S.* Baſil *upon occaſion of the ſame Prophecy,* ἡ αὐτὴ γυνὴ καὶ παρθένος καὶ μήτηρ, καὶ ὁ τοῦ ἁγιάσματος τῆς παρθενίας μένει, καὶ τὴν τῆς τεκνογονίας εὐλογίαν κληρονομεῖ. *Hom.* 25.

Thirdly, we believe the Mother of our Lord to have been not onely before and after his 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, 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 further mention in the Creed then that he was born of the Virgin *Mary*: yet the peculiar eminency and unparalell'd priviledge of that Mother, the ſpeciall 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 goodneſſe and piety of *Ioſeph*, 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*. As if the gate of the Sanctuary in the Prophet *Ezechiel* were to be underſtood of her, *This gate ſhall be ſhut, it ſhall not be open'd, and no man ſhall enter in by it; becauſe the Lord the God of Iſrael hath entred in by it, therefore it ſhall be ſhut.* † Many indeed have taken the boldneſſe to deny this truth, becauſe not recorded in ſacred writ; and not *ſome did maintain the Virginity of* Mary *no longer then to Chriſts Nativity.* In tantam nescio quis prorupit infaniam, ut affereret negatam fuiſſe Mariam à Salvatore, eo quod poſt nativitatem illius juncta fuerit Joſeph. *Homil.* 7. *in Lucam.* Tertullian *himſelf*

† Μέχρι δὲ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ οἰκονομίας ὑπάρχει ἀναγκαία ἡ παρθενία, τὸ δ' ἑφεξῆς ἀπολυπραγμόνητον τῷ λόγῳ τῶν μυουμένων καταλείπομεν. *S.* Basil. *Hom. de Nativ.*

* *For ſo the Greek Church always call'd her* ἀειπαρθένον, *and from them the Latins* Semper-Virgo.

Ezech. 44. 2.

† *Firſt we read in the time of* Origen, *that*

was produced as an aſſertor of the ſame opinion; nor does S. Hierome *deny it, though I think he might have done it.* Apollinaris, *or at leaſt his followers, deliver'd the ſame, ſayes* Epiphanius; *and* Eunomius *with his,* Τὸν Ἰωσὴφ μετὰ τὴν ἀπεγεννησεν Χωδάζειν ὑ περίκασι τῇ παρθένῳ, *as* Photius *out of* Philoſtorgius. *Not that theſe words in* Photius *were the words of* Philoſtorgius, *for he was clearly an Eunomian, and therefore would never expreſſe their opinions with an* ὑ περίκασι. *And as he alwayes commended* Eunomius, *ſo was he not commended but by an Eunomian, that is a man of his own ſect. As that Epigramme,*

Εὐνομιανῦ.

Ἰσρῆλ ἐτέλεσεν Θεῦ χαρίτεσι Σοφίσι.

which I therefore mention, becauſe Gotofred *hath made an unneceſſary emendation in the Verſe,* ἐτέλεσσ' ἀ Θεῦ, *and a worſe interpretation in the Inſcription, taking the Eunomian to be a Catholick, and the name of the ſect for the name of a man; and confirming this error by a greater miſtake, ſaying* Eunomianus *was the name of a man, twice ſpoken of in* Suidas, *once in* Εὐνομιανός, *and again in* Ἔλλας. *'Tis true indeed* Suidas *ſayes expreſly,* Εὐνομιανὸς, ὄνομα κύριον: *and immediately adds theſe words,* Τὸν δὲ Εὐνομιανὸν ἔλουσε Βελισάριος τὸ θεῖον λουτρὸν, *as if* Beliſarius *had baptized one whoſe name was* Eunomianus. *But the words are taken out of* Procopius *in Hiſt. Arcana pag. 2. from whence it appears that he who was baptiz'd was by name* Theodoſius, *and by ſect an Eunomian. And whatſoever his name was who wrote that Epigramme on the Hiſtory of* Philoſtorgius, *he was certainly by ſect an Eunomian, and that was intended in the Inſcription, written without queſtion by ſome Catholick, who thought no man could commend the Hiſtory of* Philoſtorgius *but one of his own opinion. Theſe afterwards increaſed to a greater number, whom* Epiphanius *calls by a generall name* Antidicomarianitæ. *And from him S.* Auguſt. *Antidicomarianitæ appellati ſunt Hæretici, qui Mariæ virginitati uſque adeo contradicunt, ut affirment eam poſt Chriſtum natum viro ſuo fuiſſe commixtam, de Hæreſ. condemned under that name by the ſix h Generall Councils, Act. 11. The ſame were called by the Latines* Helvidiani *from* Helvidius, *(a diſciple of* Auxentius *the Arian,) whoſe name is moſt made uſe of, becauſe refuted by S* Hierome. *He was followed by* Iovinian *a Monk of* Millan, *as S.* Hierome *teſtifieth, though S.* Auguſtine *delivereth his opinion otherwiſe,* Virginitatem Mariæ deſtruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuiſſe corruptam. *And* Bonoſus *a Biſhop in* Macedonia, *refer'd by the Councils of* Capua *to the judgement of* Anyſius *Biſhop of* Theſſalonica, *was condemned for the ſame, as appeareth by the 79 Epiſtle of S.* Ambroſe, *written to* Theophilus *and* Anyſius. *Sane non poſſumus negare de Mariæ filiis jure reprehenſum, meritoque deteſtram Sanctitatem abhorruiſſe, quod ex eodem utero virginali, ex quo ſecundum carnem Chriſtus natus eſt, alius partus effuſus ſit. This is the Catalogue of thoſe by the Ancients accounted Heretucks for denying the perpetuall Virginity of the Mother of our Lord.*

not onely ſo, but to aſſert the contrary as deliver'd in the Scriptures, but with no ſucceſſe. For though, as they object, S. *Matthew* teſtifieth that *Joſeph* a *knew not Mary, until ſhe had brought forth her firſt-born Son*; from whence they would inferre, that afterwards he knew her: yet the manner of the Scripture language produceth no ſuch inference. When God ſaid to *Iacob*, b *I will not leave thee untill I have done that which I have ſpoken to thee of*, it followeth not that when that was done he left him. When the concluſion of *Deuteronomy* was written, it was ſaid of *Moſes*, c *no man knoweth of his ſepulchre unto this day*: but it were a weak argument to inferre from thence, that it hath bin known ever ſince. When *Samuel* had delivered a ſevere prediction unto *Saul*, he d *came no more to ſee* him *untill the day of his death*: but it were a ſtrange collection to infer, that he therefore gave him a viſit after he was dead. e *Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto 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 *untill the end of the world*, who never made ſo unhappy a conſtruction as to infer from thence, that for ever after he would be abſent from them. Again, 'tis * true that Chriſt is termed the *firſt-born Son* of *Mary*, from whence they inferre 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

a Mat. 1. 25.

† For in the word Ἕως there is no ſuch force. Τὸ Ἕως ὐ πάντως ἀπολαμβάνεται τοῦ μέλλοντος, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέχρι μόνου τοῦδε τεθήκασι, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ ὐκ ἀναιρεῖ). Naz. Orat. 2. de Filio. Τὸ Ἕως πολλαχοῦ χρόνου μέν τινα δηλοῖ ὡρισμένου ὑποφαίνει, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὸ ἀδιόριστον δείκνυσιν. S. Baſ. Hom de Nat. Dō. Ἕως τῆς χάριν τὴν ῥῆσιν ταύτην μὴ δεῖ νοεῖσθαι πέρας χρόνου. S. Chryſ. Τὸ Ἕως πολλαχοῦ ὐ δηλοῖ τὸ διηνεκῶς ὂν τῇ θείᾳ χάριν ἐνδεικνύμενον κείμενον. Iſid. Peluſ. l. 1. Ep. 18. Τὸ Ἕως πολλαχοῦ ὐκ ὁπὸ χρόνου λέγει, ἀλλ' ὁδὸ τῶν πραγμάτων. Adria. Iſag. in S.S. Τὸ Ἕως ὁτὲ μὲν πρὸς ἀντίδιαστολὴν τῆς ἀφῃρέσεως χρόνου ἐφαλαμβάνεται, ὁτὲ δ' ὅτι ἐπὶ δηλώσει μεγάλων μὲν ὄντων καὶ διαρκούντων, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν, ὐ μὴν πρὸς ἀντίδιαστολὴν ἑτέρου χρόνου τινὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐναντίον οἷς ὑποδηλοῖ δυνάμενα διαστήματος. Phot. Ep. 30.

b Gen. 28. 15. c Deut. 34. 6. d 1 Sam. 15. 35. e 2 Sam. 6. 23.

* For I ſhall not deny that Chriſt was call'd the firſt-born in

in respect of his Mother, though Epiphanius *thought that a sufficient answer:* οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐγέννησε τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐτῆς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτὴν ἕως ὅτε ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, τὸν πρωλότοκον αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν πρωλότοκον. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς ἐσήμανεν, ὃς αὐτῆς κατὰ ζάρκα γεγεννῆσθαι· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τῶ πρωτοτόκου ἐπωνυμίας οὐκέτι τὸ αὐτῆς ἔθετο, ἀλλὰ πρωτότοκον μόνον. *Hær.* 78. *As if her Son the first-born were not her first-born Son.* Οὐ πάντως ὁ Πρωλότοκος πρὸς τὸς ὀπιγενομένους ἔχει τὴν ζύγκεισιν, ἀλλ' ὁ πρῶτον διανοίαν μήτραν Πρωτότοκος ὀνομάζεται. *S. Basil. Hom. de Nativ.* Primogenitus *est non tantum post quem & alii, sed ante quem nullus.* *S Hieron. adv. Helvid:* *It is observed by* Servius, *to that of* Virgil *Æneid.* 1. Trojæ qui primus ab oris, *that* Primus *is post quem nullus.*

have gone before, but concludeth not any to follow after. *Sanctifie unto me*, saith God, *all the first-born*; which was a firme and fixed law, immediately obliging upon the birth: whereas if the first-born had included a relation to a second, there could have bin no present certainty, but a suspension of obedience; nor had the first-born bin sanctified of it self, 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 bin required of him, till a second offspring had appear'd, and so no redemption at all had bin required for an onely son. Whereas all such pretences were unheard of in the law, because the Originall * Hebrew word is not capable of any such construction, and in the Law it self it carrieth with it a clear interpretation, a *Sanctify unto me all the first-born; whatsoever openeth the wombe among the children of Israel both of man and beast it is mine.* The apertion of the wombe * determineth the first-born; and the law of redemption excludeth all such tergiversation, saying, b *Those that are to be redeemed, from a moneth old thou shalt redeem*; no staying to make up the relation, no expecting another birth to perfect the redemption.

† *Thus S. Hierome makes his plea,* Quid me in unius mensis stringis articulo? quid primogenitum vocas, quem an sequantur fratres ignoro? Expecta donec nascatur secundus: nihil debeo sacerdoti, nisi & ille fuerit procreatus, per quem is qui ante natus est incipiat esse primogenitus. *Adv. Helvid.*

Being

* בכורם a *Exod.* 13. 2.

* Definivit sermo Dei quid sit *Primogenitum*; omne, inquit, quod aperit vulvam. *S. Hieron. adv. Helv.* b *Numb.* 18. 16.

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*; 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. *Luke* 2. 22, 23.

Indeed, as they thirdly object, it cannot be denyed but that we read expresly in the Scriptures of the brethren of our Lord, *He went down to Capernaum, 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.* But although his Mother and his brethren be nam'd togethet, 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. 'Tis possible *Ioseph* 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 call'd his brethren, as the † ancient Fathers, especially of the Greek Church, have taught. Nor need we thus assert that *Ioseph* had any offspring, because the language of the Iewes includeth in the name of *brethren* not onely the strict relation of fraternity, but also the larger of consanguinity; and therefore it is sufficient satisfaction for that expression, that there were such per- *Joh.* 2. 12. *Mat.* 12. 46.

† Origen *first delivereth it on S. Mat. and* Eusebius *shewe h his opinion, speaking of S.* Iames *the Brother of our Lord*, Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 1.

Τότε δῆτα καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφὸν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ ὅτος Ἰωσὴφ ἀνόμασε παῖς, τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν πατὴρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ. So we read, as it is set forth by R. Stephan. *But in my book collated with an ancient MS.* ὅτι δὴ καὶ ὅτος υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ, τοῦ νομιζομένου οἱονεὶ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *which is much more plain, for* ἀνόμασε παῖς *is nothing so pertinent in this particular, as* υἱὸς ἦν. So Epiphanius, Ἦν δὲ ὁ Ἰάκωβος ὅτος υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ὁκ γυναικὸς τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ, ἀκ ἀπὸ Μαρίας. *Hæres.* 29. and *Hæres.* 42 *(speaking of the rest, he calls them* τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰωσὴφ ὁκ τῆς ὄντως αὐτοῦ ἄλλης γυναικός. *Thus S.* Hilary, Homines pravissimi hinc præsumunt opinionis suæ authoritatem,

quod plures Dominum noſtrum fratres habuiſſe ſit traditum, quaſi Mariæ illi fuiſſent, & non potius Ioſeph ex priore conjugio ſuſcepti. *Com. in Matth. cap. 1.* Thus alſo S. Ambroſe *de Virg.* and generally all the Fathers to that time, and the Greeks afterward, S. Chryſ. S. Cyril, Euthymius, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and Nicephorus. *Theſe all ſeem to have followed an old Tradition which is partly ſtill continued in* Epiphanius, Ἐφ. δὲ ὅτ Ὁ Ἰωσὴφ τὴν μὲν πρώτην αὐτῦ γυναῖκα ὢν τῆ φυλῆς Ἰούδα· καὶ κυΐσκει αὐτὸ αὐτη παῖδας τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἓξ, τ' ταξας μὲν ἄρρενας, θηλείας δὲ δύο. *Hær. 78. The firſt of theſe ſix children was* James: μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ γίνεται παῖς Ἰωσῆ καλούμενος, εἶτα μετ' αὐτὸν Συμεών, ἔπειτα Ἰούδας· καὶ δύο θυγατέρες, ἥ τε Μαρία, καὶ ἡ Σαλώμη καλουμένη. *Thus had the Greeks a diſtinct relation of the ſons and daughters of* Ioſeph, *and of the order of their generation, whoſe authority I ſhall conclude with that of* Iobius *Oecon. l. 9.* Ἔδει πατέρος καὶ ἀδελφὰς ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάσαι τὸν ἀνάτροφα, ὧν ὁ τῶν λῃστῶν καὶ πονηρῶν τύπτης ἐξελέξατο, ἀλλὰ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν διαλάμποντας τοιῦτ Ὁ γὰρ Ἰωσὴφ, καὶ οἱ τούτῳ παῖδες. *Phot. Biblioth. 222. And that of* Amphilochius Iunior. *Orat. in Deip.* Ἡσίκης δέ ποτε καὶ οἱ τῦ Ἰωσὴφ υἱοὶ, καθὼς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς, καὶ τῆ πείρᾳ διδαχθέντες τὸ ἀληθὲς, γεγραφήκασιν Ἰάκωβ Ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας παῖδι τῷ κόσμῳ, Θεῦ καὶ Κυρίε Ἰησῦ χριστε δοῦλος ἑαυτὸς εἶναι.

persons allied unto the bleſſed Virgin. *We be brethren,* Gen. 13. 8. ſaid *Abraham* unto *Lot*; when *Abraham* was the ſon of *Terah*, *Lot* of *Haran*, and conſequently not his brother, but his nephew, and, as elſewhere properly ſtiled, *the* Gen. 12. 5. *ſon of his brother*. *Moſes called Miſhael and Elzaphan* Lev. 10. 4. *the ſons of Vzziel the uncle of Aaron, and ſaid unto them, Come neer, carry your brethren from before the Sanctuary*; whereas thoſe brethren were *Nadab* and *Abihu*, the ſons Gen. 29. 12. not of *Vzziel*, but of *Aaron*. *Iacob told Rachel that he was her fathers brother, and that he was Rebeka's ſon*; whereas *Rebeka* was the ſiſter of *Rachel*'s father. It is ſufficient therefore that the Evangeliſts, according to the conſtant language of the Iewes, call the kindred of the bleſſed Virgin the brethren and ſiſters of her onely ſon; which indeed is ſomething the † later, but the moſt generally approved Anſwer. And

† *The firſt, I conceive, who return'd this anſwer, was* S Hierome, *in a Tractate written in his youth at* Rome *againſt* Helvidius; *wherein after a long diſcourſe of ſeverall acceptions of* Brethren *in the Scriptures, he thus concludes;* Reſtat igitur ut fratres eos intel igas appellatos cognatione, non

non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non natura; quomodo Lot Abrahæ, quomodo Iacob Laban est appellatus frater. *And as for the other opinion of those which went before him, he saies twas grounded meerly upon an Apocryphal History. Com. in Mat. cap.* 12. Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Ioseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, & quandam Escham mulierculam confingentes. *Indeed* Origen *himself, followed in this particular by the Greek Church, did confesse no lesse, who tells the Authors from whom that interpretation first arose,* Fratres autem Iesu putabant nonnulli esse, ex traditione Hebræorum sumpta occasione, ex Evangelio quod titulum habet *juxta Petrum*, aut ex libro Iacobi, filios Ioseph ex priore uxore, quæ convixerat ipsi antequam duceret Mariam, *in Mat.* 13. 55. *This* Iacobus *ment oned by* Origen *is the same with him whom* Eustathius *mentions in Hexamero.* Ἄξιον δὲ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἣν διέξεισι περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας Ἰάκωβός τις ἀπελθών. *where he reckons* Ioseph *inter τοὺ χηρεύοντας: and* Epiphanius *calls* Ἰάκωβος Ἑβραῖος. *S.* Hierome *therefore observing that the former opinion of* Ioseph. *sons was founded meerly upon an Apocryphall writing, and being ready to assert the Virginity of* Ioseph *as well as* Mary, *first invented the other solution in the kindred of* Mary, *as founded not onely in the language but also testimony of the Scriptures.* Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Ioseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, & quandam Escham mulierem confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur, fratres Domini non filios Ioseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos intelligimus materteræ Domini, quæ esse dicitur mater Iacobi minoris & Ioseph & Iudæ, quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis Scriptura demonstrat. *S. Hieron. in Matth.* 12. 49. *After S.* Hierome S. Aug. *embraced this Opinion.* Consanguinei Virginis Mariæ, fratres Domini dicebantur. Erat enim consuetudinis Scripturarum appellare fratres quoslibet consanguineos & cognationis propinquos, *In Ioh. Tract.* 28. *item Tract.* 10. *& contra Faustum l.* 22. 35. *Although therefore he seem to be indifferent, in his Exposition of the Epistle to the* Galatians, Iacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Ioseph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus 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 S.* Hierome's *authority hath bin generally since received in the Latine Church.*

And yet this difficulty, though usually no further considered, is not fully clear'd; for they which impugned the perpetuall Virginity of the mother of our Lord, urged it further, pretending that as the Scriptures called them the brethren of Christ, so they also shewed them to be the sons of *Mary* the mother of Christ. For first, the Iews ex-

Mat. 13. 55. preſſe them particularly by their names, *Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren* Iames *and* Ioſes *and Simon and Iudas?* Therefore Iames and Ioſes were undoubtedly the brethren of Chriſt, and the ſame were alſo as unqueſtionably the ſons of *Mary*: For among the women at the croſſe we find [a] *Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of* Iames *and* Ioſes. Again, this *Mary* they think can be no other then the mother of our Lord, becauſe they find her early in the morning at the Sepulchre, with [b] *Mary Magdalene and Salome*; and it is not probable that any ſhould have more care of the body of the ſon then the mother. She then who was certainly preſent at the Croſſe, was not probably abſent from the Sepulchre. Wherefore they conclude, ſhe was the mother of Chriſt, who was the mother of Iames and Ioſes the brethren of Chriſt.

From this place Helvidius *argued*, Hæc eadem vocabula in alio loco nominari, & eoſdem eſſe fratres Domini, filios Mariæ. *S. Hier. adverſ. Helv. And from the next he concluded*, Ecce Jacobus & Ioſes, filii Mariæ, quos Iudæi fratres appellarunt.

[a] *Mat.* 27. 56. [b] *Mark* 16. 1. † *Here* Helvidius *exclaiming thus*, Quam miſerum erit & impium de Maria hæc ſentire, ut cum aliæ fœminæ curam ſepulturæ habuerint, matrem ejus dicamus abſentem!

And now the urging of this Argument will produce a greater clearneſſe in the ſolution of the queſtion. For if it appear that *Mary* the mother of Iames and Ioſes was different and diſtinguiſh't from *Mary* the Virgin, then will it alſo be apparent that the brethren of our Lord were the ſons of another mother, for Iames and Ioſes were ſo called. But we read in S. Iohn, that *there ſtood by the Croſſe of* Ieſus *his mother, and his mothers ſiſter, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and* Mary Magdalene. In the reſt of the Evangeliſts we find at the ſame place *Mary Magdalen and Mary the mother of* Iames *and* Ioſes; and again at the ſepulchre *Mary Magdalen, and the other Mary*: wherefore that other *Mary* by the conjunction of theſe teſtimonies appeareth to be *Mary* the wife of *Cleophas*, and the mother of Iames and Ioſes; and conſequently Iames and

Jo. 19. 25.

Matt. 27. 56. *Mark* 15. 40. *Matt.* 28. 1.

Ioſes

Ioſes the brethren of our Lord were not the ſons of *Mary* his mother, but of the other *Mary*, and therefore call'd his brethren, according to the language of the Iews, becauſe that other *Mary* was the ſiſter of his mother.

Notwithſtanding therefore all theſe pretenſions, there can be nothing found to raiſe the leaſt ſuſpition of any interruption of the ever-bleſſed *Mary*'s perpetuall 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 commended by our Saviour to his beloved diſciple as a mother onely now of an adopted ſon.

Sicut in ſepulchro ubi poſitum eſt corpus Domini, nec antea nec poſtea mortuus jacuit : ſic uterus Mariæ nec antea nec poſtea quicquam mortale ſuſcepit. S. Aug. in Joh. Tract. 28.

The third Conſideration belonging to this part of the Article is how this Virgin was a mother, what the foundation was of her maternall 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 forme of this Article, briefly thus delivered, *Born of the Holy Ghoſt and the Virgin Mary*; as alſo that the word *Born*, was not taken preciſely for the Nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatſoever belonged to his humane 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 conceiv'd him, but the bleſſed Virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit.

γεννηθέντα.

* Tantum ad nativitatem carnis ex ſe dedit, quantum ex ſe fœminæ edendorum corporum ſuſceptis originibus impendunt. *S. Hil. l. 10. de T. in.*

Firſt therefore, we muſt acknowledge a true, reall and proper conception, by which the Virgin did conceive of her * own ſubſtance the true and reall ſubſtance of our Saviour, according to the prediction of the Prophet, *Behold, a Virgin ſhall conceive*, and the Annunciation of the Angel,

Angel *behold, thou ſhalt* † *conceive in thy womb.* From whence our Saviour is expreſſely termed by *Elizabeth, the* ‖ *fruit of her womb.*

† That is by a proper conception Συλλαβὼν ἐν γαστρὶ, the Syriac in one word בטן ac ſi diceres ventreſcere. So the LXX. tranſlated the ſimple הרה ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται. As therefore ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν expreſſeth a proper gravidation, ſo doth ἐν γαστρὶ Συλλαβεῖν a proper conception. According to that expreſſion of Gregory Nazianzene, Διττῶς μὲν, ὅτι χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς ἀνθρωπικῶς ἧ, ὅτι νόμῳ κυήσεως Ep. 1. ad Cledon. ‖ Heb. פרי בטן a Luke 1. 42.

Secondly, as ſhe did at firſt really and properly conceive, ſo did ſhe alſo nouriſh and encreaſe 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*, and is deſcribed going with *Joſeph* to be taxed *being great with child*, and pronounced happy by that loud cry of the woman in the Goſpel, *Bleſſed is the womb that bare thee.*

Matt. 1. 18.

Lu. 2. 5. ἧν ἐγκύῳ.

Lu. 11. 27. κοιλία ἣ βάσασά σε.

Thirdly, when Chriſt was thus conceiv'd and grew in the womb of the bleſſed Virgin, ſhe truely and really did bring forth her ſon by a true and proper parturition; and Chriſt thereby was properly born by a true nativity. For as we read, *Elizabeth's full time came that ſhe ſhould be delivered, and ſhe brought forth a ſon*; ſo in the like ſimplicity of expreſſion, and propriety of ſpeech, the ſame Evangeliſt ſpeaks of *Mary, the dayes were accompliſhed that ſhe ſhould be delivered, and ſhe brought forth her firſt-born ſon.*

Luke 1. 37.

Luke 2. 6, 7.

Wherefore from theſe three, a true conception, nutrition and parturition, we muſt acknowledge that the bleſſed Virgin was † truely and properly the mother of our Saviour. And ſo is ſhe frequently ſtiled the mother of Jeſus

† Veri & proprii filii qui, niſi abſurdiſſimus negetve-

re & proprie eſſe matrem? *Facundus l. 1. c. 4.* Hoc & ad credendum difficile, & dignum controverſia videbatur, utrum Deum illa Virgo genuerit: cæterum quod vere & proprie genuerit, quicquid eſt ille quem genuit, nulli dignum diſceptationis apparet, *ibid.*

ſus in the language of the Evangeliſts, and by *Elizabeth* particularly the *mother of her Lord*, as alſo by the generall conſent of the Church, (becauſe he which was ſo born of her was God,) the † *Deipara*, Which *in the Greek Church, who delighting in the happy compoſitions of the language, called the bleſſed Virgin* Θεοτόκον. *From whence the Latines in imitation ſtyled her* Virginem Deiparam & Dei genitricem. Meurſius *in his Gloſſary ſets the Originall of this Title in the time of* Juſtinian: Inditum hoc nomen eſt matri Domini ac Servatoris noſtri Jeſu Chriſti à Synodo 1. Conſtantinopolitana tempore Juſtiniani. *Whereas this was not the Originall, but the confirmation of that Title.* In hac Synodo Catholice eſt inſtitutum, ut Beata Maria ſemper-virgo Θεοτόκος diceretur: quia ſicut Catholica fides habet, non hominem ſolum, ſed vere Deum & Hominem genuit. *Paul. Warnef. de Geſtis Longobard.* l. 6. c. 14. *So ſpeaketh he of the ſame Synod: and 'tis true, for the ſeventh Canon of the ſame runneth thus,* Εἴ τις χρὴ ἀναφορὰν ἢ κατηχητικὸν Θεοτόκου λέγει τὴν ἁγίαν ἔνδοξον ἀειπαρθένον Μαρίαν .... ἀλλὰ μὴ κυρίως καὶ κατ' ἀλήθειαν Θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὁμολογεῖ ..... ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. *Otherwiſe in this Councel was but confirm'd what had bin determin'd and ſetled long before: and the ſame* Photius *ſayes thereof,* Αὕτη ἡ Συνὼδος Νεστορείαν πᾶσαν τὰ μεταξὺ φυόμενα δόγματα εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἐξεθέρισεν, *that it utterly cut off the Hereſy of* Neſtorius *which then began to grow up again. Now part of the Hereſy of* Neſtorius *was the denyall of this* Θεοτόκος, *and the whole was nothing elſe but the ground of that denyall. And therefore being he was condemned for denying of it, that Title muſt be acknowledged Auncient, which he denyed from the time of the Councel of* Epheſus; *in which thoſe Fathers, ſaith* Photius *expreſſly,* τὴν παλαίαν τοῦ ἀειπαρθένου (Χριστοῦ) μητέρα κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς καλεῖσθαι καὶ ἀνευρημένης Θεοτόκου παρεδώκασι. Epiſt. 1. *And that it was ſo there is manifeſt, becauſe by the denyall of this roe* Neſtorian *Hereſy was firſt diſcovered, not in* Neſtorius *himſelf, but in his Presbyter* Anaſtaſius, *who firſt in a Sermon magiſterially deliver'd,* Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν καλεῖτο μηδείς. Soc. Eccl. Hiſt. l. 7. c. 31. & Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 4. *as alſo* Evagrius *and* Nicephorus. *Upon which words ariſing a tumult,* Neſtorius *took his Presbyters part in teaching the ſame doctrine conſtantly in the Church,* καὶ παντὶ λαῷ τὴν λέξιν τῆς Θεοτόκου ἐκβάλλων. *And hereupon the tumult grew ſo great, that a generall Councel for that reaſon was call'd by* Theodoſius Junior, τῆς Νεστορίου τὴν ἁγίαν Μαρίαν εἶναι Θεοτόκον ἀρνησάμενος, *as* Juſtinian *teſtifieth, Epiſt. ad V. Synod. in. In which when all things ſeem'd clearly to be carried againſt* Neſtorius *and his faction, he hoped to have reconciled all by his feigned acknowledgement,* Λαγχάνω καὶ Θεοτόκον ἡ Μαρία, καὶ παυσάσθω τὰ λυπηρά Socr. l. 7. c. 34. Liberat. *Brev.* c. 6. *It is plain then that the Councel of* Epheſus, *which condemn'd* Neſtorius, *confirm'd this Title* Θεοτόκος. *I ſay confirm'd it; for 'tis evident that it was before uſed in the Church, by the tumult which aroſe at the firſt denyall of it by* Anaſtaſius; *and ſo confirm'd it as receiv'd before,*

† *Τοῖς name was firſt in uſe*

because they approved the Epistles of S. Cyril, who prov'd it by the usage of those Fathers which preceded him. Where by the way it is observable, that while S. Cyril produceth nine several Fathers for the use of this word, and both before and after he produceth them, affirmeth that they all did use it, there are but three of them who expressely mention it, Athanasius, Antiochus and Ammon, 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 here were before him so many besides them that us'd it. As Greg. Nyssen, Εἴ τις ὁ Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν οὐκ ἀναμβάνει, χωρὶς ἐστι τῆς θεότητος, Epist. ad Cledonium: and in his first Oration de Filio, making of the difference of his generation from that of others, πῶς γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔγνως Θεοτόκον παρθένον; And S. Basil justly, μὴ καταδίκαζε φιλοχρίστων τὴν ἀκοὴν, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἡ Θεοτόκος. Hom. de Natu Christo. And that in the time of S. Basil and S. Gregory this terme was usual, appeareth by the objection of Iulian, who derided the Christians for this, that God could be born of a woman; Θεοτόκον δὲ ὑμεῖς ἡ πάντως Μαρίαν καλεῖτε. S. Cyril. ad. 6. Besides both these Eusebius speak those of Helena, who built a Church at Bubleben; Ἡ βασιλὶς ἡ θεοσεβεστάτη τῆς Θεοτόκου τὴν κύησιν μνήμασι θαυμασοῖς καλλυόμενα. de vita Const. l. 3. And before Eusebius, Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, ἀπαρχὴ χρόνου ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, σῶμα φορέσας ἀληθῶς ἐκ τῆς Θεοτόκου Μαρίας. Epist. ad Alexand. apud Theodor. l. 1. c. 4. Before him Dionysius Alex. calls our Saviour τὸν σαρκωθέντα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου τῆς Θεοτόκου Μαρίας. Epist. ad Paulum Samosat. and speaking of the words of Isaiah, a Virgin shall conceive, Δείκνυσιν ὅτι ἡ Θεοτόκος τινὰ ζωὴν ἁγνὴν, ἢ παρθένον δηλοῦσι. Resp. ad Quæst. 5. Many long before him Origen did not onely use, but expound at large the meaning of that title Θεοτόκος, in his first tome on the Epistle to the Romans, as Socrates and Liberatus testifie.

Which being a compound title begun in the Greek Church, was resolved into it's parts by the Latines, and so the Virgin was plainly nam'd the † Mother of God.

† *Although* Θεοτόκος *may be extended to signifie as much as the mother of God, because* τίκτειν *doth sometimes denote as much as* γεννᾶν, *and therefore is hath been translated* Dei Genitrix, *as well as* Deipara; *yet those ancient Greeks which call'd the Virgin* Θεοτόκον, *did not call her* μητέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ. *But the Latines translating* Θεοτόκος Dei genitrix, *and the Greeks translating* Dei genitrix Θεοῦ μήτηρ, *they both at last call'd her plainly the* Mother of God. *The first which the Greeks observ'd to stile her so was* Leo the Great, *as was observed by* Ephraim Patriarch of Theopolis; *whose words have bin 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 us'd the word* Θεοτόκος. *A strange error this must needs appear in so great*

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 S. Cyril. His words are these in his Epistle ad Zenobium, Πρῶτος δὲ ὁσίων Λέων ἰδικῶς εἶπεν αὐταῖς λέξεσιν, ὡς μήτηρ Θεοῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἁγία Θεοτόκος, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πατέρων διαφυγόντων ῥήμασι μὴ τοῦτο φαμένων: That is, Leo was the first who in plain termes call'd the Θεοτόκος, that is Mary, the Mother of God, whereas the Fathers before him spake not the same in expresse words. Petavius and Aliatius have clearly mistaken the proposition, making the subject the predicate, and the predicate the subject, as if he had first call'd the mother of God Θεοτόκος, whereas he is said first to call the Θεοτόκος Mother of God, as appeare 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 Syncleticum, Ὅτι μητέρα Θεοῦ πρῶτον μὲν ἡ Ἐλισάβετ ἀνεῖπεν, ἐν οἷς λέγει· Καὶ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου ἔλθῃ πρὸς μέ; σαφέστερον δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν λέξιν προῆκε Λέων ὁ Πάπας περὶ αὐτῆς. Therefore as he took the Lord, and God to be Synonymous; so he thought Elizabeth first stiled Mary the mother of God, because she call'd her the mother of her Lord, and after Elizabeth Leo was the first who plainly stil'd her so, that is, the mother of God. And that we may be yet further assured of his mind, he produceth the words of Leo the Pope in his Epistle to Leo the Emperour: Ἀναθεματίζω Νεστόριον, ὃς τὴν μαιρείαν τῆς Θεοτόκου Μαρίας ἐκ τῆς Θεᾶς, ἀνθρώπου μόνον πιστεύων εἶναι μητέρα. The sentence which he translates is this; Anathematizetur ergo Nestorius, qui beatam Virginem Mariam non Dei, sed hominis tantummodo credidit genitricem. Epist. 97. c. 1. Where plainly genitrix Dei is translated μήτηρ Θεοῦ, and Θεοτόκος is added by Ephraim out of custome in the subject, being otherwise not at all in Leo's words. It is therefore certain that first in the Greek Church they term'd the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος, and the Latines from them, Dei genitrix, and mater Dei, and the Greeks from them again μήτηρ Θεοῦ, upon the authority of Leo, not taking notice of other Latines, who stiled her so before him.

The Necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be *born of 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, [a] *from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed*; but the obligation is ours, to call her, to esteem her so. If *Elizabeth* cried out *with so loud a voice, Blessed art thou among women*, when Christ was but newly conceiv'd in her

[a] *Luke* 1. 48. Non æquandæ est mulieribus cunctis, quæ genuit majestatem. *Author l. b. de singular. clericorum.*

her wombe; what expreſſions of honour and admiration can we think ſufficient now that Chriſt is in heaven, and that Mother with him? * Farre be it from any Chriſtian to derogate from that ſpeciall priviledge granted her, which is incommunicable to any other. 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 eſteem'd, let him be worſhip'd and ador'd.

* Abſit ut quiſquam S. Mariam divinæ gratiæ privilegiis, ut ſpeciali gloria fraudare conetur.

† Ἡ Μαρία ἐν τιμῇ, ὁ Κύριος προσκυνείσθω. Ἐν τιμῇ ἔστω Μαρία, ὁ δὲ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα προσκυνείσθω. Τὴν Μαρίαν μηδεὶς προσκυνείτω. *Epiph Hæreſ 79.* Ἐν καλλίστῃ ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἁγία, καὶ τετιμημένη, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι. *ib.*

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*, and therefore ſaved none of them, who, for want of a redeemer, are *reſerved in everlaſting chains under darkneſſe unto the judgement of the great day.* And man once fallen had bin, 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.* We could look for no Redeemer, but ſuch a one who by conſanguinity was our † Brother. And being there is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Chriſt Jeſus, we cannot be aſſured that he was the Chriſt, or is our Jeſus, except we be firſt aſſured that he was a man. Thus our Redeemer the man Chriſt Ieſus

Heb 2. 16.

Heb. 2. 14.

† *Under that notion did the Ancient Jews expect him, as appeareth by the Targum*, Cantic. 8. 1.

ונהי היאלי
ויפנא מחנלי
אוינא לחוא
עמנא לאוח.

מלכא משיחא לכנישתא דישראל ויימרון ליה בני ישראל *When the Meſsias ſhall reveal himſelf, the ſons of Iſrael ſhall ſay unto him, Thou ſhalt be unto us a Brother,*

was

was born of a woman, that he might * redeem both men and women; that both sexes might rely upon him, who was of the one, and from the other.

* Hominis liberatio in utroque sexu deoui: apparere. Ergo, quia erat ut fœminei virum oportebat suscipere, qui sexus honoratil or est, conveniens sexus liberatio hinc appareret, quod ille vir de fœmina natus est. *S. Aug. Quæst. l* 83. Nolite vosipsos contemnere, viri, filius Dei virum suscepit: nolite vos ipsas contemnere, fœminæ, filius Dei natus ex fœmina est. *Idem de Agone Christi.*

Secondly, it was necessary we should believe our Saviour conceiv'd 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 as necessary, that he should be *without sin.* Our passeover is slain, and behold the lamb that taketh away the sinnes of the world; but the lambe of the passeover must be without blemish. Whereas then we draw something of corruption and contamination by our seminall traduction from the first *Adam*; our Saviour hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination, because born of a Virgin without any seminall traduction. Our high Priest is *separate from sinners* not onely in the actions of his life, but in the production of his nature. For as † *Levi* was in the loins of *Abraham*, and paid tithes in him, and yet Christ, though the son of *Abraham*, did not pay tithes in him, but receive them in *Melchizedec*: so though we being in the loins of *Adam* may

Heb. 4 15.

Non eum in peccatis mater ejus in utero aluit, quem Virgo concepit, Virgo peperit. *S. Aug. Tract.* 4. *in Ioh.* Ergo ecce Agnus Dei. Non habet iste traducem de Adam, carnem tantum sumpsit de Adam, peccatum non assumpsit. *Ibid.* Verbum caro factum in similitudine carnis peccati omnia nostra suscepit, nullum reatus vitium ferens ex traduce prævaricationis exortum. *Joan.* 4. *Epist. ad Constantinum.*

† Levi in lumbis Abrahæ fuit secundum concupiscentiam carnalem, Christus autem secundum solam substantiam corporalem. Cum enim sit in semine & visibilis corpulentia, & invisibilis ratio, utramq; cucurrit ex Abraham vel etiam ex ipso Adam usq; ad corpus Mariæ, quia & ipsum eo modo conceptum & exortum est; Christus autem visibilem carnis substantiam de carne Virginis sumpsit, ratio vero conceptionis ejus non à semine virili, sed longe aliter ac desuper venit. *S. August. de Gen. ad lit. l.* 10. *c.* 19.

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 seminall virtue of his parent, is some way under his naturall power, and therefore may be in some manner concerned in his actions; but he who is onely from him by his naturall substance, according to a passive or obedientiall 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.

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 *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 Judea*, because that was *the city of David*, whether *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, cryed 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, *Hosanna to the son of David*. And when the blind

Luke 1. 32.

Matt. 22. 42.

Mat. 2. 5.

Luke 2. 4.

Mat, 9. 27, 15. 22. 20, 30.

Mat. 21. 15.

blind and dumb both ſpake and ſaw, *all the people were amazed, and ſaid, Is not this the ſon of David?* Thus by the publick 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 loynes 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. Mat. 21. 23. Act. 2. 30. Rom. 1. 3.

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 profeſſe, and being enformed fully expreſſe what is the object of his Faith in this particular, when he ſaith, I believe in Ieſus 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 continuing in the ſame Virginity, did by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghoſt conceive within her womb the onely-begotten Son of God, and after the naturall 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 originall 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

profeſſe

profeſſe to believe in Ieſus Chriſt, *born of the Virgin Mary.*

ARTICLE IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.

THis Article hath alſo received ſome acceſſion in the particular expreſſions of Chriſt's humiliation. For the firſt word of it, now generally ſpeaking his paſſion, in the moſt ancient Creeds was no way diſtinguiſh'd from his crucifixion; for as we ſay *ſuffer'd and crucified*, they onely † *Crucified under Pontius Pilate*: nor was his crucifixion diſtinguiſhed from his death, but where we read *crucified, dead, and buried*, they onely *crucified and buried*. Becauſe the chief of his ſufferings were on the Croſs, and he gave up the ghoſt there; therefore his whole paſſion and his death were comprehended in his crucifixion.

† Crucifixus ſub Pontio Pilato, & ſepultus. *Ruffin. in Symb. Caſſianus de incarn. Domini.* Credimus in eum qui ſub Pontio Pilato crucifixus eſt & ſepultus. *S. Auguſt. de Fide & Symb. & de Trinitat.* l. 1, c. 14. Qui ſub Pontio Pilato crucifixus eſt & ſepultus. *Max. Taurin. Chryſol. Euſeb. Gallic.* Τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα, ταφέντα, Qui ſub Pontio Pilato crucifixus eſt & ſepultus, *MSS. Armach. And beſide theſe a witneſs without exception*, Leo *the Great*, Unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum & ſepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur. *Epiſt.* 10. *cap.* 5. *Afterwards the Paſſion was expreſs'd:* Paſſus ſub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus & ſepultus, *Ethcrius Uxam. And the Death:* Paſſus ſub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, & ſepultus. *Author. lib. de Symb. ad catechum. Not but both theſe were expreſs'd before in the Rule of Faith by* Tertullian, *but without particular mention of the crucifixion.* Adv. Prax. *c.* 2. hunc paſſum, hunc mortuum, & ſepultum. *And generally the Ancients did underſtand determinately his crucifying by that more comprehenſive name of his ſuffering. For as* Marcellus *and S.* Cyril *have* σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, Euſebius *and the* Nicene *Council to the ſame purpoſe have* παθόντα *only in their Creeds. Which was further enlarged afterwards by the Council of* Conſtantinople *into* σταυρωθέντα, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα.

But again, being he ſuffered not onely on the Croſſe, being it was poſſible he might have bin affixed to that curſed

curſed tree, and yet not have dyed; therefore the Church thought fit to adde the reſt of his ſufferings, as antecedent, and his death, as conſequent, to his crucifixion.

To begin then with his Paſſion in generall. In thoſe words, he *ſuffered under Pontius Pilate*, we are to conſider part as Subſtantiall, part as Circumſtantiall. The ſubſtance of this part of the Article conſiſteth in our Saviours Paſſion, *He ſuffered*: the circumſtance of time is added, declared by the preſent Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*.

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 then that we ſhew, *Who* it was which ſuffered, *How* he ſuffered, *VVhat* it was he ſuffered.

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 onely-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 Ieſus ſuffer'd, we ſhould declare he was not Chriſt. Secondly, we muſt ſhew that Ieſus, whom we believe to be the *Meſſias*, did really and truely ſuffer: for if he did not, then while we prov'd the true *Meſſias* was to ſuffer, we ſhould conclude he was not that *Meſſias*. Thirdly, it will be further advantageous for the illuſtration of this truth, to manifeſt that the ſufferings of the *Meſſias* were determin'd and foretold, as thoſe by which he ſhould be known. And fourthly, it will then be neceſſary to ſhew that our Ieſus did truely ſuffer whatſoever was ſo determin'd and foretold. And more then this cannot be neceſſary, to declare *VVho* it was which ſuffered, in relation to his Office.

For the first of these, that the promised *Messias* was to *suffer*, to all Christians it is evident; because our Saviour did constantly instruct the Apostles in this truth, both before his death, that they might expect it, and after, that they might be confirmed by it. And one part of the Doctrine which S. *Paul* disseminated through the world was this, *that the Christ must needs have suffered.*

Marc. 9. 12. *Luc.* 24. 26, 46. *Act.* 17. 11.

But because these Testimonies will satisfy onely such as already believe, and our Saviour himself did referre the disbelieving Jews to the Law and the Prophets, as those who testified of him, we will shew 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.*

Mar. 9. 12.

The fifty third Chapter of *Esay* 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 *Messias*, as we have † formerly prov'd by the confession of the most ancient Jews, and may further be evidenced both from them, and from the place it self. For surely no mans *soul* can be made

† P. 171, 172. *We shew'd 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 controversie between us and the Jews, it will not seem unnecessary to prove the same truth by further Testimonies. In the Talmud, Cod. Sanhedrin, to the question, what is the name of the* Messiah? *it is answer'd,* חיוורא *the Leper. And the reason of the name is there rendred,* שנאמר, *because it is spoken in this* Esay 53. 4. *Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, i.e.* נגוע, *and because* הנגע *is used of the Leprosy* Levitic. 13. 13. *therefore from* נגוע *they concluded his name to be a Leper, and consequently did interpret that place of the* Messias. *In the Pesikta it is written,* הוציא ה׳ בה נשמרת המשיח *God produced the soul of the* Messias, *& said unto him, Wilt thou redeem my sons after* 6000 *years? He answered, I will. Wilt thou bear the chastisements to take away their sins?* הדוא דכתיב אכן חליינו הוא נשא *as it is written* Isa. 53, 4. *Surely he hath born our griefs. And he answered, I will bear them with joy. Which is a clear testimony, considering the Opinion of the Jews, that all souls of men were created in the beginning, & so the soul of the* Messias *to suffer for the rest.*

made an offering for our *ſinnes*, but our Saviour's: nor hath God *laid on* any man the *iniquity of us all*, but on our Redeemer. *Upon* no perſon but the *Meſsias* could *the chaſtiſement of our peace* be, nor *with* any *ſtripes* could *we* be *heal'd* but his. It is ſufficiently then demonſtrated by the Prophet, that the ſuffering Perſon whom he deſcribes, was to be the Chriſt, in that he *bare our griefs*, and *carried our ſorrowes*.

This prediction is ſo clear, ever ſince the *Serpent* was to *bruiſe the heel* of the woman's *ſeed*, that the Iews, who were reſolved to expect a *Meſsias* which ſhould be onely glorious, have bin forc'd 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 ſeverall perſons promiſed under the name of the *Meſsias*: one of the Tribe of *Ephraim*, the other of the Tribe of *Iudah*; one the *ſon of Ioſeph*, the other the *ſon of David*; the one to precede, fight, and ſuffer death, the other to follow, conquer, triumph, reign, and ne're

† *So indeed the Iews expect a double* Meſſias, *one* משיח בן יוסף Meſſias *the ſon of Ioſeph, the other* משיח בן דוד Meſſias *the ſon of* David. *So the Targum expreſſly upon the* Canticles 4. 5. תרין פריקיך דעתידין למפרקיך משיח בר דוד ומשיח בר אפרים, *Two are thy Deliverers which ſhall deliver thee,* Meſſias *the ſon of* David, *and* Meſſias *the ſon of* Ephraim: *and in the ſame manner, Chapter* 7. 3. *This that Paraphraſt, nothing ſo ancient as the reſt, is conceived to have taken out of the Talmud in* Maſſecheth Succa: *where cap.* 5. *inſcrib'd* החליל *God ſaith to* Meſſias *the ſon of* David, שאל מה אחזה מבקש *Aſk what thou wilt, (according to the ſecond Pſalm) and I will give it thee.* כיון שרואה למשיח בן יוסף שנהרג, *who ſeeing* Meſſias *the ſon of* Ioſeph *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* Ioſeph. *As* Solomon Iarchi *Iſa.* 24. 18. *Zach.* 12. 10. Ezra *Zach.* 9. 9. *Malach.* 3. 1. Kimki *Zach.* 12. 10. *whom the later Iews conſtantly follow. And this* Marcion *the Heretick ſeem's to have learn'd of the Iews, and to have taught with ſome alteration in favour of his own opinion.* Conſtituit Marcion alium eſſe Chriſtum, qui Tiberianis temporibus à Deo quondam ignoto revelatus ſit in ſalutem omnium gentium; alium, qui à Deo Creatore in reſtitutionem Iudaici ſtatus ſit deſtinatus, quandoque venturus. *Tertul. adv. Marcio.* lib. 4. cap. 6.

ne're to dye. If then our Saviour were a Christ, we must confesse 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 dye: or if he ever died, he was not that *Messias* which was promised to sit upon the Throne of *David*. And while we confesse our Saviour dyed, and withall assert his descent from the house of *David*, we do, in their opinion, involve our selves in a Contradiction.

But this Distinction of a double *Messias* is far from prevailing over our belief: first, because it is in it self false, and therefore of no validity against us; secondly, because it was first invented to counterfeit the truth, and so very advantageous to us.

That it is in it self false, will appear, because the Scriptures never mention any *Messias* of the Tribe of *Ephraim*; neither was there ever any promise of that nature made to any of the sons or offspring of *Ioseph*. Beside, as we acknowlede 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 stile of the ancient Jews before our Saviour was, not they, but he ὁ ἐρχόμενος. *which is to come*. The question which was ask't him, when he profess'd himself to be the 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

Zach. 9. 9.
Isai. 9. 6.

be

be the ſon of *David*, whom *Elias* was to precede; being by the tenure of the Scriptures there was never promiſe made of more Chriſts then one, and never the leaſt mention of the Tribe of *Ephraim* with any ſuch relation; it followeth that that diſtinction is in it ſelf falſe.

Again, that the ſame Diſtinction, fram'd and contriv'd againſt us, muſt needs be in any indifferent perſons judgement advantageous to us, will appear, becauſe the very invention of a double perſon, is a plain confeſſion of a two-fold condition, and the different relations, which they prove not, are a convincing argument for the diſtinct œconomies, which they deny not. Why ſhould they pretend to expect one to dye, and another to triumph, but that the true *Meſsias* was both to triumph and to dye, to be humbled and to be exalted, to put on the raggs of our infirmity before the robe of majeſty and immortality? Why ſhould they tell us of one Mediator to be conquer'd, and the other victorious, but that the ſerpent was to bruiſe the heel 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 promiſed *Meſsias* was to ſuffer.

Secondly, that Ieſus, whom we believe to be the Chriſt, did *ſuffer*, we ſhall not need to prove, becauſe it is freely confeſſed by all his enemies. The Gentiles acknowledged it; the Iews triumphed at it. And we may well take that for granted, which is ſo farre from being 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, Ieſus ſuffered. If the infirmities of our nature, if the weight of our ſinnes, 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 Iews be testimonies, Iesus suffered. Nor was there ever any which thought he did not really and truely suffer, but † such as withall irrationally pretended he was not really and truely man.

† *Those which were called by the Greeks* Δοκηται, *and* Φαντασιαςαὶ. *who taught that Christ was man onely* putative, *and came into the world only in* phantasmate, *and consequently that he did onely* putative pati. *These were called* Δοκηται, *not from their Author, but from their opinion, that Christ did all things onely* ἐν δοκήσει, *in appearance, not reality. As* Clemens Alexandrinus, Τῶν αἱρέσεων αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ δογμάτων ἰδιαζόντων προσαγορεύονται, ὡς ἡ τῶν Δοκητῶν. *Strom. l. 7.* viz. οἱ δοκήσει Χριςὸν πεπονθέναι ὑπολαβόντες. *Id. l. 6.* Neque in Phantasia, id est, absque carne, sicut Valentinus asserit, neque de thesi, id est, putative imaginatum, sed verum corpus. *Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm. c. 2. Where, for* de thesi, *I suppose we should read* δοκήσει. *The Originall of this train of Heretickes is to be fetch'd from* Simon Magus, *whose assertion was,* Christum nec venisse, nec à Iudæis quicquam pertulisse. *S. Aug. de Hæres. Wherefore making himself the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he affirmed,* se in Filii persona putative apparuisse, *and so that he suffered as the Son amongst the Iewes* ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πεπονθέναι, ἀλλὰ δοκήσει μόνον. Damasc. *de Hæres. Now what* Simon Magus *said of himself, when he made himself the Son, that those who followed affirm'd of Christ. As* Saturninus, *who taught* Christum in substantia non fuisse, & phantasmate tantum quasi passum fuisse. *Tertul. de Præsc. adv. Hæret. c. 46.* vide *Epiph.* mutilum, *Hær. 23. c. 1. And* Basilides, *who deliver'd,* εἶναι τὸν Χριςὸν φαντασίαν ἐν τῷ φαίνεσθαι, μὴ εἶναι δὲ ἄνθρωπον, μηδὲ σάρκα εἰληφέναι.... ἀλλὰ Ἰησοῦν φάσκον πεπονθέναι, ἀλλὰ Σίμωνα τὸν Κυρηναῖον. *Epiph. Hær. 24. c. 3.* A Iudæis non credunt Christum crucifixum, sed Simonem Cyrenensem, qui angariatus sustulit crucem ejus. *S. Aug. Hær. 4. Thus the* Valentinians *particularly* Marcus, *the Father of the* Marcosian *Heretickes.* Marcus etiam nescio quis hæresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, & Christum non vere sed putative passum asseverans. *S. Aug. Hær. 14. Thus* Cerdon, Christum in substantia carnis negat, in phantasmate solo fuisse pronuntiat, nec omnino passum, sed quasi passum. *Tert. Præsc. c. 51.* Christum ipsum natum ex fœmina, neque habuisse carnem, nec vere mortuum vel quicquam passum, sed simulasse passionem. *S. Aug. Hær. 21. And the* Manichees, *who taught* Christum non fuisse in carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus præbuisse; ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem mentiretur. *Idem Hær. 46. whom therefore* Vincentius Lirinensis *calls* Phantasiæ prædicatores. *cap. 20.*

Thirdly, to come yet nearer to the particular acknowledgment of this truth, we shall further shew that the promised *Messias* was not onely engaged to suffer for us, but

but by a certain and expreſſe agreement between him and the Father, the meaſure and manner of his ſufferings were determin'd, in order to the Redemption it ſelf 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 acceptation 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 acknowledgement of the Church unto the Father; *Of a truth, againſt thy holy child Ieſus, 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 counſell determined before to be done.* Acts 4. 28. 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 dye: ſo the *hand* of God is ſaid to have *determin'd* 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 *counſell determin'd* his paſſion, becauſe he was *deliver'd by the determinate counſell and foreknowledge of God.* Lev. 16. 8. Act. 2. 23.

And this determination of Gods counſell 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 bloud of Chriſt, we muſt conſider and acknowledge another Covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son: which partly is expreſs'd by the Prophet, *If he ſhall make his ſoul an offering for ſin, he ſhall ſee his ſeed, he ſhall prolong his dayes*; partly by the Apoſtle, *Then* Iſ. 53. 10.

ſaid

Heb. 10. 7. *ſaid I, loe I come, (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.* In the condition of *making his ſoul an offering for ſin* we ſee propounded whatſoever he ſuffered; in the acceptation, *loe 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 ſuffer'd.

And as the ſufferings of the *Meſsias* were thus agreed on by conſent, and determin'd 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 propheſyes ſpoken by God in the mouthes of men, they clearly relate unto his ſufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the ceremoniall performances, they exhibite the ſame by an active repreſentation. S. *Paul's* Apology was clear, that he *ſaid* Act. 26. 22. *none other things then thoſe which the Prophets and Moſes did ſay ſhould come; that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer.* The Prophets *ſaid* in expreſſe termes that the *Meſsias*, whom they foretold, ſhould ſuffer: Moſes *ſaid* ſo in thoſe ceremonies which were inſtituted by his miniſtry. When he cauſed the Paſſeover to be ſlain, he *ſaid* that *Shiloh* was the lambe ſlain before the foundations of the world. When he ſet the braſen Serpent up in the wilderneſſe, he *ſaid* the Son of man ſhould be lifted up upon the Croſſe. When he commanded all the ſacrifices for ſin, he *ſaid*, without effuſion of bloud there was no remiſſion, and therefore the Son of God muſt dye for the ſinnes 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 throughthe vail into the higheſt heavens to make expiation for us, but by his own bloud. If then we look upon the fountain, the eternall counſell of the will of God, if we look upon the revelation of that counſell, either in expreſſe predictions

or

or ceremoniall repreſentations, we ſhall clearly ſee the truth of our third Aſſertion, that the ſufferings of the promiſed *Meſſias* were predetermined and foretold.

Now all theſe ſufferings which were thus agree'd, determin'd, and revealed as belonging to the true *Meſſias*, were undergone by that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* whom we believe to be the Chriſt. Never was there any ſuffering type which he out-went not, never prediction of any paſſion which he fulfill'd not, never any expreſſion of grief and ſorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approach'd, 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.* Luke 18. 31.

When he delivered them the bleſſed Sacrament, the commemoration of his death, he ſaid, *Truely the Son of man goeth as it was determin'd.* After his reſurrection, he chaſtiſed the dulneſſe 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 ſuffer'd theſe things, and to enter into his glory?* After his aſcenſion, S. *Peter* made this profeſſion before the Jews, who had thoſe prophecies, and ſaw his ſufferings; *Thoſe things which God before had ſhew'd by the mouth of all his Prophets that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, he hath ſo fulfill'd.* Whatſoever therefore was determined by the counſell 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 expreſſe our Saviour's *Paſſion* in relation to his Office.

Luk. 22. 22. κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον.

Luk. 24. 25, 26.

Act. 3. 18.

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 deſcrib'd; we muſt look back upon the former, till we find his de-

ſcription and his name. The Article immediately preding leaves us in the ſame ſuſpenſion; but for our ſatisfaction referrs us to the former, where we find him named *Jeſus*, and deſcribed *the onely-begotten Son* of God.

Now this Son of God we have already ſhew'd to be therefore truely call'd the *Onely-begotten*, becauſe he was from all eternity generated of the eſſence of the Father, and therefore is, as the eternall Son, ſo alſo the eternall God. Wherefore by the † immediate coherence of the Articles, and neceſſary conſequence of the Creed, it plainly appeareth that the eternall Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, *ſuffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucifyed, dead, and buried.* For it was no other perſon which *ſuffered under Pontius Pilate*, then he which was *born of the Virgin Mary*; he which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, was no other perſon then he which *was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt*; he which was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, was no other perſon then *our Lord*; and that our Lord, no other then the *onely Son* of God: therefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles it followeth, that *the onely 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 fulneſſe of time being made fleſh did ſuffer. For the *Princes of this world crucifyed the Lord of glory*; and *God purchaſed his Church with his own bloud.* That Perſon which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and ſo was really the *Lord of glory*, and moſt truely *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 fourty dayes, there was no other perſon hungry, then that Son of God which made the world; when he ſate 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 ſcourg'd, there was no other perſon ſenſible of

† *This is that* inſeparabilis connexio *in the Creed, which* Caſſianus *urgeth ſo much againſt* Neſtorius, *de Incarn. l. 6.*

2 *Cor.* 2. 8. *Act.* 20. 28. Dominum paſſum Symboli tenet authoritas, & Apoſtolus tradidit, dicens, Si enim cognoviſſent, nunquam Dominum gloriæ crucifixiſſent. *Vigil. adv. Eutyc. l.* 2.

of those pains, then that eternall Word which before all worlds was impassible; when he was crucified and dyed, there was no other person which gave up the Ghost, but the Son of him, and so of the same nature with him, *who onely 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.

But the perfect probation and illustration of this truth 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 eternall happinesse, never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore while we professe 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 bin the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffer'd. 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 humane. 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.

† Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, ἵνα καὶ ὁ λόγος ἀνθρωπος ᾖ καὶ σὰρξ καὶ ψυχὴ ὁ λογος ὢν ᾖ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ θνητὸν ἀνενέγκηται, ὃν μορφὴν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην μετὰ τοῦ ἰδίου καὶ ὁμοίους.

Whereas then the humanity of Christ consisteth of a soul and body, these were the proper subject of his passion; nor could he suffer any thing 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 S. *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

S. Athan. de Incarn.

* 1 Pet. 4. 1.

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 quickned in the Spirit*; ſuffered in the weakneſſe 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 S. *Paul*; ſo was he *put to death in the fleſh*, in the language of S. *Peter*: and as he was *declared to be the ſon of God with power, according to the ſpirit of holyneſſe*; ſo was he *quickned 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.

1 Pet. 3. 18.

Adeo ſalva eſt utriuſque proprietas ſubſtantiæ: ut & Spiritus res ſuas egerit in illo, id eſt, virtutes & opera & ſigna; & caro paſſiones ſuas functa ſit, eſuriens ſub Diabolo, ſitiens ſub Samaritide, flens Lazarum, anxia uſque ad mortem, denique & mortua eſt. *Tertul. adverſ. Prax. c.* 27.

Farre be it therefore from us to think that the Deity, which is immutable, could ſuffer; which onely hath immortality, could dye. The conjunction with humanity could put no imperfection upon the divinity: nor can that † infinite nature by any externall acquiſition be any way changed in it's intrinſecall and eſſentiall perfections. *If the bright rayes of the Sun are thought to inſinuate into the moſt noyſome bodies without any pollution of themſelves, how can that ſpirituall eſſence contract the leaſt infirmity 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 groundleſſe 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

† Τὸ γὰρ φύσει ἀφθαρτον, καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, καὶ ἀεὶ τοιοῦτον ὄντι ὑπὸ σώματος ἐπιμένον τῇ παθητῇ φύσει, ὅταν ὦν ἐκείνῃ κατ' οἰκονομίαν γένηται. *Greg. Nyſſen. Epiſt.*

* Ὡς οὖν ἁλιαχοῦ φησὶς πάθοι τι ἐκ τῶν τὰ πάντα πληροῦσαι, καὶ σωμάτων νεκρῶν καὶ καθαρῶν ἁπτόμενα, πολὺ μᾶλλον ἂν ἀσώματος καὶ θεοῦ δυνάμις κατ' ἀνθρώπου τὴν ὑπαν, ὃς ἂν βλαβείη σώματος ἀσωμάτως ἐπαφωμένη, *Euſeb. Demonſt. Evang. l.* 4 *c.* 13. ‖ *This danger is the rather to be unfolded, becauſe it is not generally underſtood. The Hereſy of* Arius *as it was*

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 deliver'd. This Phœbadius, *the firſt of the Latine 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, quæ ad Orientem & Occidentem tranſmiſſa eſt, qua aſſerit carne & Spiritu Chriſti coagulatis per ſanguinem Mariæ, & in unum corpus redactis, paſſibilem Deum factum. Hoc ideo ne quis illum ex eo crederet, quem impaſſibilem ſatis conſtat. *Lib. adv. Arianos, c. 7. And again:* Non ergo ſit ſpiritus caro, nec caro ſpiritus, quod iſti volunt egregii Doctores, ut factus ſit ſcilicet Dominus & Deus noſter ex hac ſubſtantiarum permixtione paſſibilis. Ideo autem paſſibilem volunt dici, ne ex impaſſibili credatur. *cap. 8.* Μάτην δὲ ὠν Ἀρειανοὶ φαντάζονται, σάρκα μόνην ὑποτιθέμενοι ἀνειληφέναι τὸν Σωτῆρα, τὴν δὲ τῶ πάθους γένοσιν διὰ τὴν ἀπαθῆ θεότητα ἀναφέρουσες ἀζιόπιστοι. *S. Athan.* lib. de Incarn. *Of this* S. Hilary *is to be underſtood.* Sed eorum omnis hic ſenſus, ut opinentur metum mortis in Dei Filium incidiſſe, qui aſſerunt non de æternitate prolatum, neque de infinitate paternæ ſubſtantiæ extitiſſe, ſed ex nullo illum qui omnia creavit effectum, ut aſſumptus ex nihilo ſit, & coptus ex opere, & confirmatus ex tempore. Et ideo in eo doloris anxietas, ideo ſpiritus paſſio cum corporis paſſione. *Can. 31. in Mat. Where clearly he argues againſt the Arians. The right underſtanding whereof is the onely true way to reconcile thoſe harſh ſayings of his which ſo troubled the Maſter of the Sentences, and the whole Schools ever ſince.*

and Apollinarian Hereticks, whom the Church hath long ſince ſilenc'd by a ſound and ſober aſſertion, that all the ſufferings of our Mediatour were ſubjected in his humane nature.

And now the onely 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 profeſſe the Godhead ſuffered not. But this ſeeming difficulty will admit an eaſy ſolution, if we conſider the intimate conjunction of the divine and humane nature, and their union in the perſon of the Son. For † hereby thoſe attributes which properly belong unto the one, are given to

† Per indiſſolubilem unitatem Verbi & carnis, omnia quæ carnis ſunt aſcribuntur & Verbo, quomodo & quæ Verbi ſunt prædicantur in carne. *Origen in Ep. ad Rom.* Διὰ τὴν ἀκριβῆ ἕνοτητα τῆς τε προσληφθείσης σαρκὸς καὶ τῆς προσλαβομένης θεότητος, ἀντιμεθίσται τὰ ὀνόματα· ὅτε καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τῶ θείω, καὶ τὸ θεῖον τῶ ἀνθρωπίνω καλονομάζεται. Greg. Nyſſ. *Epiſt. ad Theoph.* Χρὴ μέντοι εἰδέναι ὡς ἡ ἕνωσις κοινὰ ποιεῖ τὰ ὀνόματα. Theodor. *Dial.* 3.

to the other; and that upon good reaſon. For being the ſame individuall perſon is by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truely 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 humane 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 vertue 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 eſſentiall attributes of the divine nature may truely be ſpoken of that man; otherwiſe there would be one truely 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 truely 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 humane nature may be alſo attributed to the eternall 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 truely man, and as man truely paſſible, and mortall; ſo God the Son did truely ſuffer, and did truely dye. And this is the onely true † communication of properties.

† *Called by the Schools ordinarily* Communicatio idiomatum, *by the ancient Greek Divines* Ἀντίδοσις, *and ſometimes* Ἀντιμετάθεσις.

Not that the eſſentiall properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the Divinity of Chriſt were paſſible and mortall, or his humanity of originall omnipotence, and omnipreſence; but becauſe the ſame God the Son, was alſo the Son of man, he was at the ſame time both mortall and eternall: mortall as the ſon of man, in reſpect of his humanity; eternall as the Son of God,

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 humane nature was conjoyned to the divine, yet it ſuffered as much as if it had been alone; and the divine as little ſuffer'd as if it had not been conjoyn'd: 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: for God the Son being not onely God, but alſo man, ſuffered, though not in his Deity, by reaſon of which he is truely God, yet in his humanity, by which he who is truely God is as truely 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 cloathed with our infirmities.

Our next enquiry is, What this God the Son did ſuffer as the Son of man; not in the latitude of all his ſufferings, but ſo farre 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 Governour of *Judea* long before our Saviour's baptiſme; 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 Goſpell, 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 ſhew'd his paſsion was wholly ſubjected in his humane 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.

For

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 reall body, ſo as to become fleſh of our fleſh, bone of our bone. This body of Chriſt really and truely humane, was alſo frail and mortall, as being accompanied with all thoſe naturall properties which neceſſarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortall body: and though now the ſame body exalted above the higheſt heavens, by vertue of it's glorification be put beyond all poſsibility of paſsion, yet in the time of his humiliation it was cloath'd with no ſuch glorious perfection; but as it was ſubject unto, ſo it felt wearineſs, hunger, and thirſt. Nor was it onely liable to thoſe internall weakneſſes and naturall infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impreſsions. As all our corporall pain conſiſts in that ſenſe which ariſeth from the ſolution of that continuity which is connaturall to the parts of our body; ſo no parts of his ſacred body were injuriouſly violated by any outward impreſsion, but he was truely and fully ſenſible of the pain ariſing from that violation. Deep was that ſenſe, and grievous was that pain, which thoſe ſcourges produc'd, *when the plowers plowed upon his back, and made long their furrows*: the dilaceration of thoſe nervous parts created a moſt ſharp and dolorous ſenſation. The coronary thorns did not onely expreſſe the ſcorn of the impoſers, by that figure into which they were contriv'd; 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 open'd his ſide, though it brought forth water and bloud, cauſed no dolorous ſenſation, becauſe the body was then dead: but the nails which pierc'd 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 truely *ſuffer* the bitterneſſe of corporall pains and torments inflicted by violent externall impreſsions.

And

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 animall passion. Evil apprehended to come tormented his soul with fear, which was as truely 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 sadnesse, sorrow and anguish of mind. So that he was truely 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 sorrowfull even unto death.*

Qui susceþit animam, susceþit animæ passionem. *S. Ambros. de Fide. l. 2. c. 3.*

Isa. 53. 3.

Mat. 26. 38.

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 suffer'd; how bitter that grief, how great that sorrow and that 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 express'd his Agony, as cannot but raise in us the highest admiration of the bitternesse of that passion. *He began to be sorrowfull*, saith S. *Matthew*; *He began to be sore amazed*, saith S. *Mark*; *and to be very heavy*, say both: and yet these words in our Translation come far short of the † Originall

Mat. 26.

Mar. 14.

† *The words in the Originall are three,* λυπητὸς, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, *and* ἀδημονεῖν. Λυπητὸς, *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* signifi-

significancy, as appears by the words which follow, περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου. For as the ancient Grammarians observe, ἡ περὶ πρόθεσις σύνθετα ποιεῖ σημαίνειν, and again, ἡ περὶ περίθεσις λαμβάνεται ἀντὶ τῆς ὑπὲρ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν λόγον ἐκθέσεως καὶ ἐξιστάσεως· and therefore περίλυπος of it self must signify a man possessed with an excessive grief. But beside this Greek notation, here is to be observed a reference to the words of David Psal. 42. 5. Ἵνα τί περίλυπος εἶ ἡ ψυχή μου; מה־תשתוחחי. So that it doth not one'y signify an excesse 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 expresse that sorrow, yet the following part of our Saviours words would sufficiently evidence it, ἕως θανάτου, it was a sorrow, which like the pangs of death compassed him, and like the pains of hell gate hold upon him, Psal. 116. 3. The second word, used by S. Mark alone, is ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι. Which with the Vulgar Latine is Pavere, but in the language of the Greeks bearers a higher sense. Θάμβος σημαίνει τὴν ἔκπληξιν, sayes Etymologus: and Hesychius, Θάμβος, θῦμα, ἔκπληξις: Gloss. Vet. Θάμβος stupor: Philoponus preserved by Eustathius Il. μ'. Θάμβος μὲν ἡ ἔκπληξις· θαμβεῖ δὲ κατ' ὀξυβαρίαν ὁ ἐκπλαγείς. From hence the Verb θαμβεῖν, in termination active, in signification passive, perculsum esse, in Homer, Θάμβησεν δ' Ἀχιλεύς-- where it is the observation of Eustathius, Τὸ ἐθάμβησεν ἐνεργητικὸν ἡ νεωτέρα χρῆσις οὐκ ἔχει· θαμβέομαι γάρ, καὶ ἐθαμβήθη, καὶ τεθάμβημαι φασὶν οἱ μὲν Ὅμηρον: 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. Sam. 14, 15. ותרגז הארץ, καὶ ἐθάμβησεν ἡ γῆ, and the earth quaked. And Psal. 47. 5. חמהו, Aquila, ἐθαμβήθη, Symmachus, ἐξεπλάγη: as Psal. 31. 22. Ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου, Aquila, θαμβήσει, Symmach. ἐκπλήξει. The like is also in the passive termination: as Daniel expresses his fear in a Vision ἐθαμβήθην, καὶ πτῶμα ἔπεσε πρόσωπόν μου Dan. 8. 17. and the wicked are described by the wise man θαμβούμενοι ἀνωφελῶς, καὶ ἐν ἀδήλοις στενάζοντες, Sap. 17. 3. From whence it appeareth that θαμβεῖσθαι of it self signifieth a high degree of fear, horror, and amazement. Gloss. Vet. Θαμβοῦμαι, Obstupeo, stupeo, paveſco. And by the addition of the preposition ἐκ the signification is augmented, Ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, ἔκπληκτος. Hesych. passively; Θεῖον φοβεῖσθαι καὶ ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, Dan. 7. 7. actively, i.e. ἐκπληκτικόν. Such an augmentation in this word is justifiable by that rule left us in Eustathius ad Iliad. ε'. ἡ ἐκ περίθεσις οὐ μόνον τὸν ἔξω δηλοῖ χῶρον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὕψωμα πολλάκις σημαίνει. Of which he gives an example in ὀκνομίας, used by Aristophanes in Plut. though not nam'd by him. And again, ad Iliad. ν'. ἡ ἐκ περίθεσις ἐπίτασιν δηλοῖ, ὁποίαν καὶ τὸ μάλιστα. Ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι therefore is μάλιστα θαμβεῖσθαι, to be surprized with horror in the highest degree, even unto stupefaction. Gloss. Vet. Ἐκθαμβοῦμαι, obstupesco. The third word is Ἀδημονεῖν, Vulg. Lat. Tædere in S. Mark, mœstus esse in S. Matthew: but is hath yet a further ſenſe. Ἀδημονῶ, ἀκηδιῶ, ἀγωνιῶ, sayes Hesychius. Ἀδημονῶ, τὸ λίαν λυποῦμαι, Suidas. It signifieth therefore grief and anguish in excesse, as appeareth also by the origination of it. For, as Eustathius observes, τῷ ἀδημονεῖν πρωτότυπον ἀδήμων ἀδήμονος ὁ ἐκ λύπης ὡς οἷα καὶ τινος κόπου, ὃς δὴ λέγεται,

also

ἀναπτερωκὼς. Iliad. λ'. *From* ἀδῶ ἀδήσω ἀδήμων, *from* ἀδήμων ἀδημονῶ. *It hath therefore in it the signification of* ἄδην *or* λίαν, *satiety or extremity. From whence it is ordinarily so expounded, as if it contained the consequence of the greatest fear or sorrow, that is anxiety of mind, disquietude and restlessenesse.* Ἀδημονῶν, ἀλύων καὶ ἀπορῶν, ἀμηχανῶν, Etymol. *As* Anthony *is expres'd by* Plutarch, *after the losse of* 8000. *men, being in want of all things necessary for the rest,* Καταπάσχων περιῆμενε, καὶ βεβαιώσης ἀδημονῶν ἦλυε. *So where the Heb.* נוּגָה *is, by the* LXX. *translated* ἐκπλαγῆς, *by* Symmachus *it is rendred* ἀδημονῆς, *Eccl.* 7. 17.

nall expreſſion. Which render him ſuddenly upon a preſent and immediate apprehenſion, poſſeſſed with fear, horror, and amazement; encompaſſed with grief, and overwhelmed with ſorrow, preſs'd down with conſternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and diſquietude of ſpirit.

This he firſt expreſs'd to his Diſciples, ſaying, *My ſoul is exceeding ſorrowfull*: and leſt they ſhould not fully apprehend the exceſſe, adding, *even unto death*; as if the pangs of death had already encompaſs'd him, and, as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks, the pains of hell had got hold upon him. He went but *a little further* before he expreſs'd 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.* Nor were his cryes 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 bloud falling down to the ground.* As the Pſalmiſt had before declar'd; *I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joynt. My heart is like wax, it is melted in the midſt of my bowells.* 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 inflam'd with anguiſh and agony: well then might that melting produce a ſweat,

Heb. 5. 7.

Pſal. 22. 14.

and that inflam'd and rarified bloud force a paſſage through the numerous pores.

And as the Evangeliſts expreſſions, ſo the Occaſion of the grief will manifeſt the height and bitterneſſe thereof. For God layd on his own Son the iniquities of us all; and as we are obliged to be ſorry for our particular ſinnes, ſo was he grieved for the ſinnes of us all. If then we conſider the perfection and latitude of his knowledge, he underſtood all the ſinnes of men for which he ſuffer'd, all the the evil and the guilt, all the offence againſt the majeſty and ingratitude againſt the goodneſſe of God, which was contain'd in all thoſe ſinnes. 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 ſinnes. If we look upon his relation to the ſons of men, he lov'd them all far more then they did themſelves, he knew thoſe ſinnes were of themſelves ſufficient to bring eternall deſtruction on their ſoules and bodies, he conſidered them whom he ſo much loved, as lying under the wrath of God whom he ſo truely worſhipped. If we reflect upon thoſe graces which were without meaſure diffuſed through his ſoul, and cauſed him with the greateſt habituall deteſtation to abhorr 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 onely for his own iniquities, all which notwithſtanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterneſſe 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?

Adde 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

can happen unto any of the Saints of God; that he being *touched with the feeling of our infirmities*, might become *a mercifull High-priest*, *able* and willing *to succour them that are tempted*. Thus may we *behold & see if there be any ſorrow like unto* that *ſorrow*, *which* was *done unto* him; *wherewith the Lord afflicted* him *in the day of his fierce anger*. 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 whatſoer'e he took; in his body, by internall infirmities and externall injuries; in his ſoul, by fears and ſorrows, by unknown and inexpreſſible anguiſhes. Which ſhewes us fully, (if it can be ſhewn) the third Particular propounded, What our Saviour ſuffered.

Heb. 2, 17, 18, 4. 15.

Lam. 1. 12.

That our Saviour did thus *ſuffer*, is moſt neceſſary to believe. Firſt, that thereby we may be aſſured of the verity of his humane 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 truely humane, then could he not be truely 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 truely ſuffer, we know his Divine eſſence ſuffered not, and thence acknowledge the addition of his humane nature, as the proper ſubject of his paſſion. And from hence we may infallibly conclude, Surely that Mediator between God and man was truely 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 dyed.

Secondly, it was neceſſary Chriſt ſhould ſuffer for the Redemption of lapſed man, and their reconciliation unto God, which was not otherwiſe to be performed then by a plenary ſatisfaction to his will. He therefore was

by all his ſufferings made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our ſinnes. For Salvation is impoſſible unto ſinners, without remiſſion of ſin: and remiſſion in the decree of God is impoſſible, without effuſion of bloud. Our Redemption therefore could not be wrought but by the bloud of the Redeemer, but by a lamb ſlain, but by a ſuffering Saviour.

Thirdly, it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer, that he might purchaſe thereby eternall happineſſe in the heavens both for himſelf the Head, and for the members of his body. *He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore hath he lift up his head. Ought not Chriſt to ſuffer, and ſo to enter into his own glory?* And doth he not by the ſame right by which he entred into it, conferre that glory upon us? The recompence of the reward was ſet before him, and through an intuition of it he chearfully underwent whatſoever was layd upon him. He muſt therefore neceſſarily ſuffer to obtain that happineſſe, who is therefore happy becauſe he ſuffered.

Fourthly, it was neceſſary Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, that we might be aſſured that he is truely 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 unmercifull to himſelf, that he might be moſt mercifull unto us.

Fifthly, it was neceſſary the Son of man ſhould ſuffer, thereby to ſhew 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 naturall, his eternall, his onely-begotten Son, how ſhall he ſpare his adopted ſons, who are beſt known to be children becauſe they are chaſtiz'd, and appear to be in his paternall affection becauſe they lye under his fatherly correction? We are therefore heirs onely

becauſe

becauſe coheirs with Chriſt; and we ſhall be kings onely 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 willo f God.

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 profeſſe when he makes this confeſsion of his faith, *He ſuffered*. For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much: I am really perſwaded within my ſelf, and do make a ſincere profeſsion of this as a moſt neceſſary, certain, and infallible truth, That the Onely begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, and of the ſame eſſence with the Father, did for the redemption of mankind really and truely ſuffer; not in his Divinity, which was impaſsible, but in his humanity, which in the dayes of his humiliation was ſubject unto our infirmities: That as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, ſo he was a complete ſufferer in the whole; in his body, by ſuch dolorous infirmities as ariſe internally from humane frailties, and by ſuch pains as are inflicted by externall injuries; in his ſoul, by fearfull apprehenſions, by unknown ſorrows, by anguiſh unexpreſsible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour *ſuffered*.

UNDER.

UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

AFter the ſubſtance of this part of the Article conſiſting in our Saviours paſſion, *He ſuffered*, followeth the circumſtance of time, declared by the preſent Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*. Which though the name of a ſtranger to the Common-wealth of Iſrael and the Church of Chriſt, is well preſerved to eternall memory in the ſacred Articles of our Creed. For as the Son of God by his determinate counſell was ſent into the world to dye in the fulneſſe of time: ſo it concerns the Church to be aſſured of the time in which he dyed. And becauſe the ancient cuſtome of the world was to make their computations by their Governours, and referre their hiſtoricall 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 Governour is nam'd in that form of ſpeech which is proper to ſuch hiſtoricall or Chronologicall narrations, when we affirm that he ſuffered † *under Pontius Pilate*.

† Ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου. *Which words are capable of a double conſtruction. Firſt, as they are uſed by* S. Paul, 1. *Tim.* 6, 13. Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος 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,* Mat. 28. 14. Καὶ ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, *If this come to be tried before the Procurator. Thus* Feſtus *propounded it to* S. Paul, *Acts* 25. 9. θέλεις κἀκεῖ περὶ τούτων ἐπ' ἐμοῦ; *and* S. Paul *anſwered in the ſame propriety of ſpeech,* ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρός εἰμι, ὅπου με δεῖ κρίνεσθαι. *Thus Chriſt tells his Apoſtles* Mat. 10. 18. ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων δὲ καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε. *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 Judæa; as* ἐπ' Ἀρχιερέων Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα, Luc. 3. 2. *and* ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, Mar. 2. 26. *which is alſo according to the cuſtome and language of the Greeks; As* Καλλικλεῖδος ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἐγένετο, Marm. Arundel. *And* ἐπὶ τούτου βασιλεύοντος, *in this Kings reign, is the common phraſe of* Pauſanias. *Thus the Athenians among their* 9 Ἄρχοντες *had one who was call'd* Ἐπώνυμος, *becauſe his name was us'd for the denoiation of that year, and the phraſe was uſually* ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνα, *or* ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνα

And

τῶ δοῦνα ἄρχοντος. *As I find it thrice together in one place.* Ὁ μὲν δὴ (Ἰσοκράτης) ἐπὶ Λυσιμάχου, Πλάτων δ' ἐπὶ Ἀστείου χρόνου, ἐφ' ὧ Πασικλῆς ἐτελεύτησεν. Laert. *in Platone In the same manner did the* Lacedemonians *make their historicall accounts by their* Ephori, *and the* Argivi *by the Priestesses of* Iuno. Ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος δὲ τῆς Ἄργει τότε πεντήκοντα δυοῖν δέουσα ἔτη ἱερωμένης, καὶ Αἰνησία ἐφόρου ὄντος Σπάρτῃ, καὶ Πυθοδώρου τοῦ δυοῖν μῆνας ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίοις. Thucyd. *l.* 2. *And as the Greeks thus referr'd all actions to the times of these Governours, so did the Jews under the Roman Government to the Procurators of Judæa; as appeareth by* Iosephus, *who mentioning the first of that Office,* Coponius, *presently relates the insurrection of* Iudas Galilæus *in this manner:* Ἐπὶ τούτου (Κωπωνίου) τὶς ἀνὴρ Γαλιλαῖος, Ἰούδας ὄνομα, υἱὸς ἀπόστασιν ὠκίζε τοῦ ὄχλου. De. Bel. Iud. *l.* 2. *c.* 12. *then names his successour* Ambivius, ἐφ' ὧ Σαλώμη Ἰαμνίαν καλαλείπει. *after him* Rufus, ἐφ' ὧ δὴ καὶ τελευτᾷ Καῖσαρ. Antiq. Iud. *l.* 18. *c.* 3. *And in the same manner in the Creed,* παθόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, *our Saviour suffered under* Pontius Pilate, *that is, at the time when he was Procurator of Judæa.*

And becauſe he not onely ſuffered under him as the preſent Governour, but alſo was arraigned and condemned by him as a Iudge; 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 bin 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 † generall cuſtome of the *Romans*, he ſhould have three. The firſt of theſe two is * *Pontius*, the name deſcended to him from the originall of his family, which was very ancient; the ſecond *Pilatus*, as a cognominall addition diſtinguiſhing from the reſt deſcending from the ſame Originall.

† Pauſanias *ſpeaking of the* Romans, Τεῖα ὁπότε ἢ ὀλίγοις καὶ ἐπὶ πλέονα ὀνόματα ἐκφέρουσι. *And although* Diomedes *and* Plutarch *have obſerved, that even among the* Romans *there were ſome* ἀώνυμα, *yet the Prænomen was never omitted, as* Priſcian *affirmed.* Ex illo tempore conſuetudo tenuit, ut nemo Romanus ſit abſque prænomine. *lib.* 2.

* Pontius *and* Pilatus *were his* Nomen *and* Cognomen, *in the ſame manner as* Iulius *and* Cæſar *are deſcrib'd by* Suetonius: Non Cæſare & Bibulo, ſed Iulio & Cæſare Coſſ. actum ſcriberent, bis eundem prænominibus nomine atque cognomine. *l.* 1. *c.* 20. *Thus without a Prænomen or Cognomen he is onely known to us by his Nomen properly call'd, and his Cognomen. The nature of*

which two is thus described by the Ancients: Nomen proprium est gentilitium, id est, quod originem gentis vel familiæ declarat, ut Portius, Cornelius; Cognomen est, quod uniuscujusque proprium, & nominibus gentilitiis subjungitur, ut Cato, Scipio. *Diomedes* de Oratione l. 1. Nomen, quod familiæ originem declarat, ut Cornelius; Cognomen, quod nomini subjungitur, ut Scipio. *Charisius l.* 2. *The first of these* Dionysius *calls* τὸ ζυγγενικὸν καὶ πατρωνυμικὸν, Plutarch, ἰδίαν ἢ χώρας κοινὸν, & κοινὸν ἀπὸ συγγενείας: *the second he calls* περιγραπτικὸν ἢ ὁπωσδήποτε. *Thus* Pontius *was his* Nomen gentis *or* gentilitium, *and* Pilatus *his* Cognomen. *As therefore* Pontius Aquila, 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 Hispal. *Orig. l.* 7. *c.* 10. Pontius, declinans concilium, utique Judæorum: accepta enim aqua lavit manus suas, dicens, innocens ego sum à sanguine hujus justi. *And S.* Jerome, Quod significat nomen Pilati, *i.e.* malleatoris, *i.e.* qui domat ferreas gentes, *ad Mat.* 15. Pilatus, os malleatoris, quia dum Christum ore suo & justificat & condemnat, more malleatoris utrinque ferit. *Isid. ib.* Pontius, declinans consilium; Pilatus, os malleatoris. *S.* Jer. *de nom. Hebraicis. in Luca. & rursus 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 ף, *to which the* Latine F *more properly answers.* Sed sciendum est quod apud Hebræos P litera non habetur, nec ullum nomen est quod hoc elementum sonet: abusive igitur accipienda quasi per F literam scripta sint. *Thus did they vainly strive to find an* Hebrew *Originall, and that such an one as should represent the conditions of* Pilate, *when these two names are nothing else but the Roman* Nomen *and* Cognomen *of that Person.*

† Τῆς Ἀρχελάου ἐθναρχίας μεταπεσούσης εἰς ἐπαρχίαν, *Joseph. de Bel. Jud.* l. 2. c. 13. Τῆς δ' Ἀρχελάου χώρας κατοπλιν προσγενομένης τῷ Σύρων, *id.* Antiq. Jud. *l.* 17. c. 15. Παρὰν δὲ Κυρίνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν προσῆκεν Συρίας γενόμενος, *ibid.* l. 18. c. 1.

He was by birth a *Roman*, by degree of the Equestrian order, sent by *Tiberius* the Emperour to be a Governour in *Judea*. For about threescore yeares before our Saviours birth the *Jewes* 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 *Jewes* to be ruled by their own lawes and governours; yet when *Archelaus* was banish'd by *Augustus*, they received their Governours from the *Roman* Emperour, being made a part of the † Province of *Syria* belonging to his care. 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 Gratus*, and at his departure by *Pontius Pilate*. The

The Office which this *Pilate* bare was the Procuratorship of *Judea*, as is most evident out of the History both of the † *Romans*, from whom he received his authority, and of the *Jewes*, over whom he exercis'd his dominion.

† Tacitus *speaking of the Christians*, Author nominis ejus Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est. *Annal.* l. 15. *And* Tertullian, *most skilfull of their laws and customes, speaks thus of our Saviour*: posttremo oblatum Pontio Pilato, Syriam tunc ex parte Romana procuranti. *Apologet. cap.* 21. *Whom S.* Cyprian *followes*: Hunc Magistri eorum .... Pontio Pilato, qui tunc ex parte Romana Syriam procurabat, tradiderunt. *Adv. Demetr. Thus also* Josephus *for the* Jewes: Πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἐπίτροπος παρὰ Τιβερίου Πιλάτος. *de Bel. Jud. l.* 2. *c.* 14. *and* Philo, Πιλάτος ὢν τῆς κατὰ χώραν ἐπίτροπος ἀποδεδειγμένος τῆς Ἰουδαίας. *de legat. ad Caium. And therefore those words of* S. Luke, *c.* 3. 1. ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, *were properly translated by the old Interpreter*, procurante Pontio Pilato Judæam. *Thus* Lucius Dexter *ad annum Christi* 28. Pontius Pilatus procurator Judææ à Tiberio mittitur in Judæam. *And* Justin Martyr *most properly*, Τὸν σωτῆρα ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπιτρόπου Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ὁμοτρόπου, *Apolog.* 2. *And again speaking to the Emperours, by whom the Procurators were sent*, Καὶ Πιλάτου τοῦ ὑμετέρου παρ' Ἰουδαίοις ἡμῶν ἐπιτρόπου. *As also* Eusebius, Δωδεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς Τιβερίου βασιλείας ἐπίτροπος τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ Τιβερίου καθίσταται Πιλάτος. *Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 10. *And* S. Jeromes *translation of his Chronicon*: Pilatus procurator Judææ à Tiberio mittitur. *Thus it appears that* Pilate *of the Equestrian Order was properly Procurator, as that Office was ordinarily given to men of that Order, as* Tacitus *testifies*: Cn. Julius Agricola utrumq; avum procuratorem Cæsarum habuit, quæ equestris nobilitas est. *In vita* Jul. Agric. *which is to be understood concerning the Imperiall Provinces: for into those which were of the Provinces of the People, the Procurators sent by* Cæsar *were of the* Liberti. *For the Emperour sent into all the Provinces his Procurators, but with this difference, as* Dio *observes*, οἷς πάντα ὁμοίως τὰ ἔθνη τάττει αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ τοῦ δήμου μὲν ὃν τῷ ἡγεμονίαν, παρ' ᾧ δὲ καὶ ἀποδείξαν, πέμπει. *Hist. l.* 53.

But what was the Office of a † Procurator in those times, though necessary for our present purpose, is not so easie 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 publick Office in any of the Provinces, and

† *The* Roman *Procurator is ordinarily in* Greek *Authors expressed by their* ἐπίτροπος. *as the Glossa Latino-Græc.* Procurator, Ἐπίτροπος. *But yet they are not of the same latitude in their use*; Ἐπίτροπος *comprehending the notion of Tutor, as well as Procurator.* Hesyc. Ἐπίτροπος ὁ προ-

παρὰ χωλεῖν, καὶ ὅλης τῆς οὐσίας, καὶ ὀρφανῶν. *Gloss. Vet.* Ἐπίτροπος, Procurator, tutor. Ἐπίτροπος *therefore was uſed by the Greeks in both notions, whereof* Procurator *of the* Latines *is but one. And in the language of the* Romans, *he is a Procurator, which undertake to manage the buſineſſe of another man.* Procurator ſi negotium ſuſcipit, *ſaith* Aſconius *in Divinat. and* Sex. Pompeius, Procurator abſentis nomine actor ſit; *he to whom the care of another mans eſtate or affairs was committed.* Gloſſ. Vet. Ἐντολή, Commiſſum, *and* Ἐντολεύς, Procurator. *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 Imperiall revenue: who in reſpect of th. Perſon whom they ſerv'd, were called* Procuratores Cæſaris, *or* Auguſtales; *in reſpect of the Countreyes where they ſerved, were termed* Procuratores provinciales. *Their office is beſt deſcribed by* Dion *Hiſt. l.* 53. Τὺς ἐπιτρόπους, ὅτω δὴ τὰς τε χώρας περιόδους ὀλίγους τινὰς καὶ προστάγματα σφίσιν αὐτοκρατῆ ὀνομάζομεν. *We call, ſayes he, thoſe* ἐπιτρόπους, *that is* procuratores, *which receive the publick revenues, and diſpoſe of them according to the commands received from the Emperour. For they acted in his name, and what was done by them was accounted as done by the Emperour himſelf.* Quæ acta geſta ſunt à Procuratore Cæſaris, ſic ab eo comprobari, ac ſi à Cæſare geſta eſſent, *Vlpian. l.* 1. *ff. As we read in* Tacitus *of the Emperour* Claudius, Æquius audita vox Principis, parem vim rerum habendam à Procuratoribus ſuis judicatarum, ac ſi ipſe ſtatuiſſet, *Annal. l.* 12. *and in* Suetonius, Ut rata eſſent quæ Procuratores ſui in judicando ſtatuerent, à Senatu precario exegit. *The proper Office therefore of the Provinciall* Procurator *was, to receive the Imperiall revenue, and diſpoſe of it as the Emperour commanded, and to all intents and purpoſes to do ſuch things as were neceſſary thereunto, with ſuch authority as if the Emperour himſelf had done them.*

and particularly in *Judæa* none till after the baniſhment of *Archelaus*, ſome yeares after our Saviours 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 Governour in chief of the Province, a Procurator, whoſe office was, to take an account of all the tribute, and whatſoever elſe was due to the Emperour, 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 & diſpoſall of the Imperiall Revenue: which they exerciſ'd as inferiour and ſubordinate to the Preſident, alwayes ſupreme Provinciall Officer.

Now

Now *Judæa* being made a part of the Province of *Syria*, and consequently under the care of the President of that Province, a particular Procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the Emperours revenue. And because the Nation of the *Jewes* were alwayes suspected of a rebellious disposition against the *Roman* State, and the President of *Syria*, who had the power of the sword, was forc'd to attend upon the other parts of his Province; therefore the Procurator of *Judæa* was furnished with † power of life and death, and so administred all the 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.

† *This appeareth by* Coponius, *the first proper Procurator of Judæa, who was brought in by* Quirinus *Præses of* Syria,

For *when he came to dispose of the goods of* Archelaus, *and to reduce* Judæa *into the form of a Province, and anjoyn it to* Syria. *Of this* Coponius Josephus *writeth after this manner:* Κωπώνιός τε αὐτῷ (Κυρηνίῳ) συνεπέμπετο τάγματος ἱππέων, ἡγησόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ὅπ' πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ: *That being of the Equestrian order, he was sent with* Quirinus *to govern the Jews with the supreme power.* Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. *And yet more expressly as to the time, occasion, and extent of his power:* Τῆς δ' Ἀρχελάου χώρας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν περιγραφείσης, ἐπίτροπός τις ἱππικῆς τάξεως Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως, Κωπώνιος, πέμπεται, μάχειν τε κτείνειν λαβὼν ἐξουσίαν καὶ τὴν Καίσαρος ἔξουσίαν, *Id. de* Bel. Jud. *l.* 2. *c.* 11. *When those parts which were under the command of* Archelaus *were reduced into a Province,* Coponius *was sent thither by the Emperour, and furnished with power of life and death. For although in the Proconsular Provinces the Procurator of the Emperour had no power but in those things which belonged to the Exchequer; yet in those Provinces which were properly* Præsidales *the* Procurator *was often* loco Præsidis. *From whence in the Ancient Inscriptions we read of the same person,* Procurator & Præses Alpium, Procurator & Præses provinciarum per Orientem, Procurator & Præses provinciæ Sardiniæ. *It was often therefore so that the* Procurator *did* Præsidis partibus fungi: *as* Ulpian *l.* 8. *De officio Proconsulis,* In provinciam enim Præsidum provinciarum, nec aliter Procuratori Cæsaris hæc cognitio injungitur, quam Præsidis partibus in provincia fungatur. *And this is very necessary to be observed, because a* Procurator *barely such, not armed with the power of the* Præses provinciæ *had not the power of the sword.* As Antoninus *to* Valerius; Procurator meus, qui vice præsidis non fungebatur, exilii tibi pœnam non potuit irrogare, *l.* 9 *Cod. de pœnis: and to* Heliodorus; Procurator meus, qui vice præsidis provinciæ non fungitur, sicut exigere pœnam desertæ accusationis non potest, ita judicare ut ea inferatur sententia sua non potest, *l.* 3. *C.* Ubi causæ, *This was plain in the case of* Lucilius Capito *Procurator*

of Asia minor, *who was call'd in question for exceeding his power, & deserted therein by* Tiberius. Procurator Asiæ Lucilius Capito, accusante provincia, causam dixit magna cum adseveratione Principis, non se jussisse vitia & pecunias familiares dedisse. Quod si vim Prætoris usurpasset, manibusque militum usus foret, spreta in eo mandata sua, audirent socios. *Tacit. Annal.* And Dio *upon the said example observes in general*, *that the* Procurators *had no such power.* Οὐ γὰρ ἐξῆν τότε τοῖς τὰ αὐτοκρατορικὰ χρήματα διοικοῦσι πλέον ἔλαττόν τι, ἢ τὰς νενομισμένας προσόδους ἀναλίσκειν, καὶ περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς ἔν τε τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς ἰδιώταις δικάζεσθαι. *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* Judæa, *as the others who preceded him also were.*

For by this means it came to passe that Christ, who by the determinate counsell of God was to dye, 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 forreign power, and so suffer death after the customes 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 *condemn'd him to*
Mar. 14. 64. *be guilty of death*; yet they could not condemn him to dye, or pronounce the sentence of death upon him, *but*
Joh. 18. 30. *deliver'd him up unto* Pilate: and when he refusing said unto them, *take ye him, and judge him according to your*
31. *law*, they immediately returned, *it is not lawfull for us to put any man to death.* The power of life and death was not in any Court of the *Jews*, but in the *Roman* Gover-
† *Isay* therefore *the* Jews *answered that it was not lawfull for them to* nour alone, as supreme; & † therefore they answered him, it was

put any man to death, *because that power was taken out of their hands. For although* S. Augustine *think they thought it not lawfull in respect of the Passeover*, Intelligendum est eos dixisse, non sibi licere interficere quenquam, propter diei festi sanctitatem, quem celebrare jam cœperant, *Tract. 14. in Joan. and* S. 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 ἕνεκεν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀπέλυον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλᾶτον ἤγαγον; μάλιστα μὲν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἀρχῆς

ἀρχῆς αὐτῷ ἡ ἐξουσία ὑπετίμητο, λοιπὴν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις τῶν πραγμάτων κειμένων: and upon those words in S. John, Ὡς ἐκπεσόντες τῆς ἀρχῆς, διὰ τοῦτο ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις, φησὶ, γέγονε. So Theophylact, Ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν, ὑπὸ κείμενον αὐτοῖ ἐξουσίαν ἀνελεῖν, ἅτε τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις κειμένων: and before him S. Chrys.

was *not lawfull*: not in respect of the law 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. Fourty years before the destruction of *Jerusalem* the *Jews* themselves acknowledge that they lost their power; which is sufficient to shew that they had it not when our Saviour suffer'd: 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.

But how this Judge could be perswaded to an act of so much injustice and impiety, is not yet easie to be seen. The numerous controversies of the religion of the *Jews* did not concern the *Roman* Governours, nor were they moved with the frequent quarrells arising from the different sects. *Pilate* knew well it *was for envy* that the chief Priests *delivered him*; and when *he had examin'd him*, *he found no fault touching those things whereof* they *accused him*. Three times did he challenge the whole 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 condemn'd and crucified him. Mat. 27. 18. Luc. 23. 14. 22. Mat. 27. 19. Joh. 19. 7, 8.

Here we must look upon the nature and disposition of *Pilate*

Pilate, which enclined and betray'd him to so foule an Act. He was a man of an † high, rough, untractable, and irreconcilable spirit; as he is describ'd by the *Jews*, and appeareth from the beginning of his government; when he brought the Bucklers stampt with the pictures of *Cæsar* into *Jerusalem*, (which was an abomination to the *Jews*,) and could neither be moved by the bloud of many, nor perswaded by the most humble applications and submisse intreaties of the whole Nation, to remove them, till he received a sharp reprehension and severe command from the Emperour *Tiberius*. After that he seis'd on the *Corban*, that sacred treasury, and spent it upon an Aquæduct: nor could all their religious and importunate petitions divert his intentions; but his resolution went through their bloud to bring in water. When the *Galilæans* came up to *Jerusalem* to worship God at his own temple, *he mingled their bloud with their sacrifices*. Adde to this untractable and irreconcilable spirit, by which he had so often exasperated the *Jews*, an avaritious and rapacious disposition, which prompted him as much to please them; and we may easily perceive what mov'd him to condemne that person to death whom he declared innocent. The Evangelist telleth us that *Pilate*, *willing to content the people*, *released Barabbas unto them, and deliver'd Jesus to be crucified*. They accused him at *Rome* for all the * insolencies and rapines which he had committed, and by this Act he thought to pacify them.

† So Philo testifieth of him: ἀν γὰρ τὸν φύσιν ἀκαμπὴς, καὶ μετὰ τῆ αὐθαδες ἀμείλικτος. de Legat. ad Caium. And again, Οἷα ἐπὶ ἐγκλήτου ἔχων καὶ βαρυμήνιος ἀνθρωπος.

Luc. 23. 1.

Mar. 15. 15.

* 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, viz. that he feared the Jews should complain of him to Tiberius. Τὸ παλαιὸν γὰρ τοῦτο μάλιστα αὐτὸν ἐξετάχυνε, καταδείσαντα μὴ πρὸ ὀργῆς προσβολὰς ποιήσωσι καὶ τῆς ἄλλης αὐτῆ ὑπερηφανίας ἐξελέγξωσι τὰς δωροδοκίας, τὰς ὕβρεις, τὰς ἁρπαγὰς, τὰς αἰκίας, τὰς ἐπηρείας, τὸν ἀκήρυτον καὶ ἐπαχθῆ φόνους, τὴν ἀνήνυτον καὶ ἀφάλαντον ὠμότητα διεξελθόντες. de Legat. ad Caium.

It

It was thus necessary to expresse the Person under whom

whom our Saviour ſuffered, Firſt, that we might for ever be aſſured of the † time in which he ſuffered. The enemies of Chriſtianity began firſt to unſettle the time of his Paſſion, that thereby they might at laſt deny the Paſſion it ſelf; and the reſt of their falſhood was detected by the * diſcovery of their falſe Chronology. Some fixed it to the " ſeventh year of the reign of *Tiberius*; whereas it

† Cautiſſime qui Symbolum tradiderunt, etiam tempus, quo hæc ſub Pontio Pilato geſta ſunt, deſignarunt, ne ex aliqua parte velut vaga & incerta geſtorum traditio vacillaret. *Ruffinus* in Expoſ. Symb. Credimus itaque in eum qui ſub Pontio Pilato crucifixus eſt & ſepultus Addendum enim erat Judicis nomen propter temporum cognitionem. S. *Aug.* de Fide & Symb. Pilatus Judex erat in illo tempore ab Imperatore poſitus in Judæa, ſub quo Dominus paſſus eſt, cujus mentio ad temporis ſignificationem, non ad perſonæ illius pertinet dignitatem. *Serm.* 131. *de Tempore.*

* So Euſebius *detected ſome of thoſe which liv'd not long before him.* Οὐκοῦν παρὼς ἀπελήλεγκται τὸ πλάσμα τῆς κατὰ τὸν Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθὲς καὶ πρώην διαβεβλημένων, ὧν οἷς πρῶτος αὐτὸς ὁ τῆς παραπομπάσεως χρόνος τῆς πεπλανημένης ἀποδείξεως τὸ ψεῦδος. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* l. 1. c. 9. " Ἐπὶ τῆς πέμπτης δ' οὖν ὑπατείας Τιβερίου, ἣ γέγονεν ἕτους ἑβδόμου τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, τὰ περὶ τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῖς πάθος τολμήσαντα ἐδείχθη, καθ' ὃν ἐπέμενε χρόνον μηδὲ ὅπωσδήποτε τῆν Ἰουδαίᾳ Πιλάτος. Euſeb. *Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 10.

is certain *Pontius Pilate* was not then Procurator in *Judæa*, and as certain that our Saviour was baptized eight years after, *in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæſar.* Some of the *Jews*, left the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* might ſeem to follow upon and for our Saviour's crucifixion, have remov'd it near threeſcore years more backward yet, † placing his death in the beginning of *Herods* reign, who was not born till toward the death of the

Luc. 3. 1.

† *Divers of the Jews place the Paſſion of Chriſt in the year of their account* 3724. *which is* 69 *years before our common account of the year in which he truly ſuffer'd. This Invention of their own, grounded upon no foundation, and back'd with not ſo much as the leaſt probability, they deliver as a Tradition amongſt them, continued in this Rhythm,*

בשנת ג אלפים חשכ"ו חנצרי נלכד
ובשנת תקל"ב בשם נצלב

i.e. *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 thoſe two unequall

unequall numbers signify the same year, the lesser number being a Period of years, which seven times numbred equalleth the greater. So that their meaning is, that after 7. periods consisting of 532. years, in the year of the world 3724. Jesus of Nazareth was crucified.

the same King. Others have removed it further yet near † twenty years, and so vainly tell us how he dyed under *Aristobulus*, above fifty years before his birth in *Bethlehem*. This doe they teach their Proselytes to this end, that they may not believe so much as the least historicall part of the blessed Evangelists. As therefore they deny the time of our Saviour's passion, in designe to destroy his doctrine; so, that we might establish the substance of the Gospel depending on his death, it was necessary we should retein a perfect remembrance of the time in which he dyed.

† *Others of the Jews pretend another account, viz. that Iesus was born in the year 3671. which was the fourth of Jannæus, and crucified in the year 3707. which was the third of* Aristobulus: *making him the disciple of* R. Josuah *the son of* Perachiah; *according to that usuall phrase of theirs,* רבי יהושע בן פרחיה שרחפו לישו בשתי ידים *vide* Sepher Juchasin.

Secondly, it was thought necessary to include the name of *Pilate* in our Creed, as of one who gave a most powerfull externall † testimony to the certainty of our Saviours death, and the innocency of his life. He did not onely professe, 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 wayes he is related to have given most ample testimony to the truth: * first by an Expresse written to *Tiberius*, and by him pre-

† Nota quod in Pilato & uxore ejus, justum Dominum confitentibus, Gentilis populi testimonium est. S. *Hieron.* in Mat. 27.

* *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.* Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, & ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Cæsari tum Tiberio nunciavit. *Apolog. c.* 21. *And again,* Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum introivit, annunciatum sibi ex Syria Palæstina, quæ veritatem illius (Christi) divinitatis revelarat, detulit ad Senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui. *c.* 5. *This is related by* Eusebius *out of* Tertullian *in his Ecclesiasticall History l.* 2, *c.* 2. *and referred to the two and twentieth year of* Tiberius

Tiberius *in his Chron.* Pilato de Chriſtianorum dogmate ad Tiberium referente Tiberius retulit ad Senatum, ut inter cætera ſacra reciperetur. *The authority of this Expreſſe is grounded on the great reputation of* Tertullian, (*as is obſerved alſo by the Author of the* Chronicon Alexandrinum, *who concludes the relation with theſe words,* ὡς ἱστορεῖ Τερτυλλιανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος,) *and the generall cuſtome by which all the Governours of the provinces did give an account unto the Emperour of all ſuch paſſages as were moſt remarkable:* παλαιᾶς κεχρημένος ἤθεσι τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἄρχουσι, τὰ ἀξιόσημα τῶν κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους γινομένων πρὸς τὴν βασιλέων ἀρχὴν ἀναφέρειν σημαίνειν, ὡς μηδὲν αὐτὸν διαδιδράσκοι τῶν γινομένων. Euſeb. *Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 2.

preſented to the Senate; ∴ ſecondly, by Records written in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his government.

∴ *The Ancient* Romans *were very deſirous to preſerve the memory of all remarkable paſſages which happened in the City: and this was done either in their* Acta Senatus, *or* Acta diurna populi; *which were diligently made, and carefully kept at* Rome. *In the ſame manner the Governours in the Provinces took care that all things worthy of remark ſhould be written in publick Tables, and preſerved as the* Acta *of their government. And agreeably to this cuſtome* Pontius Pilate *kept the Memoires of the* Jewiſh *affairs, which were therefore called* Acta Pilati, *in which an account was given of our bleſſed Saviour; and the Primitive Chriſtians did appeal unto them in their diſputes with the Gentiles, as to a moſt undoubted teſtimony.* Juſtine Martyr *urged them even unto the* Roman *Emperours:* Καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι γέγονε, δύνασθε μαθεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἀπὸ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γινομένων Ἄκτων. *And again,* Ὅτι δὲ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν, ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γινομένων Ἄκτων μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Apol. 2. *And in the differences between the Chriſtians, they were cited by both parties. As the* Teſſareſdecatitæ *alledged them for their cuſtome of the obſervance of Eaſter, as* Epiphanius *teſtifieth of them;* ἀπὸ τῶν Ἄκτων δῆθεν Πιλάτου αὐτοὺς εὑρηκέναι, ὃν ὡς ἐμήνυσε, τῷ πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸ Σωτῆριον πεπονθέναι. *And* Epiphanius *urgeth the ſame* Acta *againſt them, but according to other Copies:* Ἔτι δὲ εὐαγγελικὰ ἀπήγεκται ἐκ τῶν Πιλάτου, ὃν ὡς σημαίνει, πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸ πάθος γεγονέναι. *Hæreſ.* 50.

Thirdly, it behoved us to take notice of the *Roman* Governour in the expreſſion of our Saviours paſſion, that thereby we might underſtand how it came to paſſe 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 cuſtome no man amongſt them ever ſo dyed. Being then ſo great a Prophet could not dye but in *Ieruſa-*

Iews, being the death he was to ſuffer was not agreeable to the lawes and cuſtomes of the *Jews*; it was neceſſary a *Roman* Governour ſhould condemn him, that ſo the counſell of the will of God might be fulfilled, by the malice of the one, and the cuſtomes of the other.

And now the advantage of this Circumſtance is diſcover'd, every one may expreſſe the importance of it in this manner. I am fully perſwaded of this truth, as beyond all poſſibility of contradiction, that in the *fulneſſe of time* God ſent his Son, and that the eternall Son of God ſo ſent by him did ſuffer for the ſinnes of men, after the fifteenth year of *Tiberius* the *Roman* Emperour, and before his death, in the time of *Pontius Pilate* the *Caſarean* Procurator of *Judæa*; who, to pleaſe the Nation of the *Jews*, did condemn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him, according to the cuſtome of that Empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the propheſies, to dye a painfull and a ſhamefull death upon the Croſs. And thus I believe in Chriſt that *ſuffered under Pontius Pilate*.

WAS CRUCIFIED.

FRom the generall conſideration of our Saviours 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 explication whereof it will be neceſſary, firſt, to prove that the promiſed *Meſsias* was to be crucified, that he which was deſigned to dye for our ſinnes was to ſuffer upon the Croſſe; ſecondly, to ſhew that our Jeſus, whom we worſhip, was certainly and truly crucified, and did ſuffer, whatſoever was ſo foretold, upon the Croſſe; thirdly, to diſcover what is the nature of crucifixion, what peculiarities of ſuffering are contain'd in dying on the Croſſe.

That the *Meſsias* was to be crucified, appeareth both by

by Types which did apparently foreſhew it, and by Propheſies which did plainly foretell 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 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*; nor could they ever be brought to confeſſe the *Meſsias* ſhould

† *The ancient Fathers following the ſtyle of the Apoſtles, to prove all the particulars of our Saviours death out of the Old Teſtament, have made uſe of thoſe types and propheſies which did really and truly foreſhew 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 Croſſe;* λέγει γὰρ οὕτως καρδίαν Μωσῆ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τύπον σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν: *but the text aſſures us no more then that* Moſes *held up his hand, which might be without any ſimilitude of a Croſs; & when both were liſted up by* Aaron *and* Hur, *the repreſentation it not certain. And yet after* Barnabas, Juſtine *tells us that* Moſes *repreſented the Croſſe;* Ἰδὰς χεῖρας ἐκατέρωθεν ὁπλίδας: *and* Tertullian *calls it* habitum crucis. *In the ſame manner with the ſtrange* Indian *ſtatue, which is deſcribed by* Bardiſanes, *as* ἀνδριὰς ἐπὶ ὀρθὸς, ἔχων τὰς χεῖρας ὑπλωμένας ἐν τύπῳ σταυροῦ. Porphyr. *de Stygc. With leſſe probability did they gather both the name of Jeſus, and the Croſs of Chriſt, from the* 318. *ſervants of* Abraham. Ἰῶτα λέγα, Ἡτα ὀκτὼ, ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν· ἔτι δὲ σταυρὸν τοῦ Τ ἔμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν, λέγει δὲ τὰς τριακοσίους. *Epiſt.* Barn. *As if* IH *ſtood for Jeſus, and* T *for the Croſs. And yet* Clemens Alex. *follows him:* Φασὶν οὖν τινὲς τῷ μὲν Κυριακῷ σημείῳ τύπον εἶναι τὸ σχῆμα τετρακοσιοστὸν γὰρ χιλιοστόν· τὸ δὲ Ἰῶτα καὶ τὸ Ἡτα τὄνομα σημαίνειν τὸ σωτήριον. *Stromat. l.* 6. *as alſo* S. Ambroſe, Nam & Abraham 318. duxit ad bellum, & ex innumeris trophæa hoſtibus reportavit, ſignoque Dominicæ crucis & nominis, *&c. Prol. ad l.* 1. *de Fide. and* S. Auguſtine *of another* 300. Quorum numerus, quia trecenti erant, ſignum inſinuat Crucis, propter literam T Græcam, qua iſte numerus ſignificatur. *and* Clemens Alexandrinus *again of the* 300. *Cubits in the Ark;* Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τὰς τριακοσίους πήχεις σύμβολον τοῦ Κυριακοῦ σημείου λέγειν. *Strom. l.* 6. *As unlikely a Type did they make* Jacob's *Ladder.* Ego puto crucem Salvatoris illam eſſe ſcalam quam Jacob vidit. *Hieron.* Scala uſq; ad cœlũ attingens crucis figurã habuit; Dominus innixus ſcalæ Chriſtus crucifixus oſtenditur. *Auguſt. Theſe and many others, by the writers of the ſucceeding ages, were produced out of the Old Teſtament, as Types of the Croſs, and may in ſome ſenſe be applied to it being otherwiſe proved, but prove it not.*

† dye that death upon a tree to which the curse of the law belonged: and yet wee need no other Oracles, then such as were committed to those *Jews*, to prove that Christ was so to suffer.

† Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue with Justine Martyr, when he had confessed many of the Christian doctrine, would by no means be brought to this: εἰ γὰρ ἐτίμως ὑπὸ σταυρωθῆναι τὸν Χριστὸν, subaud. ἔδει) ἀπρεπῶς ἐκατάρατος καὶ ὁ σταυρούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου λέγεται· ὥστε πρὸς τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἀπαίτησιν ἔχω. And afterwards granting his Passion, urge him to prove his crucifixion; ἡμεῖς γὰρ οὐδὲ εἰς ἔννοιαν ἐλθεῖν δυνάμεθα. So Tertullian describes the Jews, negantes passionem crucis in Christum prædicatam, & argumentantes insuper non esse credendum, ut ad id genus mortis exposuerit Deus filium suum, quod ipse dixit, Maledictus omnis homo qui pependit in ligno. *Adv. Judæos c.* 10.

† 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, then *Isaac* was; nor can God the Father, who gave his onely-begotten Son, be better expressed then by that Patriarch in his readinesse to sacrifice his son, *his onely son Isaac, whom he loved.* 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?* 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 dye no other death in which the wood was to be carried; and being to dye upon the Crosse, was, by the formall * custome used in that kind of death, certainly to carry it.

* This custome 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 expresse. Βασάζουν τινὰ τῶν δαιμόνων χθονίων κακύργων μὲν ἰδόντι σταυρὸν αὐτῷ σημαίνοντι· οἶσιν γὰρ ὁ σταυρὸς διανέμω, καὶ ὁ μέλλων περιπλέκεσθαι πρότερον αὐτὸν βασάζει. *Artemid. l.* 2. *c.* 41. Τῷ μὲν σώματι τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος τὸν κακούργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτῶν σταυρόν. *Plutarch.* de his qui sero puniuntur. So these not long after our Saviours death, and much before it. Plautus *in Carbonaria*; Patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde affigatur cruci.

† This

it. Therefore *Isaac* † bearing the wood, did preſignifie Chriſt bearing the croſſe.

† *This is not onely the obſervation of the Chriſtians, but the* Jews *themſelves have refer'd this Type unto that cuſtome. For upon* Gen. 22. 6. *And* Abraham *took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it upon* Isaac *his ſon, the leſſer Bereſhith hath this note:* צלובו בכתפו כזה שטוען *even as a man carries his croſſe upon his ſhoulders.*

When the fiery ſerpents bit the *Iſraelites*, and *much people dyed*, *Moſes*, by the command of God, *made a ſerpent of braſſe, 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 braſſe, he lived.* Now if there were no expreſſer promiſe of the *Meſſias*, then the *ſeed of the woman* which ſhould *bruiſe the ſerpents head*; if he were to perform that promiſe by the vertue 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 wilderneſſe, even ſo muſt the ſon of man be* † *lifted up.* Num. 21. 9. Joh. 3. 14.

† *The common phraſe by which that death was expreſſed.* In crucem tolli: *Paul. l. 5. Sentent. Tit. 22, 23, & 25. As in the* Chaldee תקיפוה *by origination* elevatio, *by uſe is particularly* crucifixio.

The Paſchal lamb did plainly typify that lamb of God that taketh away the ſinnes of the world; and the preparing of it did not onely * repreſent the Croſſe, but the command or ordinance of the paſſeover did foretell as much. For

* Juſtine Martyr *ſhews how the manner of the roaſting of the Paſchall lamb did repreſent the affixing of a man unto the croſſe, and thereby was a tyre of Chriſt.* Τὸ καλευόμενον πάσχα τοῦτο ὅλον γίνεται, τῷ πάθος τοῦ σταυροῦ δι' ὃ προεχειρίζετο ἔμελλεν ὁ Χριστὸς σύμβολον ἦν, τὸ γὰρ ὀπτὸν ἀμνὸν πρόβατον, σχηματιζόμενον ὁμοίως τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀπτᾶται. Εἷς γὰρ ὄρθιος διὰ μέσου διατρυπᾶται ἀπὸ τοῦ κατωτάτω μέρους μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς· καὶ πάλιν κατὰ τὸ μεταφρενον, ᾧ προσαρτῶνται καὶ αἱ χεῖρες τοῦ πρόβατου. Dial. cum Tryphone. *To which* Arnoldus Carnotenſis *alludeth.* In veru crucis boni odoris aſſatio excoquat carnalium ſenſuum cruditatem. *De Cœna Domini, commonly attributed to* S. Cyprian. *Nor is this roaſting of the Lamb any far-fetcht figure of the Croſſe: for other roaſting hath bin thought*

thought a proper resemblance of it: where the body of the thing roasted hath limbs, as a Lamb, there it beares the similitude of a proper Crosse, with an erect and transverse beam; where the roasted body is onely of length and uniform, as a fish, there the resemblance is of a streight and simple στυρός. As it is represented by Hesychius. Σκόλοψ ὡς ὄπτανον, τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν κακούργως ἀνεσκολόπιζον ὀξυνόντες ξύλον διὰ τῆς ῥάχεως ἢ τῆς νάτης, καθάπερ νῦν ὀπτωμένους ἰχθῦς ἐπὶ ὀβελίσκων.

Exod. 12. 46. For while 'tis said, ye shall not *break a bone thereof*, 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 custome, † was the punishment of crucifixion;) but onely in that death should by the providence of God be so particularly preserv'd, as that not one bone of his should be touch'd. And thus the crucifixion of the *Messias* in severall Types was represented.

† *Although indeed it must be confess'd, that the* Crurifragium *and the* Crucifixion *were two several punishments, and that they ordinarily made the Crosse a lingering death; yet because the Law of* Moses *did not suffer the body of a man to hang upon a tree in the night, therefore the* Romans, *so far to comply with the* Jews, *did break the bones of those whom they crucified in* Judæa *constantly, whereas in other Countreys they did it but occasionally.*

Nor was it onely thus prefigured and involved in these typicall resemblances, but also clearly spoken by the Prophets in their particular and expresse predictions. Nor shall we need the accession of any lost or additionall Prophetical expressions, which some of the * Ancients have made use of: those which are still preserved even among the *Jews*, will yield this truth sufficient testimonies.

* *As* Barnabas *cites one of the Prophets whom we know not.* Ὁμοίως πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὁρίζει ἐν ἄλλῳ προφήτῃ λέγοντι, Καὶ πότε ταῦτα συντελεσθήσεται; ἢ λέγει Κύριος, Ὅταν ξύλον κλιθῇ καὶ ἀνασταθῇ, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ ξύλου αἷμα στάξῃ. *which words are not to be found in any of the Prophets. Thus* Justine Martyr, *to prove* ὅτι μετὰ τὸ σταυωθῆναι βασιλεύσει ὁ Χριστὸς, *produceth a prophesy out of the* 96. *Psalm in these words*; ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. *And* Tertullian, *who advances all his conception*; Age nunc, si legisti penes prophetam in Psalmis, *Dominus regnavit à ligno*; expecto quid intelligas,

telligas, ne forte lignarium aliquem regem significari putetis, & non Christum, qui exinde à passione Christi (*lege* crucis, *for he himself hath it* ligni, *Adv.* Marcion. *l.* 3. *c.* 19.) superata morte regnavit. *Adv. Jud. c.* 10. *And in the place cited against* Marcion: Etsi enim mors ab Adam regnavit usque ad Christum, cur Christus non regnasse dicatur à ligno, ex quo crucis ligno mortuus regnum mortis exclusit? *Thus they, and some after them, make use of those words,* ἀπὸ ξύλου à ligno, *which are not to be found either in the* Greek *or* Latine *Translation, from whence they seem to produce them; nor is there any thing like them in the Original, or any Translation extant, nor the least mention or footstep of them in the* Catena Græcorum Patrum. Justine Martyr *indeed accused the* Jews *for razing the words* ἀπὸ τῦ ξύλυ *out of the text.* Ἀπὸ τῦ ἐπιγνόντος ἢ πίστιν ἀλαμὲν ἐδιδάβιλ λοχδόντων λόγων λέξις βραχείας ἀφείλοντο, ἀπὸ τῦ ξύλυ· εἰρημένης ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τῦ ξύλυ, *but first he doth not accuse them for razing it out of the Originall* Hebrew, *for his discourse is onely to shew that they abus'd the* LXX. *Secondly, though the* Jews *had razed it out of their own, it appeareth not how they should have gotten it out of the Bibles in the Christians hands, in which those words are not to be found.* † Zach. 12. 10. *These words of* Zachary *are clear in the Originall* והביטו אלי את אשר דקרו, *although the* LXX. *have made an other sense,* ἐμβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, *by translating* את אשר ἀνθ' ὧν, eo quod, *as also the* Chaldee *Paraphrase* על די, *with the* Arabick *version; and the* Syriack *another yet, by rendring it* per eum quem, *as if they should look upon one, and pierce another: yet the plain construction of* את אשר *is nothing else but* quem, *relating to the person in the affix of the precedent* אלי, *who being the same with him who immediately before promiseth to poure upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the* Jews *might avoid, they read it not* אלי *but* אלין, *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* Syriack *and* Arabick *translations. Nor can the* Rabins *shift this place, because it was anciently by the* Jews *interpreted of the* Messias, *as themselves confesse. So* R. Solomon Jarchi *upon the place,* רומז לפרשהו על משיח בן יוסף, 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* S. John *did apply it to our Saviour according to the acknowledged exposition. And in* Bereshith Rabba *we are clearly taught thus much; for unto that question,* Who art thou, O great mountain? Zac. 4. 7. *he answereth,* הר הגדול זה משיח בן דוד the great mountain is the Messias the Son of David. *And he proves it from,* Grace grace unto it, חן חן לה ותחנונים שהוא נותן because *he giveth grace and supplications, as it is written* Zach. 12. 10.

shewes that he speaks of the Son of God, which was to be the Son of man, and by our nature liable to vulneration;

and withall foretells the piercing of his body: which being added to that prediction in the [a] Psalmes, "*they pierced my hands and my feet*, clearly represenleth and foretelleth to us the death upon the Crosse, to which the hands and feet of the person crucified were affixed with nails. And because these Prophesies appeared so particular and clear, and were so properly applied by that Disciple whom our Saviour lov'd, and to whom he made a singular applicarion even upon the Crosse; therefore the *Jews* have used more then ordinary industry and artifice to elude these † two predictions, but in vain. For these two Prophets, *David* and *Zachary*, manifestly did foretell the particular punishment of crucifixion.

[a] Psal. 22. 17. "*This Translation indeed seemes something different from the* Hebrew *Text as now we read it*, כארי ידי ורגלי sicut leo, manus meas & pedes meos. *But it was not always read as now it is. For* R. Jacob *the son of* Chajim *in* Massoreth *magna*, סעורת אות האלף, ordine אד, *testifieth that he found* כחוב בקצת ספרים כריקים, *in some correct copies*, כחוב, *written in the Text* כארו, *but* כרו *read, and therefore written in the margin* כארי. *The same is testified by the* Masorah *on* Num. 24. 9. *citing the words of this Text, and adding* כרו כחיב. *and* Johannes Isaac Levita *confirmeth it by his own experience, who had seen in an ancient Copy* כארו *in the text, and* כארי *in the margin. It was anciently therefore without question written* כארו, *as appeareth not only by the* LXX. *who translated it* ὤρυξαν, foderunt, *and* Aquila, *who rendred it* ἤμρυναν, fœdarunt, *in the same sense with that of* Virgil,

Obscœnas pelagi ferrò fœdare volucres.

and the old Syriac, *which translateth it* בזעו transfixerunt; *but also by the lesse, or marginall* Masorah, *which noteth that the word* כארי *is found written alike in two places, this and* Esay 38. 18. *but in diverse significations. wherefore being in* Esay *it manifestly signifieth,* sicut leo, *it must not signifie the same in this, and being the* Jews *themselves pretend to nothing else, it followeth that it be still read as it was,* כארו, *and translated* foderunt. *From whence it also appeareth that it is was one of the* 18. *places, which were altered by the Scribes.* † *For the* Masorah *in severall places confesseth that* 18. *places in the Scriptures have bin altered by the Scribes, and when they come to reckon the places, they mention but* 16. *the other two without question are those concerning the crucifixion of the* Messias, Psal. 22. 17. *and* Zach. 12. 10. *For that of* Zachary, *a* Jew *confessed it to* Mercerus; *and that of* David *wesh. wed before to be the other.*

It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by types, and promulgated by prophesies, that the promised *Messias* was to be *crucified*. And it is as certain that our Jesus, the Christ

Chriſt whom we worſhip, and from whom we receive that honour to be named Chriſtians, was really & truly *crucified*. It was firſt the wicked deſigne of *Judas*, who *betrayed* him to that death: it was the malicious cry of the obdurate *Jews*, *crucifie him, crucifie 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 ſouldiers, the † Inſtruments commonly uſed in inflicting that puniſhment, who *led him away to crucifie him*: he underwent thoſe previous paines which cuſtomarily antecede that ſuffering, as *flagellation, and bearing of the Croſſe; for [a] *Pilate when he had ſcourged Jeſus, delivered him to be crucified: [b] and he bearing his Croſſe went forth into Golgotha*. They carried him forth out of the city, as by "cuſtome in that kind of death they were wont to doe, and there between two malefactors, ·.· uſually by the *Romans* condemned to that puniſhment, they *crucified* him. And that he was truly faſtened

Mat. 26. 2.

Joh. 19. 16. Luc 23. 24.

Mat. 27. 31.

† *That the ſouldiers did execute the ſentence of death given by the Roman Magiſtrates in their provinces, and not onely in the Camp, is evident out of the Hiſtories of that Nation.*

* Sciendum eſt, Romanis Pilatum legibus miniſtraſſe, quibus ſancitum eſt, ut qui crucifigitur, prius flagellis verberetur. *S. Hieron.* ad Mat. 27. 26. *To which* Lucian *alludes in his own condemnation:* Ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀγεσκολοπίσθαι δοκεῖ αὐτὸν, νὴ Δία, μαστιγωθέντα γὰ πρότερον. Lucian. *in Piſcatore.* Multi occiſi, multi capti, alii verberati crucibus affixi. *Liv. l.* 34. *And l.* 28. Ad palum deligatus, lacerato virgis tergo, cervicem cruci Romanæ ſubjiciam. *So* Curtius *reports of* Alexander; Omnes verberibus affectos ſub ipſis radicibus Petræ crucibus juſsit affigi. *Thus were the* Jews *themſelves us'd, who caus'd our Saviour to be ſcourg'd and crucified:* μαστιγώσαντες καὶ πρόσθεν ἅπαντα τὸν σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀνεσταύρωσαν Joſeph. *Excid.* l. 5. c. 32. a Mat. 27. 26. b Joh. 19. 17. " *This was obſerved both by the* Jews *and* Romans, *that their capitall puniſhments were inflicted without their cities. And that particularly was obſerved in the puniſhment of Crucifixion.* Plautus,

Credo ego iſthuc extemplo tibi
Eſſe eundum actutum extra urbem diſpeſsis manibus,
Patibulum cum habebis.

Tully, Cum Mamertini more atque inſtituto ſuo crucem fixiſſent poſt urbem in via Pompeia. ∴ *Theeves and Robbers were uſually by the* Romans *puniſhed with this death.* Τοὺς Cæſar *us'd his Pirates,* τοὺς λῃστὰς ἅπαντας ἀνεσταύρωσεν. Plut. *in Vita.* Imperator provinciæ juſsit Latrones crucibus affigi. *Petron. Satyr.* Latronem iſtum, miſerorum pignorum meorum peremptorem, cruci affigatis. *Apuleius de Aur. Aſin. l.* 3. Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? ut ſuſpendatur.

tur. *Sen. Epiſt. 7. Where* ſuſpendi *is as much as* crucifigi, *and is ſo to be underſtood in all* Latine *authors which wrote before the dayes of* Conſtantine. Famoſos latrones in his locis ubi graſſati ſunt furca figendos compluribus placuit. *Calliſt. l.* 38. de pœnis, *where* furca figendos *is put for* crucifigendos, *being ſo altered by* Tribonianus, *who becauſe* Conſtantine *had taken away the puniſhment, took alſo the name out of the Law.*

faſtened to the Croſſe, appears by the ſatisfaction given
Joh. 20. 25. to doubting *Thomas*, who ſaid, *Except I ſhall ſee in his hands the print of the nayles, and put my finger into the print of the nayles, I will not believe*: and our Saviour
27. ſaid unto him, *Reach 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 ſond † Hereſie which made *Simon* the *Cyrenian* not onely bear the Croſſe, but endure crucifixion, for our Saviour. We therefore inferre 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 undergoe thoſe ſufferings, which were pretypified and foretold, upon the Croſſe.

† *This was the peculiar Hereſie of* Baſilides, *a man ſo ancient, that he hated to follow* Glaucias *as his Maſter, who was the Diſciple of S.* Peter. *And* Irenæus *hath declared this particularity of his:* Quapropter neque paſſum eum, & Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portaſſe crucem ejus pro eo, & hunc ſecundum ignorantiam & errorem crucifixũ transfiguratum ab eo, uti putaretur ipſe eſſe Ieſus, & ipſum autem Ieſum Simonis accepiſſe formam, & ſtantem irriſiſſe eos. *Adv. Hær. l.* 1. *c.* 23. *and* Tertullian *of the ſame* Baſilides: Hunc, (Chriſtum) paſſum à Judæis non eſſe, ſed vice ipſius Simonem crucifixum eſſe: unde nec in eum credendum eſſe qui ſit crucifixus, ne quis confiteatur in Simonem credidiſſe. *De Præſc. adv. Hær. c.* 46. *From theſe it is the ſame delivered by* Epiphanius *Hær.* 24. *and by S.* Aug. *Hær.* 4.

Being thus fully aſſured that the *Meſſias* was to be, and that our Chriſt was truly crucified; it thirdly concerns us to underſtand what was the nature of crucifixion, what the particularityes of ſuffering which he endured on the Croſſe. Nor is this now ſo eaſily underſtood as once it was. For being a *Roman* puniſhment, it was continued

in

in that Empire while it remained heathen; but when the Emperours themſelves received Chriſtianity, and the towring eagles reſign'd the flags unto the Croſſe, this puniſhment was † forbidden by the ſupreme authority, out of a due reſpect and pious honour to the death of Chriſt. From whence it came to paſſe, that ſince it hath been diſuſed univerſally for ſo many hundred yeares, it hath not bin ſo rightly conceived as it was before, when the generall 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 expreſſe it, it were enough to ſay that Chriſt was *crucified*: but being the moſt uſuall or * originall word doth not of it ſelf declare the figure of the tree, or manner of the ſuffering, it will be neceſſary to repreſent it by ſuch expreſſions as we find partly in the Evangelicall relations, partly in ſuch repreſentations as are left us in thoſe Authors whoſe eyes were daily witneſſes of ſuch executions.

† *This is obſerved by S. Auſtin, Serm. 18. de Verbis Dom.* Quia ipſe honoraturus erat fideles ſuos in fine hujus ſæculi, prius honoravit crucem in ſæculo, ut terrarum principes credentes in eum prohiberent aliquem nocentium cruciſigi. *And Tract. 36. in Joh. ſpeaking of this particular puniſhment;* Modo in pœnis reorum non eſt apud Romanos: ubi enim Domini crux honorata eſt, putatum eſt quod & reus honoraretur ſi cruciſigeretur. *whence it appears, firſt, that in the dayes of S. Auſtin Crucifixion was diſuſed: ſecondly, that it was prohibited by the ſecular Princes. But when it was firſt prohibited, or by whom, he ſheweth not. It is therefore to be obſerved, that it was firſt forbidden by the firſt chriſtian Emperour,* Conſtantine *the Great: of whom* Sozomenus *gives this relation;* Ἀμέλει τὸ παλαιὸν νενομισμένον Ῥωμαίοις τὸν τῶν κακούργων θάνατον ἀπεῖπε ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τὸν σταυρὸν τὸν σωτήριον. *l. 1. c. 8.*

The

* *The Originall word in the New Teſt. for the tree on which our Saviour ſuffer'd is* σταυρὸς, *and the action or* σταύρωσις, *the active* σταυῶ, *and the paſſive* σταυοῦμαι. *Now* σταυὸς, *from which the reſt mentioned are manifeſtly derived, hath of it ſelf originally no other ſignification then of a* ſtake. *As we find it firſt us'd by* Homer,

Ὀδυσ. ξ'. Σταυρὸς δ' ἐκτὸς ἔλασσε διαμπερὲς ἔνδον ἰόντα,
Πυκνὸς καὶ δαμάσας, τὸ μέλαν δρυὸς ἀμφιτμηθέντας.

Ἰλιαδ. ω'. Ἀμφὶ δ' ἃ μεγάλῳ αὐλὴν πλήσαν ἄκλῃ
Σταυροῖσιν πυκινοῖσιν.

These are the same which Homer *elsewhere calls* σκόλοπες, *and the ancient Grammarians render each by other. As* Eustathius, Σταυροί, ὀρθὰ καὶ ἀπηκυιωμένα ξύλα, οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ σκόλοπες λέγονται, ἀφ' ὧν τὸ ἀνασκολοπίζειν, καὶ ἀνασαυροῦν. *so be expounding* σαυρὸς, *and in the same manner expounding* σκόλοπες, λέγων ὅτι οἱ τοιοῦτοι σκόλοπες καὶ σαυροί, ὃν τύπον τὸ ἀνασκολοπίζειν καὶ ἀνασαυροῦν. *In the same manner* Hesychius, Σταυροί, οἱ καταπεπηγότες σκόλοπες, χάραγες. *and,* Σκόλοπες, ὀρθία (*l.* ὀρθὰ) καὶ ὀξέα ξύλα, σαυροὶ, χάραγες. *Besides they all agree in the same Etymology,* ἀπὸ τῆς ἴσης ὁδοῦ, *and therefore always take it for a straight standing stake, pale or palisadoe. Thus* Καλέουτες *in* Antiphon *are briefly rendred* ὀρθὰ ξύλα. *but more expressly thus by* Etymologus; Καλέουτες, κυρίως οἱ ἰσόπλευροι, κατὰχρησιν δὲ καὶ τὰ καταπεπηγότα ξύλα, ἃ καὶ σαυρὸς καλεῖται. *This is the undoubted signification of* σαυρὸς, *in vain denyed by* Salmasius, *who will have it first to signifie the same with* furca, *and then with* crux, *first the figure of* Υ, *and then of* Τ. *Whereas all antiquity renders it no other then as a straight and sharp stake. In which signification it came at first to denote this punishment, the most simple and prime* σαύρωσις *or* ἀνασκολόπισις *being upon a single piece of wood, a* defixus & erectus stipes. *And the* Greeks *which wrote the* Roman *history, used the word* σαυρὸς *as well for their* palus, *as their* crux. *As when* Antony *beheaded* Antiochus *the King of the* Jews, Dion *thus begins to describe his execution,* Ἀντίοχον ἐμαστίγωσε σαυρῷ προσδήσας. *not that he crucified him, as* Baronius *mistakes; but that he put him to another death after the* Roman *custome, as those dyed in* Livy, *l.* 28. Deligati ad palum, virgisque cæsi, & securi percussi: *so that* σαυρῷ προσδῆσαι *is* ad palum deligare. *Thus were the heads of men said* ἀνασαυροῦσθαι, *as of* Niger *and* Albinus *in* Dio *and* Herodian; *which cannot be meant but of a single* palus: *and we read in* Ctesias *how* Amytis *put* Inarus *to death,* ἀνεσάυρωσε μὲν ὑπὸ τεσσάρων σαυρῶν, *not that he crucified him upon three crosses, but pierc'd his body with three stakes fastened in the gound, and sharp'd at the upper end; as appears by the like* Persian *punishment inflicted by* Parysatis *on* Mesabates, *delivered by* Plutarch *in* Artaxerxe, προσέπηξεν ὀρθίοις ζῶντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα πλαγιον διὰ τριῶν σαυρῶν ἀνάπηξαι, τὸ δὲ κῶλα χερὶς διαπεπαλεῦσθαι. *which the* Latine *Translator renders in* tres sustolli cruces, *(a thing impossible) whereas it was to be transversly fastened to three stakes piercing the body lying, and thrust down upon them; which in the Excerpta of* Ctesias *is deliver'd onely in the word* ἀνεσαυρῶσθαι.

The form then of the Crosse on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple but a compounded figure, according to the custome of the *Romans*, by whose Procurator he was condemn'd to dye. 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

† *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,*

erect, *the other transverse*; *the first to which the body was applied*, *the second to which the hands were fastened. These two as the chief parts of the Crosse are several wayes expressed. First*, *by the Jews*, *who had no one word in their language particularly to expresse that punishment*, (*as being not mentioned in the Law*, *or at all in use amongst them*,) *and therefore call it by a double name*, *expressing the conjunction of these beams*, שתי וערב *stamen & subtegmen*, *the warp and the woof.* The Greeks *expresse the same by the letter* Ταῦ, *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* Ταῦ, *because Tyrants in imitation of that first made the* (τρεῖς. Τῷ γὰρ τότε σώματί φασι τὸν τυραννον ἀκολουθήσαντας καὶ μιμησαμένους τὸ πλάσμα, ὕστερα σχήματι ἰσότιμον ξύλα τεκτήναντας αἰσχρῶς αἰσχολοπίζειν ἐπ' αὐτά. *Jud. Vocal.* Ipsa est enim litera Græcorum Tau, nostra autem T, species crucis. *Tertul.* adv. Marc. *l.* 3. *c.* 22. S. Jerome *affirmes the same of the* Samaritan Tau; *but there is no similitude to be found in that which is now in use*, *or any other Orientall*, *onely in the* Coptick *Alphabet* Salebdi, *that is the crosse* Di. *These two parts of the Crosse are otherwise expressed by the mast and yard of a ship.* So Justine Martyr; Θάλασσα μὲν γὰρ ἄτιμος ἦν, μὴ τοῦτο τὸ τρόπαιον ὃ καλοῦσι ἴσον ὂν τῇ νηῒ σῶον μένῃ. *and* Tertullian; Antenna navis crucis pars est. *and* Minutius Felix; Signum sane Crucis naturaliter visimus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur. *and* Max. Taurin. Cum à nautis scinditur mare, prius arbor erigitur, velum distenditur, ut cruce Domini facta aquarum fluentia rumpantur. *Now because the extremities of the* Antenna *are a kind of* κέρατα (*as* Virgil *that great master of proprieties*, Cornua velatarum obvertimus antemnarum,) *therefore in* Greek κεραία *is* antemna: *and from thence the* Greek *Fathers applied the words of our Saviour*, Mat. 5. 18. Ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται, *to the Crosse of Christ*; τῷ γὰρ σταυρῷ Ἰῶτά ἐστι τὸ ὀρθὸν ξύλον, καὶ κεραία τὸ πλάγιον. *Because* Ἰῶτα *is like the straight piece or mast of the crosse*, *and* κεραία *the yard or transverse part*, *therefore some of the Ancients interpreted this place of the Cross*, *sayes* Theophylact *on the place. and* Gregor. Nyssen *l.* 2. *de vita Mosis*: Ἀληθῶς γὰρ τοῖς καθαρῶν διωμένοις ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ κατὰ τὸν νόμον μάλιστα τὸ χαρακτὴρ τὸν σταυρὸν διαφαίνεται μυστήριον. Διό φησί που τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν τοῦ νόμου τὸ ἰῶτα καὶ ἡ κεραία ἀπαρέγκλητον· σημαίνων διὰ τῆς εἰρημένων τὴν τε ὀρθὴν γραμμὴν, καὶ τὴν κάθετον, ἐξ ὧν τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ καλαχρᾶται. *Not that this is the true interpretation of that place*, *for* κεραία *signifies a part of a letter*, *as in* Apollonius *Syntax. l.* 1, *p.* τὸ ἄ τὴν κεραίαν ἁπλῆν· *but by that they testifie their apprehension of the figure of a Crosse. And this similitude of the Mast and Yard leads to the consideration of that part of the erected pale which was eminent above the transverse beam. For as the* καρχήσιον *was above the* κεραία, *so the* stipes *did extend it self above the* patibulum. *And this is evident by those expressions which make the two beams have four sides*, *and four extremities*, *as two lines cutting each other at equall angles needs must have. These* Theophanes *and* Gregory Nyssen *call* ἴδε ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου πέντε πέρατα προβολάς, Damascen τὰ πέντε ἄκρα τοῦ σταυροῦ διὰ τοῦ μέσου κέντρου κραθέντα καὶ συσφιγχθέντα. *Hence* Nonnus *calls the Crosse* δόρυ τετράδελφον. *And of these* 4. *parts the Fathers interpret the heigth*, *and bredth*, *and length*, *and depth*, *mentioned by* S. Paul

S. Paul *Eph.* 3. As Gregory Nyssen: Ἐφεσίοις γὰρ τὸ πᾶν διαπαῤῥήδην τε καὶ σαφῶς ἐκφαίνων τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ κατεχρήσατο .... ὕψος καὶ βάθος καὶ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καταγομένων, ἑκάστῳ χαρίζων τῷ κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ διαφερόντων ἰδίοις περιγραφεῖσιν ὀνόμασιν· ὡς τὸ μὲν ἄνω μέρος ὕψος εἰπεῖν, βάθος δὲ τὸ κάτω τὴν συμβολὴν ἀποκαλοῦντα, τὴν δὲ ἑκάτερον καθ' ἑκάτερα χεῖρα τοῦ ξύλου μῆκος τε καὶ πλάτος ὀνόμασι διασημαίνων. *Contra* Eunom. *Orat.* 4. & *idem, Catech. Orat. c.* 32. & *in Resurr. Orat.* 1. *And* S. Augustine *makes the same interpretation*; In hoc mysterio figura crucis ostenditur: *which he thus expresseth*, Latitudo est in eo ligno quod transversum desuper figitur; .... longitudo in eo quod in ipso ligno usque ad terram conspicuum est; .... altitudo est in ea ligni parte quæ ab illo quod transversùm figitur sursù versus relinquitur, hoc est ad corpus crucifixi, &c. *Epist.* 120. & alibi sæpe. *These* 4. *parts are severally expressed by the Ancients, and particularly by the figure of a man with his hands stretch'd forth; which is the most proper similitude, because the Crosse was first made and adapted to that figure.* Quod caput emicat, quod spina dirigitur, quod humerorum obliquatio cornuat, si statueris hominem manibus expansis, imaginem crucis feceris. *Tertull. adv. Nat. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

top thereof; and beside these two cutting each other transversly at right angles (so that the erected part extended it self above the transverse) there was also another * piece of wood infixed into and standing out from that which was erected and 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 nail'd: upon the lower part coming out from the erected piece his sacred body rested, and his feet were transfixed and fastened with nailes: his head being pressed with a Crown of thorns, was applied

* *Beside the direct and transverse part of the Crosse with their* 4. *extremities, which onely usually are considered, and represented in the figures, we must find yet another part, and a fifth extremity.* Irenæus *giving severall examples of the number* 5. *delivers it plainly thus, l.* 2. *c.* 42. Ipse habitus crucis fines & summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudine, duos in latitudine, & unum in medio, ubi requiescit qui clavis affigitur. *Beside therefore the* 4. *extremities of the direct & transverse beams, there was a fifth* ἄκρον in medio, (viz. *of the erected* palus) *on which the crucified body rested. This fifth part of the Crosse fastned to the* arrectarius stipes *was before* Irenæus *acknowledged and described by* Just. Martyr *under the notion of the horn of the* Rhinoceros, *taken to be a figure or type of the Crosse.* Μονοκέρωτος γὰρ κέρατα ὑδαγὸς ἀμφὶ τεράγμασ' ἡ σχῆμα ἔχοι ἂν τις εἰπεῖν καὶ ἀποδεῖξαι, εἰ μὴ τῷ πᾶσι τὸν σαφῆ διείκυσιν. ὄρθιον γὰρ τὸ ἐν ὅτι ξύλον, ἀφ' οὗ ὅτι τὸ ἀνάστατον μέρος εἰς κέρας ἀποτερμίζον, ὅταν τὸ ἀμφὶ ξύλον προσαρμοσθῇ, καὶ ἑκατέρωθεν ὡς κέρατα τῷ ἐνὶ κέρατι παρεζευγμένα τὰ ἄκρα φαίνῃ· καὶ τὸ ὂν τῷ μέσῳ πεπηγὸς μόνον ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ ὀξὺ ἔστιν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐπικεῖται οἱ σταυρώ-

σανίδιον, ἢ βάλετε ὡς κέρας ἢ αὐτὸ ζυὸ ἄγγος κέρατι ὅμοιον ἢ πεπηγμένον. Dial. cum Tryphone. *where besides the* ὀρθὸν ξύλον, *or* erectarius stipes, *and the* ἄγχος ξύλον, *or* transversarium lignum, *there is a third,* τὸ ἐν μέσῳ πεπηγὸς μόριον, *fastned in the middle;* ἐφ' ᾧ ὑποκάτω εἰ σανίδιον, *sayes he;* ubi requiescit qui clavis affigitur, *sayes* Irenæus. *So* Tertullian, *l.* 1. *adv. Nationes, c.* 12. Pars crucis, & quidem major, est omne robur quod directa statione defigitur. Sed nobis tota crux imputatur, cum antemna scilicet sua, & illo sedilis excessu. *where the excessus is the* τὸ ὄκλον, *signifying the nature, as the* sedile *signifieth the use of the part. Which in another place, in imitation of* Justinus, *he refers unto the Typicall Unicorn.* Nam & in antemna navis, quæ crucis pars est, extremitates cornua vocantur; Unicornis autem medio stipite palus. *Adv.* Marcion. *l.* 3. *c.* 18. *& Adv. Jud. c.* 10. *To this* sedile *in the cross* Mœcenas *seemeth to allude in those words in* Seneca, Hanc mihi vel acuta subsidem cruce sustine. *And* Seneca *himself does expound him;* Sustigas licet & acutam sessuro crucem subdas, est tanti vulnus suum premere, & patibulo pendere districtum. *Epist.* 101. *Of this* Innocentius *the first also speaks* Serm. 1. *de uno Martyr.* Fuerunt in Cruce Dominica ligna quatuor; stipes erectus, & lignum transversum, truncus suppositus, & titulus superpositus. *This* Gregorius Turonensis, *after the use of the Cross was long omitted, interpreted of* suppedaneum, *a piece of wood fastened under the feet of him that suffered.* De glo. Marty. *c.* 6. Clavorum ergo Dominicorum gratia quod quatuor fuerint hæc est ratio. Duo sunt affixi in palmis & duo in plantis: & quæritur cur plantæ affixæ sint, quæ in cruce sancta dependere vix sunt potius quam stare. Sed in stipite erecto foramen factum manifestum est. Pes quoque parvulæ tabellæ in hoc foramen insertus est. Super hanc vero tabulam tanquam stantis hominis sacræ affixæ sunt plantæ.

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, in *Hebrew, Greek*, and *Latine* Characters, the accusation, according to the *Roman* custome: *and the writing was,* JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS. Thus S. Luke ἐπιγραφὴ, *by* S. Matthew αἰτία, *by* S. Mark ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας, *and by* S. John τίτλος. *From all which we may collect, that there was an Inscription written over the head of our Saviour, signifying the accusation and pretended crime for which he was condemned to that death.* Glossæ Vet. Αἰτία, causa, materia, titulus. *In the language of* Suetonius, Titulus, qui causam pœnæ indicavit. *This was done according to the* Roman *custome, as we read in* Dio *l.* 54. *of the son of* Cæpio, τὸν ὑὸν τὸν πεφονευκότα αὐτὸν διά τε τῆς ἀγορᾶς μέσης μετὰ γραμμάτων, τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς δικαιώσεως αὐτῆς δηλούντων, διαγαγόντες, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀνασταυρώσαντες. *This title was written upon a table, and that table fastened to the upper part of the Crosse.* The Syriack, Arabick, *and* Persian *Translations render* τίτλον *expressly a*

* *That which was written over the head of our Saviour is called simply by*

Table. And Hesychius, Τίτλος, ξύλον ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον, (*not* ἔχων, *as it is printed*) *not the Inscription it self, but that upon which the Inscription was written. Thus the Epistle of the* French *unto the Christians in Asia represents the Inscription of the Martyr* Attalus *in a Table:* φέρεται ξύλῳ τῷ ἔμπροσθεν προτεταγμένῳ πίναξ, αὐτὸν τοῦτον ἔχοντι τὸν, ὃν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐπεγράψατο Ῥωμαῖοι, Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἄτταλος ὁ Χριστιανός. Euseb. *l.* 5. *c.* 1. *And* Sozomen *describing the invention of the Crosse by* Helena, *sayes there were three severall crosses in the same place;* καὶ χωρὶς ἄλλο ξύλον ὂν μέρος λευκώματος ῥήματα καὶ γεγραμμένα Ἑβραϊκοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς τε καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς. *This* Nicephorus *call* λευκὴν σανίδα, *which is the proper interpretation of* λεύκωμα. Suidas, Λεύκωμα, πίναξ (*Etymol.* πίναξ) γύψῳ ἀλειφόμενον πρὸς γραφὴν πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιτήδειος. Hesyc. Σανίς, Σῦρε, λεύκωμα (*as* Julius Pollux *joines* σανὶς *and* λεύκωμα *together*) ὃν ἐφ' αἷς γραφαὶ Ἀθήνησιν ἐγγέφουσι πρὸς τὸ κακοῦργος. πίσσα ἢ καὶ ταῦρε, leg. σανίς. *His meaning is, that such a* λεύκωμα *as contained the accusation or crime of malefactors was placed upon the crosse on which they suffered: and without question he spake this in reference to our Saviours crosse, because he used in a manner the same words with* S. John: τίθησι ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, *sayes* Hesyc. ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, *saith* S. John. *It was therefore a Table of wood whited and fastened to the top of the Crosse, on which the Accusation or Crime was written, as it is expressed by* Nicephorus. Σανὶς λευκὴ ἣ βασιλεὺς ἦν Ἰουδαίων γράφων ὁ Πιλάτος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐτίθει, ὃν οἵδε φίλης βασιλεὺς ἦν Ἰουδαίων τὸν σταυρωθέντα κηρύττων. *Hist. Eccl. l.* 8. 29.

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 passe the sentence of death upon him. It was not any opposition to the law of *Moses*, not any danger threatned to the Temple, but pretended sedition, and affectation of the Crown objected, which moved *Pilate* to condemn him. The *Jews* did thus accuse him, *a We found this fellow perverting the Nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King.* And when *Pilate* sought to release him, they cryed out saying, *b If thou let this man go thou art not Cæsars friend: whosoever maketh himself a King speaketh against Cæsar.* This moved *Pilate* to passe sentence upon him, and, because that punishment of the Crosse was by the † *Roman* custome used for that crime, to crucifie him.

a Luc. 23. 2.

b Joh. 19. 12.

† Auctores seditionis aut tumultus, pro qualitatis dignitate, aut in crucem tolluntur, aut bestiis objiciuntur. *Paulus. l.* 5. *tit.* 22.

Two

Two things are moſt obſervable in this Croſſe; the acerbity, and the ignominy of the puniſhment: for of all the *Roman* wayes of execution it was † moſt painfull, and moſt ſhamefull. Firſt, the exquiſite paines 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 nayles; which cauſed, not a ſuddain diſpatch, but a lingring & tormenting death. Inſomuch that the *Romans*, who moſt uſ'd this puniſhment, did in their language deduce their expreſſions of pains and * cruciation from the Croſſe. And the acerbity of this puniſhment appears, in that thoſe who were of any merciſull diſpoſition would "firſt cauſe ſuch as were adjudged to the Croſſe to be ſlain, and then to be crucified.

† Illa morte pejus nihil fuit inter omnia genera mortium. *S. Auguſt.* in Joh. Tract. 36. Tully *calls it* crudeliſſimum teterrimumque ſupplicium; *and* Auſonius, pœnæ extremum.

* Ubi dolores acerrimi exagitant, cruciatus vocatur, à cruce nominatus; pendentes enim in ligno crucifixi, clavis ad lignum pedibus manibuſque confixi, producta morte necabantur. Non enim crucifigi hoc erat occidi, ſed diu vivebatur in cruce; non quia longior vita elegebatur, ſed quia mors ipſa protendebatur, ne dolor citius finiretur. S. *Aug.* Tract. in Johan. 36. *To this Etymology did* Terence *allude in thoſe words*, & illis crucibus, quæ nos noſtramque adoleſcentiam habent deſpicatui, & quæ nos ſemper omnibus cruciant modis.

" *As it was obſerved of* Julius Cæſar: Piratas à quibus captus eſt, cum in ditionem redegiſſet, quoniam ſuffixurum ſe cruci ante juraverat, jugulari prius juſſit, deinde ſuffigi. *Suet. l.* 1.

As this Death was moſt dolorous and full of acerbity, ſo was it alſo moſt infamous and full of ignominy. The *Romans* themſelves accounted it a † ſervile puniſhment, and inflicted it upon their ſlaves and fugitives. It was a high crime to put ſhat diſhonour upon any free man; and the greateſt

† Vulcatius Gallicanus *relateth of* Avidius Caſſius, *in the caſe of ſome Centurions which had been proſperous, but in fighting without Orders given*; Rapi eos juſsit, & in crucem tolli, ſervilique ſupplicio affici, quod exemplum non extabat. *And* Juvenal *ſpeaks with relation to this cuſtome*, Pone crucem ſervo. So Palæſtrio *in* Plautus, Niſi quidem illa nos volt, qui ſervi ſumus, Propter ſuum amorem omnes crucibus contubernales dari. *And again*, Noli minitari, ſcio crucem futuram mihi ſepulchrum. Ibi majores mei ſiti ſunt, pater, avus, proavus, abavus. So *in* Terence, *Pam.* Quid meritus es? *Da.* Cruce. *and* Horace, Si quis eum ſervum pati-

patinam qui tollere juſſus, Semeſos piſces, tepidumque ligurrierit jus, In cruce ſuffigat. *So* Capitolinus *of* Pertinax, in crucem ſublatis talibus ſervis; *and* Herodian *of* Macrinus, Δοῦλοι ὄντες δεσπότας καταγγελοῦσιν. *This Puniſhment of the Croſſe did ſo properly belong to the Slaves, that when ſervants and free-men were involved alike in the ſame crime, they were very careſull to make a diſtinction in their death, according to their condition:* ut quiſque liber aut ſervus, ſuæ fortunæ à quoque ſumptum ſupplicium eſt. *Liv. l.* 3. *And then the Servants were alwayes crucified. As* Servius *obſerves among the* Lacedæmonians: Servos patibulis ſuffixerunt, filios ſtrangulavere, nepotes fugavere. *Æneid.* 3. Novercæ quidem perpetuum indicitur exilium, ſervus vero patibulo ſuffigitur. *Apul. Metam. l.* 10. *Thus in the combuſtion at* Rome *upon the death of* Julius Cæſar; Ἀμυθήτους ἀνῃρέθησαν ἔνιοι, καὶ συλληφθέντες ἕτεροι ἐκρεμάσθησαν ὄντες δεσπόται, οἱ δὲ ἐλεύθεροι κατὰ κρημνῶν κατῆρξαν. Appia. *de Bell. civil. l.* 3. Ea nocte ſpeculatores prehenſi ſervi tres, & unus ex legione vernacula: ſervi ſunt in crucem ſublati, militi ceruices abſciſſæ. *Hirtius* l. de Bell. Hiſpan. *So* Africanus: gravius in Romanos quam in Latinos tranſfugas animadvertit; illos enim, tanquam patriæ fugitivos, crucibus affixit, hos, tanquam perfidos ſocios, ſecuri percuſsit. *Valer. Max. l.* 2. *This puniſhment of the croſſe was ſo proper unto Servants, that* ſervile ſupplicium *in the Language of the* Romans *ſignifies the ſame: & though in the words of* Vulcatius *before cited, they goe both together, as alſo in* Capitolinus, Nam & in crucem milites tulit, & ſervilibus ſuppliciis ſemper affecit; *yet either is ſufficient to expreſſe crucifixion: as in* Tacitus, malam potentiam ſervili ſupplicio expiavit, *Hiſt. 4. and again,* Sumptum de eo ſupplicium in ſervilem modum, *Hiſt. 2. And therefore when any ſervants were made free, they were put out of fear of ever ſuffering this puniſhment.* An vero ſervos noſtros horum ſuppliciorum omnium metu dominorum benignitas una vindicta liberabit, vos à verberibus, ab unco, crucis denique terrore, neque res geſtæ, neque acta ætas, neque noſtri honores vindicabunt? *Cic. Orat. pro Rabir.*

† Carnifex, & obductio capitis, & nomen ipſum *crucis*, abſit non modo à corpore civium Romanorum, ſed etiam à cogitatione, oculis, auribus. Harum enim omnium rerum non ſolum eventus atque perpeſsio, ſed etiam conditio, expectatio, mentio denique, indigna cive Romano atque homine libero eſt. *Cic. Orat. pro Rabir.* Facinus eſt vinciri civem Romanum, ſcelus verberare, parricidium necare: quid dicam in crucem tollere, crudeliſsimum teterrimumque ſupplicium? verbo ſatis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo poteſt. *Idem* 5. *in Verrem.*

greateſt indignity which the moſt undeſerving † *Roman* could poſſibly ſuffer in himſelf; or could be contrived to ſhew their deteſtation to ſuch creatures as were below ‖ humane nature. And becauſe when a man is beyond poſſibility

‖ *A. when the Capitoll was betray'd 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.* Eadem de cauſa ſupplicia annua canes pendunt, inter ædem Junonis & Summani vivi in furca ſambucea arbore fixi. *Plin. l.* 29. *c.* 4. Πομπεῖοι μὲν

μίχει γὰρ ἐπὶ μνήμῃ τ τότε συμπαθομένων ἢ τύχῃ, πάσῃ μὲν ἀνίσως μοίρᾳ, χάλω δ μᾶλλα συμπᾶς ἐπὶ τραυμᾶς πολυτελῶς καὶ φαιδίμῳ καθαιρόμ. *Plutarch. de Fort. Rom.*

bility of ſuffering pain, he may ſtill be ſubject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquiſite torments ſome men have taſted the bitterneſſe of death, after that they have in their † breathleſſe corps by vertue 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 Croſſe hath bin thought a ſufficient ignominy to thoſe which dyed, and terrour to thoſe which liv'd to ſee it. Yea where the bodies of the dead have bin 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 Croſſe.

† *As Oroetes the* Perſian, *when he had treacherouſly & cruelly murder'd* Polycrates *the Tyrant of* Samos, ἀπηλείνας Ἄμιν ὐκ ἀξίως ἀπηγήσιος ἀνασαύρωσι. *Herod. l. 3. So*

Antiochus *firſt cut off the head of* Achæus, *and then faſtened his body to a Croſſe.* Ἔδοξε πρῶτον μὲν ἀκρωτηριάσαι τὸν τράχηλον, μετὰ δ ταῦτα λαβὼν καθήλαι ἀποτεμόντες αὐτῶ, καὶ παρὰ βίαν τὰς ὄψεις ἀνάσχοιεν, ἀνασαυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα. "This *was the deſign of* Tarquinius Priſcus, *when the extremity of labour which he laid upon his ſubjects made many lay violent hands upon themſelves*; Paſsim conſcita nece Quiritibus tædium fugientibus, novum & inexcogitatum antea poſtea que, remedium invenit ille Rex, ut omnium ita defunctorum figeret crucibus corpora, ſpectanda civibus ſimul, & feris volucribuſque laceranda. *Plin. l. 36. 15. Who makes this handſome obſervation of it*; Quamobrem pudor Romani nominis propius, qui ſæpe res perditas ſervavit in prælis, tunc quoque ſubvenit; ſed illo tempore impoſuit, tum erubeſcens cum puderet vivos tanquam puditurum eſſet extinctos. "*Thus they uſed* Celſus, *one of the* 30. *Tyrants of* Rome, *as* Trebellius Pollio *teſtifieth*: Novo injuriæ genere imago in crucem ſublata, perſuluante vulgo, quaſi patibulo ipſe Celſus videretur affixus.

It is neceſſary we ſhould thus profeſſe faith in Chriſt *crucified*, as that puniſhment which he choſe to undergoe, as that way which he was pleaſ'd to dye. Firſt, becauſe by this kind of death we may be aſſured that he hath taken upon himſelf, and conſequently from us, the malediction of the Law. For we were all under the curſe; be-

Deut. 27. 26. Gal. 3. 10. cauſe it is expreſly written, *Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to doe them:* and it is certain none of us hath ſo

Gal. 3. 22. 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

Gal. 3, 13. 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 generall curſe, which lay upon all men for the breach of any part of the law, by taking upon him that particular curſe, laid onely upon them which underwent a certain puniſh-

Deut. 21. 13. ment of the Law. For it was written, *Curſed is every one that hangeth on a tree.* Not that Suſpenſion was any of the Capitall puniſhments preſcribed by the law of *Moſes*; not that by any tradition or cuſtome of the *Jews* they were wont to puniſh their malefactors with that death: but ſuch as were puniſhed with death according to the law or cuſtome of the *Jews*, were for the enormity of their fact oftimes after death expoſ'd to the ignominy of a gibbet; and thoſe

† Deut. 21. 22. *If a man have committed a ſin worthy of death, and he be put to* who † being dead were ſo hanged on a tree, were accurſed by the law. Now though Chriſt was not to dye by the ſentence of the *Jews*, who had loſt the ſupreme power in

death, and thou hang him on a tree. In which words, being put to death precedeth being hanged. But I confeſſe, in our Engliſh *tranſlation it hath another ſenſe,* [*and he be to be put to death,*] *as if he were to dye by hanging. And ſo the Vulgar* Latine, Et adjudicatus morti appenſus fuerit patibulo; *as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and ſo his ſentence were ſuſpenſion. But there is no ſuch ſentence contained in the Originall, as the Vulgar, nor futurition of death, as our* Engliſh *Tranſlation mentioneth. The* Hebrew is מוֹת יוּמָת *in Hopha', that is,* interfectus, occiſus, mori factus fuerit; *or, as the* LXX. *clearly tranſlate it,* κ) ἀποθάνῃ.

cauſes capitall, 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 legall curſe belonged, which is *the hanging on a tree.*

For

For he which is crucified, as he is affixed to, ſo he hangeth on the croſſe: and therefore true and formall crucifixion is often named by the generall word † ſuſpenſion; and the *Jews* themſelves doe commonly call our bleſſed Saviour by that very "name to which the curſe is affix'd by *Moſes*.

† *As we before noted on the words of* Seneca. *Thus the* Greeks *do often uſe* κρεμᾶν *for* crucifigere. *For* Curtius *ſpeaking of the taking of* Tyre *by* Alexander, *ſays*, Duo millia crucibus affixa per ingens littoris ſpatium pependerunt. *and* Diodorus Siculus *relating the ame*, Τὰς ϑ' ἡνίας πάντας ὄντας ἐκ ἀλαθείας ἐπὶ λιθίνων ἐκρέμασεν. *And the ſame* Curtius *teſtifies that* Muſicanus *was* in crucem ſublatus: *of whom* Arrianus *ſpeaks thus*; τοῦτον κρεμάσας Ἀλέξανδρος κελεύει ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γῇ. *Thus in the language of the Scriptures*, οἱ ἐπὶ ξύλου κρεμάμενος κακοῦργος *is one of the crucified thieves*, Luc. 23. 39. *and the* Jews *are ſaid to have ſlain our Saviour* κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου, Act. 5. 30. & 10. 39. *The* Latines *likewiſe often uſe the word* ſuſpendere *for* crucifigere. *As* Auſonius *in the* Idyllium *whoſe title is* Cupido crucifixus, *deſcribes him thus*, Hujus in excelſo ſuſpenſum ſtipite Amorem. *And when we read in* Polybius, *that they did* ἀνασαυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα *of* Achæus; Ovid *deſcribes his puniſhment thus*,

Mo e vel intereas capti ſuſpenſus Achæi,
Qui miſer aurifera teſte pependit aqua.

"*The words of* Moſes *are* Deut. 21. 23. קְלֻלַּת אֱלֹהִים תָּלוּי, maledictio Dei ſuſpenſus: *and this word* תָּלוּי, *which is of it ſelf ſimply* ſuſpenſus, *as* 2 Sam. 18. 10. *I ſaw Abſalon* תָּלוּי בָּאֵלָה *hinged on an oak, is ordinarily attributed by the* Jews *to our Saviour, to ſignifie that he was crucified. Hence they term* Chriſtians עוֹבְדֵי וְתָלוּי cultores ſuſpenſi: *and they call the Crucifix* צוּרַת וְתָלוּי figuram ſuſpenſi.

Secondly, it was neceſſary to expreſſe our faith in Chriſt crucified, that we might be aſſured that he hath *aboliſhed in his fleſh the enmity*, even *the law of commandements*; which if he had not done, the ſtrength and power of the whole law had ſtill remain'd. For all the people had ſaid *Amen* to the Curſe, upon every one that kept not the whole law, *and entred into a curſe and into an oath to walk in Gods law, which was given by Moſes the ſervant of God, and to obſerve and doe all the commandements of the Lord their God, and his judgements 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

Eph. 2. 15.

Deut. 27. 26.

Neh. 10. 29.

the condition. But the ſtrongeſt Obligations may be cancell'd; and one ancient cuſtome 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 Croſſe.*

Col. 2. 14.

Thirdly, hereby we are to teſtifie the power of the death of Chriſt working in us after the manner of crucifixion. For we are to be *planted in the likeneſſe 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 confeſſe, 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 croſſe 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.*

Rom. 6. 5, 6.

Gal. 5. 24.

Gal. 6. 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 nailes which pierced his hands and feet, and never left that torturing activity till by their dolorous impreſſions they forced a moſt painfull death, to acknowledge the bitterneſſe of his ſufferings for us, and to aſſure our ſelves that by the * worſt of deaths he hath overcome all kinds of death; and with patience and cheerfulneſſe to endure whatſoever he ſhall think fit to lay upon us, who with all readineſſe and deſire ſuffered farre more for us.

* Mori voluit pro nobis, parùm dicimus: crucifigi dignatus eſt; utque ad mortem crucis obediens factus, elegit extremum & peſſimum genus mortis, qui omnem fuerat ablaturus mortem: de morte peſſima occidit omnem mortẽ. *S. Aug.* Tract. 36. in Johan.

Laſtly, by the ignominy of this puniſhment, and univerſall infamy of that death, we are taught how farre our Saviour deſcended for us, that while we were ſlaves and in bondage unto ſinne, 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 croſſe*: teaching us the glorious doctrine of

† Phil. 2. 7, 8.

† humility,

† humility, and patience in the most vile and abject condition which can befall us in this world; and encouraging us to imitate him [a] *who for the joy that was set before him, endured the crosse, despising the shame*; and withall deterring us from that fearfull sin of falling from him, least we should [b] *crucifie unto our selves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame*; & so become worse then the *Iews* themselves, who crucified the Lord of life without the walls of *Jerusalem*, and for that unparallell'd 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.

† Humilitatis enim magister est Christus, qui humiliavit seipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. *S. Aug.* in Johan. Tract. 51.

a Heb. 12. 2.

b Heb. 6. 6.

∴ Jos. *de Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 28.* Περισλων δ' οἱ στρατιῶται δι' ὀργὴν καὶ μῖσος τὸν ἁλόντας ἄλλον ἄλλῳ σχήματι πρὸς χλεύην· καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος χώρα τε ἐνελείπετο τοῖς σταυροῖς, καὶ σταυροὶ τοῖς σώμασιν.

And now we have made this discovery of the true manner and nature of the crosse 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 obliged to speak thus much: I am really perswaded, and fully satisfied, that the onely-begotten and eternall son of God, Christ Jesus, that he might cancell 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 chearfully submit himself unto the false accusation of the *Jews*, and unjust sentence of *Pilate*, by which he was condemned, according to the *Roman* customs, to the Crosse; and upon that did suffer that servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain, and of the greatest ignominy, despising the shame. And thus I believe in Christ *crucified*.

DEAD.

THough Crucifixion of it self involveth not in it certain death, and he which is fastened to a Crosse is so leisurely to dye, as that he being taken from the same may

live; though when the insulting *Jews* in a malicious derision call'd to our Saviour to *save himself*, and *come down from the Crosse*, 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 fulfill'd the utmost intention of Crucifixion: so that, as we acknowledge him *crucified*, we believe him *dead*.

For the Illustration of which part of the Article, it will be necessary, First, to shew that the *Messias* was to dye; that no sufferings, howsoever-shamefull or painfull, 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 onely 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 then this cannot be necessary to shew we believe that *Christ was dead*.

First then, we must consider what S. *Paul delivered* to the *Corinthians first of all*, and what *also* he *received*, *how that Christ dyed for our sinnes according to the Scriptures*; that the *Messias* was the *Lamb slain before the foundations of the world*, and that his death was severally represented and foretold. For though the sacrificing *Isaac* hath been acknowledged an expresse 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 onely-begotten Son*, when *Isaac* dyed 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 Crosse, and offer'd up to the Father, but not suffer death: yet being *without effu-*

1 Cor. 15. 3.

Heb. 11. 17.

sion

ſion of bloud there is no remiſsion, 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*; we may ſafely affirm the ancient and legall Types did repreſent a Chriſt which was to dye. It was an eſſentiall part of the Paſchall Law, that the Lamb ſhould be ſlain: and in the ſacrifices for ſin, which preſignified a Saviour to *ſanctifie the people with his own bloud, the bodies of the beaſts were burnt without the camp, and their bloud brought into the Sanctuary.* Heb. 11. 19. Heb. 13. 11.

Nor did the Types onely require, but the Propheſies alſo foretell 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.* Which are ſo plain and evident predictions, that the † *Jews* ſhew not the leaſt appearance of probability in their evaſions. Iſa. 53. 7, 8, 10.

† *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, מהארץ חיים היא ארץ ישראל, from the land of the living, that is, the land of Iſrael. *And* D. Kimchi *endeavours to prove that expoſition out of* David, כי נגוד מארץ חיים נאשר גזרה מארצי שנקראת ארץ חיים כמו ארחלך לפני ה׳ בארצו החיים *as if the land of the living muſt be the 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, then that he will ſerve God while he liveth. As* Pſal. 27. 13. I had fainted, unleſſe I had believed to ſee the goodneſſe of the Lord in the land of the living: *and* Iſa. 38. 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 perſwade us that it could not referre 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 dye.*

Being then the obſtinate *Jews* themſelves acknowledge one *Meſſias* was to dye, and that a violent death; being we

have already prov'd, there is but one *Messias* foretold by the Prophets, and shewed by those places which they will not acknowledge, that he was to be slain; it followeth, by their unwilling confessions and our plain probations, that the promised *Messias* was ordain'd to dye: which is our first assertion.

Secondly, we affirm, correspondently to these Types and prophesies, that *Christ our Passeover is slain*, that he whom we believe to be the true and onely *Messias* did really and truly dye. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain, as being secure of any even the least denyall. Jesus of *Nazareth* upon his crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they which wished, they which thirsted for his bloud, they which obtein'd, which effected, which extorted his death, even they believ'd it, even they were satisfied with it: the Chief-Priests, the Scribes and the Pharisees, the Publicans and Sinners, all were satisfied; the Sadduces most of all, who hugg'd their old opinion, and lov'd their errour the better, because they thought him sure for ever rising up. But if they had denyed, or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the Sun put on mourning, why were the graves open'd, but for a funerall? Why did the earth quake, why were the rocks rent, why did the frame of nature shake, but because the God of nature dyed? Why did all the people who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such Tragick spectacles, why did they beat their breasts and return, but that they were assured *it was finished*, there was no more to be seen, all was done? It was not out of compassion that the mercylesse souldiers 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 pierce his side, and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man: thereby becoming stronger witnesses then they would, by being lesse the au-

1 Cor. 5. 7.

thors

thors then they desir'd, of his death. For out of his sacred, but wounded, side came bloud and water, both as evident signes of his present death, as certain seals of our future and eternall 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 passe into the Church of Christ, teacheth us that he dyed to whom we come. *For know you not,* saith S. *Paul, that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ, are baptized into his death?* The Sacrament of the Lords supper, the bread broken, and the wine pour'd forth, signifie that he dyed which instituted it; and *as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we shew forth the Lords death till he come.* Rom. 6. 3. 1 Cor. 11. 26.

Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the Crosse; and that not by a feign'd or metaphoricall, but by a true and proper death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortall nature which we the sons of *Adam* have, so did he undergoe a true and proper death, in the same manner as we dye. † Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, motion and sensation; and while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the life it self consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the originall 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 reall distinction of which soul from the body in man our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition, [a]*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.* Now being death is nothing else but the privation or *recession of life, and we are then properly said to dye 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 vitall perfection; death can be

† Τὸ ἔμψυχον τῇ ἀψύχῳ διὰ μάλιστα διαφέρει θανάτου, κινήσει τε καὶ αἰσθήσει παραλήψεως· ἡ μὲν γὰρ δύο ταῦτα ἢ τὸ πρὸς ἑκάτερον ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑπάρχον ψυχὴν φαμέν. Arist. de anima, l. 1. c. 2.

Ὧν διαφέρει τὰ ἔμψυχα (leg. ἔμψυχα) τῶν ἀψύχων, τοῦτό ἐστι ψυχή· διαφέρει δὲ κινήσει, αἰσθήσει, φαντασίᾳ, νοήσει. Sall. H. de Diis & Mundo, c. 8.

a Mat. 10. 28.

* As Secundus, φυγὴ δὲ ἀπόστασις βίου.

nothing elſe but the ſolution of that vitall union, or the actuall † ſeparation of the ſoul before united to the body. As therefore when the ſoul of man doth leave the habitation of it's body, and being the ſole fountain of vitality bereaves it of all vitall 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 vitall influence from the ſame.

† *As the Philoſophers have anciently expreſſd it, eſpecially Plato, who by the advantage of an errour in the Original of ſo his ſ beſt underſtood the end of life.*

Τοῦτό γε θάνατος ὀνομάζεται, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος. *in* Phædone. *Again,* Ὁ θάνατος τυγχάνει ὤν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ λύσιν πραγμάτων δύο, τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος, ἀπ' ἀλλήλοιν. *in* Gorgia. *And more plainly and fully yet,* Ἠγοῦμαι δέ τι εἶναι τὸν θάνατον τοῦτο; Πάνυ γ', ἦν δ' ἐγὼ λαβὼν ὁ Σιμμίας. Ἆρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ τοῦτο τὸ τεθνάναι, χωρὶς μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπηλλάχθαι αὐτὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ τὸ σῶμα γεγονέναι, χωρὶς δ' ἂν τοῦ σώματος ἀπηλλαγῆναι αὐτὴν καθ' αὑτήν; Οὐκ, ἄλλο τι ἢ θάνατος τοῦτο; Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο, ἔφη. *in* Phædone. *Thus with 4. ſeveral words,* λύσις, διάλυσις, χωρισμὸς, *and* ἀπηλλαγή, *doth* Plato *expreſſe the ſeparation of the ſoul from the body, and maketh death formally to conſiſt of that ſeparation: which is far more philoſophicall then the notion of* Ariſtotle, *who makes it to conſiſt in the corruption of naturall heat.* Ἀναίτιον τοίνυν ἡμᾶς τοῦ ζῆν ὑπάρχειν καὶ τὴν τοῦ θερμοῦ φυσικοῦ σβέσεως, καὶ τὸν καλούμενον θάνατον εἶναι τὴν τούτου φθοράν. *in* Parv. Natural. *in as much as the ſoul is not that naturall heat, and the corruption of that heat followeth upon the ſeparation of the ſoul.*

Nor is this onely our conception, or a doubtfull truth; but we are as much aſſured of the propriety of his death, as of the death it ſelf. For that the unſpotted ſoul of our Jeſus was really and actually ſeparated from his body, that his fleſh was bereft of naturall 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.*

Luc. 23. 46.

† *This is expreſſd three wayes, all ſignifying the ſeparation of his ſoul from his body.* S. Mark *and* S. Luke ἐξέπνευσεν, *which is of the ſame force with* ἐξέψυξε. *But becauſe* ἐκψύχειν *doth not always ſignifie an abſolute expiration, but ſometimes a lipothymy onely; as* Heſychius, Ἐκψύχει, λειποθυμεῖ. *So* Hippocrates *uſeth it,* Εἰσὶ δ' ὀξύτατοι (κωφοὶ) ὅσοις ἢ ἐκψύχουσι δεῖ τι ὠφελῆσαι, *l.* 1. de Morbis; *and again,* Ἐκψύχουσι δ' διὰ τῦ αἵματος

αἷμα & τὴν μετάστασιν ἐξαίφνης γινομένην: lest therefore we should take ἐξέπνευσεν in such an imperfect sense, S. Matth. hath it ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, and S. John, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. 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.*

When he was to dye, he resigned his soul; when he *gave it up*, he dyed; * when it was delivered out of the body, then was the body dead: and so the eternall Son of God upon the crosse did properly and truly dye.

* *These three points or distinctions of time I have therefore noted, that I might occurre to any objection which possibly might arise out of the ancient Philosophicall subtility, which* Aulus Gellius *reports to be agitated at the table of* Taurus. *The Question was propounded thus,* Quæsitum est, quando moriens moreretur, cum jam in morte esset, an tum etiam cum in vita foret. *Where* Taurus *admonished the rest, that this was no light question; for, sayes he,* graviſſimi Philosophorum super hac re serio quæsiverunt; & alii moriendi verbum atque momentum manente adhuc vita dici atque fieri putaverunt, alii nihil in illo tempore vitæ reliquerunt, totumque illud quod mori dicitur morti vendicarunt. *The ancienter Philosophers were divided, some saying a man dyed 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 dye while he is alive, nor when he is dead;* & idcirco peperit ipse aliud quoddam novum in confinio tempus, quod verbis propriis atque integris τὴν ἐξαίφνης φύσιν appellavit: *which he thus describes in his* Parmenides, Τὸ δὲ ἐξαίφνης τοιοῦτόν τι ἔοικε σημαίνειν, ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνου μεταβάλλον οὐδέτερον ἐκείνων. *thus* A. Gellius, *l.6. c.13. Thus when our Saviour commended his soul into the hands of his Father, he was yet alive; when the souldier pierced his side, he was already dead: and the instant in which he gave up the Ghost, was the* τὸ ἐξαίφνης *when he dyed.*

This reality and propriety of the death of Christ is yet further illustrated from the cause immediately producing it, which was an externall violence and cruciation, sufficient to dissolve that naturall disposition of the body which is absolutely necessary to continue the vitall union of the soul: the torments which he endured on the Crosse did bring him to that state, in which life could not longer be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of supernaturall power, must necessarily follow.

For Christ, who took upon him all our infirmities, sin onely excepted, had in his nature not onely a possibility and

& aptitude, but also a necessity of dying; & as to any extrinsecall 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 naturall preservative; nor was it in the power of his soul to continue it's vitall conjunction unto his body bereft of a vitall disposition.

It is true that Christ did voluntarily dye, as he said of himself, *No man taketh away my life from me, but I lay it down of my self: 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 hands of his enemies; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of *Pilate*, and the nailing to the Crosse; it was in his power to have come down from the Crosse (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.

Joh. 10. 18.

'Tis true that *Pilate marvelled* he was *dead* so soon, and the two thieves lived longer to have their legs broken, and to dye 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 any such kind of agony as he was in the night before. What though *he cryed 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 dye, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud: he dyed not by, but with a miracle.

Mar. 15. 44.

Mar. 15. 37, 39.

Should we imagine Christ to anticipate the time of death, and to subtract his soul from future torments necessary

ceſſary 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 in 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 S. *Peter* expreſly chargeth his enemies, *Him ye have taken, & by wicked hands have crucified and ſlain*; and again, *The God of our fathers raiſed up Jeſus, whom ye ſlew, and hanged on a tree.* Thus was the Lamb properly *ſlain*, and the *Jews* authors of his death, as well as of his crucifixion. Act. 2. 23. Act. 5. 30.

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 bloudy agony in the garden, to the hands of the plowers who made long their furrowes, and to the nailes which faſtened him to the Croſſe; being theſe torments thus inflicted and continued did cauſe his death, and in this condition *he gave up the ghoſt*; it followeth, that the onely-begotten ſon of God, the true *Meſsias* promiſed of old, did dye a true and proper death. Which is the ſecond Concluſion in this Explication.

But thirdly, becauſe Chriſt was not onely man, but alſo God, and there was not onely 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 further neceſſary, for the underſtanding of his death, to ſhew what union was diſſolved, what continued; that we may not make that ſeparation either leſſe or greater then it was.

Whereas then there were two different ſubſtantiall unions in Chriſt, one of the parts of his humane nature each to other, in which his humanity did conſiſt, and by which he was truly man; the other of his natures humane and divine, by which it came to paſſe that God was man,

and that man God: first, it is certain, as we have already shew'd, that the union of the parts of his humane nature was dissolved on the Crosse, and a reall separation made between his soul and body. As far then as humanity consists in the essentiall union of the parts of humane 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.

† Credimus certe non in solum Deum Patrem, sed & in Iesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum. Modo totum dixi, in Iesum Christum filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum; totum ibi intellige & verbum & animam & carnem. Sed utique confiteris etiam illud quod habet eadem Fides, in eum Christum te credere qui crucifixus est & sepultus. Ergo etiam sepultum Christum esse non negas, & tamen sola caro sepulta est. Si enim erat ibi anima, non erat mortuus; si autem vera mors erat, & ejus vera fit resurrectio, sine anima fuerat in sepulchro, & tamen sepultus est Christus. Ergo Christus erat etiam sine anima caro, quia non est sepulta nisi caro. *S. Augustin.* in Joh. Tract. 48.

The truth of this assertion appeareth, first from the language of this very † Creed. For as we prov'd before, that the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was *conceiv'd*, and *born*, and *suffer'd*, and that the truth of these propositions relyed upon the communion of properties, grounded upon the hypostaticall union: so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same person, that he *was buried*, and *descended into hell*, it sheweth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his soul, in respect of which he was generally conceiv'd to descend into hell, had lost that union.

Again, as we believe that God redeemed us by his own bloud, so also it hath bin the constant language of the Church, that God dyed 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,

tance, nor doth he ever ſubſtract his grace from any without their abuſe of it, and a ſinfull 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.

'Tis true, Chriſt cryed upon the croſſe with a loud voice ſaying, *My God, My God, why haſt thou forſaken me?* But if that dereliction ſhould ſignifie a ſolution of the former union of his natures, the ſeparation had bin made not at his death, but in his life. Whereas indeed thoſe words inferre no more, then that he was bereft of ſuch joyes and comforts from the Deity, as ſhould aſſwage and mitigate the acerbity of his preſent torments.

It remaineth therefore that when our Saviour yielded up the ghoſt, he ſuffered onely an externall violence; and what was ſubject to ſuch corporall force did yield unto thoſe dolorous impreſſions. Being then ſuch is the imbecillity and frailty of our nature, that life cannot long ſubſiſt in exquiſite torments; the diſpoſition of his body fail'd the ſoul, and the ſoul deſerted his body. But being no power hath any force againſt omnipotency, nor could any corporall or finite agent work upon the union made 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.

Greg. Nyſſ. *Orat. 1. ac Reſurr.* Ὅλον ἦν ἄνθρωπον τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀναφέρεσθαι εἰς τὴν θείαν φύσιν μεταστοιχειούμενον, ὡς τῷ χωρίῳ τῆς κράσεως τὸ πάθος οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα δυνάμεως τὸ ἄπαξ ἰσχυρὰν ἀνεχόμενον· ἁμαρτίαν γὰρ θεῷ οὐ προσῆκε· τὴν μὲν ψυχὴν τῷ σώματι ἡ τῶν ἐκείνου θλίψεις ἐξέδοσαν, ἑαυτὴν δὲ ὁ ἄμφω πέφυκε μένων ἀδιάλυτος.

† *This is the concluſion of S.* Auguſt. Ex quo Verbum caro factum eſt, ut habitaret in nobis, & ſuſceptus eſt à Verbo homo, id eſt totus homo, anima & caro, quid fecit paſſio, quid fecit mors, niſi corpus ab anima ſeparavit? animam vero à Verbo non ſeparavit. Si enim mortuus eſt Dominus .... ſine dubio caro ipſius expiravit animam (ad tempus enim exiguum anima deſeruit carnem, ſed redeunte anima reſurrecturam) à Verbo autem animam ſeparatam eſſe non dico. Latronis animæ dixit, *Hodie mecum eris in paradiſo*: fidelem latronis animam non deſerebat, & deſerebat ſuam? abſit: ſed illius ut Dominus cuſtodivit, ſuam vero inſeparabiliter habuit. Si autem dixerimus, quia ipſa ſe anima poſuit, & iterum ipſa ſe ſumpſit, abſurdiſſimus ſenſus eſt: non enim quæ à Verbo non erat ſeparata à ſeipſa potuit ſeparari. *Tract. in Joh.* 47.

Thus Christ did really and truly dye, according to the condition of death, to which the nature of man is subject: but although he was more then man, yet he dyed no more then man can dye: a separation was made between his soul and body, but no disunion of them and his Deity. They were dis joyned one from other, but not from him that took them both together; † rather by vertue of that remaining conjunction they were again united after their separation. And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

† Ἐπεὶ διαλοιῶ μὲν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σύγκραμα, ἀπολῦσαι δὲ οὐ μονοειδὴς ἡ τῆς θεότητος φύσις, ἐν τῷ χωρῷ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς διαζεύξεως ἡ ζωοποιοῦσα τοῦ ζωοποιοῦντος τὸ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔμπαλιν γίνεται· τῇ γὰρ ἐνότητι τῆς θείας φύσεως, τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἀμφοτέροις ὅσης, πάλιν πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ διεζευγμένα συμφύεται. Greg. Nyss. *Orat.* 1. *de Resurr.* Tam velox incorruptæ carnis vivificatio fuit, ut major ibi esset soporis similitudo quam mortis, quoniam Deitas quæ ab utraque susceptæ hominis substantia non recessit, quod potestate divisit, potestate conjunxit. *Leo* Serm. 1. de Resurr.

The necessity of this part of the Article is evident, in that the death of Christ is the most intimate and essentiall part of the Mediatorship, and that which most intrinsecally concerns every office and function of the Mediator, as he was Prophet, Priest, and King.

First, it was necessary, as to the Propheticall office, that Christ should dye, to the end that the truth of all the doctrine which he delivered might be confirmed by his death: he was the *true and faithfull witnesse, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession. This is he that came by water and blood: and there are three that bear witnesse in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood.* He preached unto us a new *and better covenant, which was established upon better promises*, and that was to be ratified with his bloud; which is therefore called by Christ himself the *bloud of the new Testament*, or *everlasting Covenant*: for that covenant was also a testament; and *where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.* Beside Christ, as a Prophet, taught us not onely by word, but by

Rev. 3. 14.
1 Tim. 6. 13.
1 Joh. 5. 6, 8.
Heb. 8. 6.
Mat. 26. 28.
Luc. 22. 20.
Heb. 10. 29. and 13. 20.
Heb. 9. 16.

by example; and though every action of his life, who came to fulfill the law, be most worthy of our imitation, yet the most eminent example was in his death; in which he taught us great variety of Christian vertues. What an example was that of faith in God, *to lay down his life that he might take it again*, in the bitterness of his torments to *commend his spirit into the hands of his Father*, and *for the joy that was set before him to endure the crosse, and despise the shame*? What a pattern of meekness, patience, and humility, for the *Son of man to come not to be ministred unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransome for many*? *to be led like a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the shearer, not to open his mouth*? to *endure the contradictions of sinners against himself*, and to *humble himself unto death, even the death of the crosse*? What a precedent of obedience, for the Son of God *to learn obedience by the things that he suffered*, to be *made under the Law*, and though he never broke that law, to *become obedient unto death*, to goe with chearfulness to the cross upon this resolution, *as my Father gave me commandement, even so I doe*? What exemplar of Charity, to dye for us *while we were yet sinners & enemies*, when *greater love hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his friends*; to pray upon the crosse for them that crucified him, and to apologize for such as barbarously slew him, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they doe*? Thus Christ did suffer for us, *leaving us an example that we should follow his steps*; that as he *suffered for us in the flesh*, we should *arme* our *selves 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.* And so his death was necessary for the confirmation and completion of his Propheticall Office.

Joh. 10. 17. Heb. 12. 2. Mat. 20. 28. Act. 8. 32. Heb. 12. 3. Phil. 2. 8. Heb. 5. 8. Phil. 2. 8. Joh. 14. 31. Rom. 5. 8. Joh. 15. 13. 1 Pet. 2. 21. 4. 1, 2.

Secondly, it was necessary that Christ should dye, and by his death perform the Sacerdotall Office. *For every*

Heb. 5. 1. *high-Priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things* pertaining *to God, that he may offer both gifts & sacrifices for sinnes.* But Christ had no other sacrifice to offer for our sinnes then himself. For *it was not possible that*
Heb. 10. 4. *the blood of bulls and goats should take away sinnes*: and therefore when Sacrifice and offering God would not, *then*
9. *said he, Loe, I come to do thy will, O God*; then did Christ determine to offer up himself for us. And because the sacrifices of old were to be slain, and generally *without*
Heb. 9. 22. *shedding of blood there is no remission*; therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin, he must of necessity dye, and so *make*
Isa. 53. 10. *his soul an offering for sin.* If Christ be our Passeover, 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,*
1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. *as silver and gold, but* onely *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 pass'd upon us; it was necessary therefore that Christ our surety should dye, to satisfie the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for our sinnes, and for that penalty, as he which was to bear our griefs. God was offended with us, and he must dye who was to reconcile
Rom. 5. 10. him to us. *For when we were enemies,* saith S. *Paul, we*
Col. 1. 21. *were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* We *were sometimes alienated and enemies in our mind by wicked workes, 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 sinnes of the whole world: and not onely for the act it self, but also for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it: For *if the*
Heb. 9. 13, 14. *blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternall Spirit offered himself without spot to God,*

purge

purge our conſcience from dead works? and of the happineſſe flowing from it; For *he that ſpared not his own ſon,* Rom. 8. 32. *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 freedome and *boldneſſe to* Heb. 2. 19, 20. *enter into the Holieſt by the bloud of Jeſus, by a new and living way which he hath conſecrated for us, through the vail, that is to ſay, his fleſh.* Neither was the death of Chriſt neceſſary onely in reſpect of us immediately for whom he dyed, but in reference to the Prieſt himſelf who dyed, both in regard of the qualification of himſelf, and conſummation of his Office. For *in all things it behoved* Heb. 10. 17, 18. *him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciſull and faithfull 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 paines of death, having ſuffered all which man can ſuffer, and much more, he became as an experimentall 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 Offering. For as the High-Prieſt *once every year* for the atonement of the ſinnes of the people Heb. 9. 7, entred into the Holy of Holies *not without bloud*; ſo Chriſt 11, 12. *being come an High-Prieſt of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle not made with hands, by his own bloud entred in once into the Holy place*, having *obteined eternall redemption* for us. And this is the grand neceſſity of the death of Chriſt in reſpect of his Sacerdotall Office.

Thirdly, there was a neceſſity that Chriſt ſhould dye in reference to his Regall Office. *O King, live for ever*, is either the loyall or the flattering vote for temporall Princes; either the expreſſion of our deſires, or the ſuggeſtion of their own: whereas our Chriſt never ſhew'd more Soveraigne

veraigne power then in his death, never obtained more then by his death. It was not for nothing, that *Pilate* ſuddenly wrote, and reſolutely maintain'd what he had written, *This is the King of the Jews.* That title on the Croſſe did ſignifie no leſſe then that his Regall power was
Col. 2. 15. active even there: for *having ſpoyled principalities and powers, he made a ſhew of them openly, triumphing over them in it; and through his death deſtroyed him that had*
Heb. 2. 14. *the power of death, that is the Devil.* Nor was his death onely neceſſary for the preſent execution, but alſo for the aſſecution of further power and dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. The Spirit of Chriſt in the Pro-
1 Pet. 1. 11. phets of old *teſtified before-hand the ſufferings of Chriſt, and the glory that ſhould follow. He ſhall drink of the brook*
Pſal. 110. 7. *in the way*, ſaith the Prophet *David*; *therefore ſhall he lift*
Philip. 2, 8, 9. *up his head. He humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the croſſe. Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which*
Rom. 14. 9. *is above every name. For to this end Chriſt both dyed and roſe and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.*

Thus it is neceſſary to believe and profeſſe our faith in Chriſt who dyed: for by his bloud and the vertue of his death was our Redemption wrought, as by the price which was pay'd, 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.

After which Expoſition thus premiſed, every Chriſtian is conceived to expreſſe thus much when he makes profeſſion of faith in Chriſt Jeſus which *was dead.* I do really and truly aſſent unto this, as to a moſt infallible and fundamentall truth, that the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, for the working out of our redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truely dye, ſo

as

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*.

And Buried.

When the most precious and immaculate soul of Christ was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which consisted his naturall life was dissolved, his sacred body, as being truly dead, was layd 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 shew'n, first, that the promised *Messias* was to be buried, and secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the *Messias* was to be.

That the *Messias* was to be buried, could not possibly be denyed by those who believ'd he was to dye among the *Jews*, because it was the universall custome of that nation to †bury their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers: and though those that were con-

† it is observed by Tacitus of the Jews, in opposition to the Roman *custome*, Corpora condere, quam cremare, è more Ægyptio. *Hist. l. 5.* As of the Egyptians *b*, others, Θάπτουσι δὲ Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν περιχύσαντες, Ρωμαῖοι δὲ καίοντες, Παίονες δὲ ὡς τὰς λίμνας ῥιπτοῦσιν. Laert. Pyrrh. *But the Jews receiv'd this custome no more from the Egyptians then from the Persians, whom they may be rather said to follow, because they used not the Egyptian* περιχύσας. *neither were they more distinguished from the Romans then the Grecians, who also burned the bodies of the dead.* Διελόμενοι καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰς ταφὰς, ὁ μὲν Ἕλλην ἐκαυσεν· ὁ δὲ Πέρσης ἔθαψεν· ὁ δὲ Ἰνδὸς ὕδατι ἐφιεῖς· ὁ δὲ Σκύθης κατεδίδου· περιχύσας δὲ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος. Lucian. περὶ πένθους. *Although therefore it be not true, that the Jews receiv'd their custome 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*

that their generall custome was to interre. Philo, *one of their own writers* : Ἀνθρώποις μὲν οἰκειότερον ἡ φύσις χωρίον ἀπένειμε γῆ, ἣ μόνον ζῶσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανοῦσιν, ἵν' ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ τὴν πρώτην τοῦ Νεῷ γένεσιν, καὶ τὴν ὀπὴ τοῦ βίου τελευτὴν ἀπόλυσιν. *l.* 1. *in* Flaccũ.

condemned by their ſupreme power were not buried in their Fathers graves, yet publick ſepulchres there were appointed even for them to lye in; and not onely they, but all the Inſtruments which were uſed in the puniſhment, were buried with them. And yet beſide the generall conſequence of death among the *Jews*, there was a perfect type in the perſon of *Jonas*: for as that Prophet *was three*
Mat. 12. 40. *dayes and three nights in the whales belly*, ſo was the *Meſſias*, or *the Son of man*, to be *three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth*. Nor was his Buriall onely repreſented Typically, but foretold Propheti cally, both by a ſuppoſitive intimation, and by an expreſſe prediction. The Pſalmiſt intimated and ſuppos'd no leſſe, when ſpeaking in the perſon of the Chriſt he ſaid, *My fleſh ſhall*
Pſal. 16. 9. *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 onely 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 putrifie.

† *So the* Midraſh Tillim *anciently expounded it,* My fleſh ſhall reſt in hope, לאחור מירוה after death; *adding,* אר יצחק מלמר שלא שלט בו דמה וחולעה, that Rabbi Iſaac ſaid, he taught by theſe words, that the moth and worm ſhould have no power over him. *Whence by the Argument of S.* Peter, *it muſt be underſtood not of* David, *for his fleſh ſaw corruption, nor of any other but the* Meſſias. *And although the Rabbins are wont to ſay that the worm ſhall never eat the juſt, in oppoſition to the laſt words of* Eſay; *yet they muſt confeſſe there is no difference in the grave; and therefore that worm muſt ſignifie ſomething elſe then the corruption of the body. Well therefore are thoſe words paraphraſed by* Didymus, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κατοικήσουσιν ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τὴν ἐνοῦσαν ἀνάστασιν.

Beſide this intimation there is yet a clear expreſſion of the grave of the *Meſſias*, in that eminent prediction of *Iſaiah*,

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 Propheſie 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 ſhewn, that he which was to be *cut off* was the *Meſſias*; it followeth, that by vertue of this prediction the promiſed *Meſſias* was to be buried. Iſaiah 53. 9.

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 ſentenc'd by the *Romans* to dye upon the Croſſe, had not the favour of a ſepulchre, but their bodies were † expoſed to the fouls of the air and the beaſts of the field, or, if they eſcaped their voracity, to the longer injury of the air and weather. A guard was alſo

† *To this cuſtome* Horace *alludes*, Epiſt. 16. l. 1. Non hominem occidi: non paſces in cruce corvos. *and* Juvenal, Vulcur, jumento & canibus crucibuſque relictis, Ad fatus properat, partemque cadaveris affert. *So* Prudentius, Crux illum tollat in auras, Viventeſque oculos effrat alitibus, περὶ στεφ. Hymn. 4. *This punſhment did appertain to the Mythology of* Prometheus: *who though he were by ſome repreſented ſimply, as* Δημώτης; *by others particularly he is deſcrib'd as* ἀνεσταυρωμένον, *eſpecially by* Lucian, *who deliters him* περσπλώμενον, χρεμάμενον, περσπαπαλευόμενον, ἀνεσταυρώμενον, ἀνασκολοπιζόμενον. *And* Tertullian *ſpeaking of* Pontus *from whence* Marcion *came*; Omnia torpent, omnia rigent: nihil illic niſi feritas calet, quæ fabulas ſcenis dedit, de ſacrifiiis Taurorum, & amoribus Colchorum, & crucibus Caucaſorum. *Adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 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 that* Auguſtus *once ſaid*, Cuidam ſepulturam petenti reſpondit, jam illam in volucrum eſſe poteſtate. *Sueton. c. 13. Nor were they onely in the power of the fowls of the air, as* Prometheus *was, whom they durſt not hang too low, leſt men ſhould ſuccour him,* ἵνα μὴ παρεῖτο ἡ μείζονος ἐσταυρῶσθαι χάριν *ſayes* Vulcan *in* Lucian *for that reaſon; but ordinarily they hung ſo low upon the Croſſe, that the ravenous beaſt might reach them, as* Apuleius *deſcribes* Patibuli cruciatum, cum canes & vultures intima protrahunt viſcera. * *So the bodies were often left upon the Croſſe till the ſun and rain had putrified and conſumed them. As when the daughter of* Polycrates *did ſee her fathers face in a dream to be waſht by* Jupiter, *and to be anointed by the Sun, when he hung upon the Croſſe, it was perform'd.*

Πολυκράτης ἢ ἀναπρεμάθη ἐπεστήλωσε πρὸς τὸν ὄλισθον τῆς Δηλιάδος· ἐλοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς ὄμως ὕστερον, ἐκρέετο ἢ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἀγιοῦς αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκμαδὰ. Herod. Thalia. *Of which* Tertul. *de anima*, c. 46. Ut cum Polycrati Samio filia crucem prospicit de Solis unguine & lavacro Jovis. *And which is further thus expreſs'd by* Valerius Maximus: Putres ejus artus, & tabido cruore manantia membra, atque illam lævam cui Neptunus annulum manu piscatoris restituerat, situ marcidam, Samos lætis oculis aspexit, *l.* 6. *c.* 9. *Thus were the bodies of the crucified left*, ut in sublimi putrescerent: *and so they perished, as the* Scythians *generally did, according to the description of* Silius Italicus, *l.* 13.

At gente in Scythica suffixa cadavera truncis
Lenta dies sepelit, putri liquentia tabo.

Thus, whether by the fowls or beasts, or by the injury of time and weather, the fleſh of those which were crucified was consum'd; as Artemidorus *observ'd, who concluded from thence, that it was bad for the rich to dream of being crucified,* Τὸς ἢ πλουσίους βλάπτει· γυμνοὶ γὰρ σαρκῶν, ἢ τὰς σάρκας ἀπολλύουσι οἱ σαρκοφάγοντες. *Oneirocr. l.* 2. *c.* 58.

† *As appeareth by that Relation of* Petronius Arbiter:

† allo usually set about them, lest any pittying hand should take the body from the curſed tree, and cover it with earth.

Imperator Provinciæ latrones jussit cruci bus affigi .... Proxima autem nocte cum miles qui cruces asservabat ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detraheret, *&c. And when that souldier was absent*, Itaque cruciarii unius parentes, ut viderunt laxatam custodiam, detraxere nocte pendentem, supremoque mandaverunt officio. *Where we see the souldier set for a guard, and the end of that* custodia, (*which the* Greek *Lexicographers do not well confine to the* σχῆτυμα τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου ὀπικοίμησον) *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 Crosse* (*another example of the ignominy of this punishment*) *by the command of* Ptolemy: Ὁ ἢ Πτολεμαῖος ἐκέλευσε ταῦτα, περσάπαξε τὸ μὲν σῶμα τῷ Κλεομένει κρεμάσαι κατὰ βυρσόσυτος. *Where* κρεμάσαι *is again to be observed as taken for* ἀνασταυροῦσαι: *for not long after in the same Author it follows,* Ὀλίγαις ἢ ὕστερον ἡμέραις, οἱ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένους ἀνεσταυρωμένον παρφυλάσσοντες εἶδον ἐυμεγέθη δράκοντα τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐπιπλεγόμενον, ἢ ἀποκρύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ὡς μὴ ἂν ὄρνεον ἐρίπτεσθαι σαρκοφάγον. *where we see a guard set to keep him from burial, and the voracious fowls ready to seize on him, had they not bin kept off by a serpent involving his head. Thus were there souldiers upon the crucifixion of any person set as a guard,* τὸν ἀνεσταυρωμένον παρφυλάσσοντες, *or* τηροῦντες, & crucem asservantes, *viz.* ne quis ad sepulturam corpus detraheret.

Under that custome of the *Roman* Law was now the body of our Saviour on the Crosse, and the guard was set; there was *the Centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus.* The Centurion returned as soon as Christ

Mat. 27. 54.

was

was dead, and gave teſtimony unto *Pilate* of his death: but the watch continueth ſtill. How then can the ancient predictions be fulfill'd? how can this *Jonas* be convey'd into the belly of the whale? where *ſhall he make his grave with the wicked*, or *with the rich in his death* of *crucifixion*? By the providence of him who did foretell it, it ſhall be fulfill'd. They which petition'd that he might be crucified, ſhall intercede that he may be interr'd. For the † cuſtome of the *Jews* required, 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 expreſſe words of *Moſes*, *a 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.* Upon this generall cuſtome and particular law, eſpecially conſidering the ſanctity of the day approaching, *b the Jews, that the bodies ſhould not remain upon the croſſe on the Sabbath day, beſought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away.* And this is the firſt ſtep to the buriall of our Saviour.

† מצות עשה לקבור את כל הרוגי בית דין ביום ההריגה:

Maimon. *Tract. Sanh. cap.* 15.

Sr Joſephus. Τοσαύτῳ Ἰουδαίων σπεὶ τὰς τάφας σπέρειαν τοιμένων, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς ἐκ κατακίκης ἀνασταυρωμένους πρὸ δύσεως ἥλιε θάπτειν. *de Bel. Jud. l.* 14. *c.* 18.

a Deut. 21. 22, 23.

b Joh. 19. 31.

For though by the common rule of the *Roman* law, thoſe which were condemned to the croſſe were to looſe both ſoul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either ſepulture or † mourning; yet it was in the power of the Magiſtrate to * indulge the leave of buriall: and there-

† Non ſolent autem lugeri (ut *Neratius* ait) hoſtes, vel perduellionis damnati, nec ſuſpendioſi, nec qui manus ſibi intulerunt non tædio vitæ, ſed mala conſcientia. *Digeſt. l.* 3. *tit.* 2. l. *Liberorum.*

* *Sc* Ulpianus, *l.* 9. *de Officio Proconſulis*: Corpora eorum qui capite damnantur cognatis ipſorum neganda non ſunt; & id ſe obſervaſſe etiam Divus Auguſtus libro decimo de vita ſua ſcribit. Hodie autem eorum in quos animadvertitur corpora non aliter ſepeliuntur, quam ſi fuerit petitum & permiſſum: & nonnunquam non permittitur, maxime majeſtatis cauſa damnatorum. *Sc* Paulus *l.* 1. *Sententiarum*: Corpora animadverſorum quibuſlibet petentibus ad ſepulturam danda ſunt. Obnoxios criminum digno ſupplicio ſubjectos ſepulturæ tradi non vetamus, *Cod. l.* 3. *tit.* 43. *l.* 11.

fore *Pilate*, who crucified Christ onely becauſe the *Jews* deſir'd it, could not poſſibly deny him buriall 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 bin thereby certainly buried, yet had not the prediction bin fulfill'd which expreſly mentioned the *rich in his death*. For as he was crucified between two thieves, ſo had he bin buried with them, becauſe by the *Jews* there was appointed a publick place of buriall for all which ſuffered as Malefactors.

Iſa. 53. 9.

Wherefore to reſcue the body of our bleſſed Saviour from the malicious hands of thoſe that cauſ'd his crucifixion, *there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joſeph, an honourable counſeller, a good man and a juſt, who alſo himſelf waited for the kingdome 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.*

Mat. 27. Mar. 15. Luc. 23. Joh. 19.

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 myrrhe 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.* And thus was the buriall of the Son of God perform'd according to the cuſtome 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 fulfill the propheſy.

Joh. 3. 1. and 19. 39, 40.

As for the fulfilling the cuſtome 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 might 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 cuſtome of wrapping in the linen clothes we ſee in *Lazarus* riſing from the grave; for *he came forth bound hand & 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 lye, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by it ſelf.* Thus according to the cuſtome of the *Jews* was the body of Chriſt bound in † ſeverall linen clothes with an aromaticall compoſition, and ſo prepared for the ſepulchre.

Mar. 14. 3, 8.

Mar. 16. 1. Luc. 24. 1.

Joh. 11. 44.

Joh. 20. 6, 7.

† *There are 4. words in the Goſpell expreſſing the linen clothes in which the dead were buried,* Σινδὼν, ὀθόνια, κρῖα, & συνδεσμοι. *The* Σινδὼν *is uſed by 3. Evangeliſts, as what was brought by* Joſeph. Καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα, καθελὼν αὐτὸν, ἐνείλησε τῇ σινδόνι, Marc. 15 46. *and S.* Matthew *and S.* Luke, ἐντυλίξας αὐτὸ σινδόνι. Ὀθόνια *is uſed by S.* Luke *and S.* John; Ἔλαβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις. *Now both theſe words ſhew that the clothes were linen.* Σινδὼν, tunica linea, Gloſſ. Φαινόπιον λινοῦν πᾶν ὅτι σινδόνιον, etym. So Ὀθόνια, λινᾶ ἱμάτια, Heſyc. *This was according to the cuſtome 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, λύσαντες τὸν νεκρὸν κατελίσσουσι πᾶν αὐτῷ τὸ σῶμα σινδόνος βυσσίνης, *ſo the* Jews. *But it is further to be obſerved, that S.* John *ſaith* ἔδησαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις, *they bound up his body with ſeverall clothes, which ſignifies it was done faſciatim. As* Herodotus *in another caſe,* σμύρνῃσί τε ἰσχνῶσι τὰ ἄλλα, καὶ σινδόνος βυσσίνης τελαμῶσι κατελίσσοντες. *Whereas then* Julius Pollux *obſerves,* ὥρηται δὲ καὶ τελαμὼν σινδονίτης, *I conceive theſe* ὀθόνια *in S.* John *were ſuch* τελαμῶνες σινδονῖται, linea faſcia *or* initx, *called in the caſe of* Lazarus κρῖα. *for as he is deſcribed* δεδεμένος κειρίαις, *ſo it is ſaid of the body of Chriſt,* ἔδησαν αὐτὸ ὀθονίοις, *they bound him with linen bandages.*

As

bandages or swathes. These are the ὀθόνια λεπτά, *as the Grammarians interpret* κειρία *tanquam* κειρία. *So the Ancient* MS. *in the Library at S. James's read it,* Δεδεμένον τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας κειρίαις. *And so* Hesychius *read it, when he made that interpretation,* Κειρίαις (*leg.* Κειρίαις) ὀθονίοις δεδεμένα ὀθονιλιγμένα. *What anciently* κειρία *was, will appear by the words of* Julius Pollux: Καὶ μὴν τόγε τῇ κλίνῃ ἢ τοῖς σκίμποσι ἐπιτεταμένον ὃς φέρει τὰ πλαίσια, σπαρτία, καὶ ἱμάντα, τόν τε, κειρία, *the bands or cords by which the bed or couches are fastened, and upon which the bedain lyes. In this sense it is to be taken in that known place of* Aristophanes, *in Avibus,*

Σπάρτων δ' ἂν θέλοιμι ἐγὼ τῇ μὴ πολλῇ,
Οὐδ' ἂν χαμεύνων πόνηρα κειρίαν ἔχων.

Of which Eustathius *Iliad.* β'. *gives us this account:* Φησὶ μὲ ἂν λινᾶναι σπάρτος, κειρίαν ἔχων· ἤτοι μὲ λινᾶναι σπαρτίνῃ πλέγματος, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ἔχοι κειρίαν, ἤτοι δεσμὸν κλίνης. *Hence the Grammarians give that interpretation of* κειρία: *as* Etymologus, Κειρία σημαίνει τὸ ὁτιοῦν τὸ δεσμοῦον τὴν κλίνην, *viz. in reference to that place of* Aristophanes: *otherwise it hath no relation to a bed, but indifferently signifieth any fascia or band. So the Scholiast of* Aristophanes; Ἡ δὲ κειρία οὐδὲ ζώνης ἐστὶν ὁτιοῦν παραπλησίως ἱμάντι ἢ δεσμοῖς τὰς κλίνας, *not the cord of a bed, but a fascia or girdle like unto it. With such linen* fasciæ, *swathes, or bandages, was the body of* Lazarus *involved.* Ἐκ ποδὸς ἄχρι καρήνου Σφιγξαμένου πλεκτῇσιν ὅλον δέμας ἔσχε κειρείαις, *sayes* Nonnus. *And* Juvencus,

Nec mora, connexis manibus pedibusque repente
Procedit tumulo, vultum cui linea texit,
Et totum gracilis connectit fascia corpus.

How Basil *Bishop of* Seleucia *makes* Lazarus *come out of the grave to life like an infant in his swadling-clothes.* Ἐκεῖθεν ἀνεπήδα νεκρὸς τετραήμερος τὰ τῆς θανάτου πειρατηρίου Σύμβολα κἂν θάνατον ἐνδυόμενος, τὴν τάφου σολὴν ἐκπλάξατο, ἀλλ' ἐφίσατο τῆς κειρίας ὡς ἐκ τάφου τοκάδος, μητρὸς τόκον φέρων τὰ σπάργανα. *Orat.* in Publican. & Phar. *The* κειρίαι *then were* instituæ, *as the Vulgar Latine;* fasciæ, *as* Juvencus *and the* Syriack *Translation,* אסיר בסבכיהון, vincti fasciis. *Of the same nature I conceive were the* ὀθόνια *mentioned in our Saviours burial; and so* S. Augustine *does expresse them in reconciling the rest of the Evangelists, who mentioned onely* Joseph *and the* sindon, *with* S. John, *who addeth* Nicodemus *and the* ὀθόνια. Neque hic aliquid repugnet recte intelligentibus. Neque enim illi qui de Nicodemo tacuerunt, affirmaverunt à solo Joseph Dominum sepultum, quamvis solius commemorationem fecerint; aut quia illi una sindone à Joseph involutum dixerunt, propterea prohibuerunt intelligi & alia lintea potuisse afferri à Nicodemo & superaddi: ut verum narraret Johannes quod non uno linteo, sed linteis involutus sit; quamvis & propter sudarium quod capiti adhibebatur, & institas quibus totum corpus alligatum est, quia omnia de lino erant, etiamsi una sindon ibi fuit, verissime dici potuit, *ligaverunt eum linteis.* De consensu Evang. *l.* 3. *c.* 23. *These, which he calls* institæ quibus totum corpus alligatum est, *were the* חגריני רמתא, involucra mortui. *Beside these, we read in the history of* Lazarus, ᾗ ἦλθε ὠὴ συδαρίῳ περιδέδετο, Joh. 11. 44. *& of our Saviour,* καὶ τὸ σουδάριον ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ. *The same is rendred by*

the

the Syriack סודרא, and Nonnus makes it a Syriack word, Καὶ λινέῳ πεπύκασο καλύμματι κυκλάδα κόρσην, Συδάριον τόδε φῶτα Σύρων σόφα. Whereas the word is not of a Syriack, but Latine original, and from the Latines came to the Greek and Eastern people: Sudor and Sudare, from thence Sudarium. Varinius reus, agente in eum Calvo, sudario candido frontem detersit. Quintil. Suetonius of Nero, Plerumque prodiit in publicum largato circa collum sudario. This was translated into their own language by the later Grecks, to signifie that which before was called ἱματίβιον and καλύπτριον, as is observed by Julius Pollux Τὸ μὲν ἱματίβιον, ἔστι μὲν ᾧ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων· εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῃ Κωμῳδίᾳ καλύπτριον καλούμενον, ὃ νῦν Συδάριον ὀνομάζεται. Ἀεισοφάνη γὰρ ἐν Πλούτῳ τοιαύτης ἦν δόξα. Ἔπειτα καθεὼν ἱματίβιον λαβὼν, Τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψησι. where τὰ βλέφαρα περιέψησι, is the same with that in Quintilian, frontem detersit; ἱματίβιον then the same with sudarium. So the Scholiast upon that place: Ἱματίβιον ἀντὶ τοῦ Συδάριον· ῥάκος ἱματισθὲν, λινοῦν τι ὃ ἐκμαγεῖον. This is the proper signification of Συδάριον, viz. a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat: but when it was translated into the Chaldee or Syriack language, it received a more generall signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use. As Ruth 3. 15. Bring the veile that thou hast upon thee: the Chaldee rendreth it, הַבִי סוּדְרָא דִי עָלָיִךְ, and it held 6. measures of barley. So, when Moses is said to put a veil on his face, Exod. 34. 33. the Chaldee again renders it וִיהַב עַל סוּדְרָא עַל רֵישֵׁיהּ. So the Rabbins ordinarily use אֵיקוּנִין דְּבֵית אַנְפּוֹי סוּדְרָא the veil or covering of his head: and in that sense it is here taken, not with any reflection to the Etymology, as Nonnus conceiv'd in those words, Θερμὸν ἔχων ἱδρῶτα καλυπταμένοις περόωσιν, as if Lazarus had come sweating out of his grave; but onely to the use, as being bound about the head, and covering the face, which the Epistle of Marcialis calls sudarium mortuorum.

As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custome of the *Jews* was also punctually observ'd in that. *Ioseph* of *Arimathea* had prepar'd a place of buriall for himself, and the manner of it is expressed. For *in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre wherein never man was laid, which* Joseph *had hewen out of the rock for his own tombe; there layd they Iesus, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre*: and so Christ was buried after the manner of the *Iews*, in a Vault made by the † excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth, & that Vault secured from externall injury by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which

Mat. 27. Mat. 15.

† Strabo observe's of Jerusalem, that the ground about it, ὑπτιὸς ἐξωκοντα σταδίων, was ὑπόπεδος, for nine miles rocky underneath. It is therefore no wonder

wonder that in a garden so near Jerusalem *there should be found ground which was* petrosa. *It is said therefore of* Joseph, *that* μνημεῖον ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ· *of the sepulchre, that* ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, *and* λαξευτὸν, *which signifie no lesse then that it was cut out of a rock: and* Nonnus *makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of* λαξεύτὸν *one*; Ἔνθ' ἐν γλυπτοῖσι κύπῃ Τύμβος ἀδωμήτοιο βαθυωμένος ἐκ πέτρης Γλυφὶς ὅλος ναότευκτος. *Where* βαθυωμένος *signifies the excavation of the rock, and* γλυφὶς *the manner by which that excavation was performed, by incision or exculption. But* Salmasius *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, alledging that* πέτρα *signifies, in the writers of that age, a stone, not a rock; and therefore* λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας *is* ἐκ λίθου, *made of stone: otherwise the Article would have bin added,* ἐκ τῆς πέτρας, *if he meant the rock which was there. But this is soon answered; for in* S. Matthew *the Article is expressly added,* ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ. S. Matthew *therefore understood it of that rock which was in the garden: and the rest without question understood the same. Again he objects, that* λατομεῖν *signifies not onely* lapides ex lapidicina cædere, *but also* polire & quadrare ad ædificandum; *and* λαξεύειν *signifies the last onely. Whereas being it is said not onely* λελατομημένον, *which may be understood of building, but also* λαξευτὸν, *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* λαξεύειν, *which may be extended to any sense of* λατομεῖν· *and that, when it speaks of a* Jewish *custome, must be taken in that sense which is most congruous to their custome, and as they used the word. Now they rendred the word* חצב בהר *by* λατομεῖν, *as* 1 King. 5. 15. חצב בהר λατόμων ἐν ὄρει. Isa. 51. הביטו אל צור חצבתם, ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὴν στερεὰν πέτραν ἣν ἐλατομήσατε, unde excisi. *As therefore* Deut. 6. 11. λάκκους λελατομημένους οὓς οὐκ ἐξελατόμησας; *so* Isa. 22. 16. Ὅτι ἐλατόμησας σαυτῷ ὧδε μνημεῖον... καὶ ἔγραψας σαυτῷ ἐν πέτρᾳ σκιάν: *in both places* λατομεῖν *is nothing else but* חצב, *and there* μνημεῖον λελατομημένον *in the language of the Jews is to be taken in the same sense with* λάκκος λελατομημένος, *that is, digged or hewen out of the ground. This cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather then building of it in the earth, is very materiall in the opinion of* S. Jerome, *who makes this observation on* Matth. 27. In monumento novo quod excisum fuerat è petra conditus est, ne fi ex multis lapidibus ædificatum esset, suffossis tumuli fundamentis, ablatus furto diceretur; *and gives this interpretation of the Prophet* Isaiah, Quod autem in sepulchro ponendus esset, Prophetæ testimonium est dicentis, *Hic habitabit in excisa spelunca petræ fortissimæ*: statimque post duos versiculos sequitur, *Regem cum gloria videbitis. Another use of the same supposition is made likewise by* S. Ambrose. Domini corpus tanquam per Apostolorum doctrinam infertur in vacuam & in novam requiem lapidis excisi; scilicet in pectus duritiæ gentilis quodam doctrinæ opere excisum Christus infertur, rude scilicet ac novum, & nullo antea ingressu timoris Dei pervium. *in* Matth. *Can.* 33. *Thus was the Sepulchre prepared for the body: and when* Joseph *had laid it there,* προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ, *he rolled a great stone to the door, the last part of that solemnity. For this great stone was said to be rol-*

led,

led, by reaſon of the bigneſſe, as being not portable, (from whence aroſe the womens doubt, Mar. 16. 3. Who ſhall roll us away the Stone from the door of the ſepulchre?) and that very properly, for it had it's name from that rolling, being called conſtantly by the Jews גולל, *or* גוללא, *from* גלל volvere. הגולל אבן גדולה ורחבה שמוחמים בה פי הקבר מלמעלה מלשון וגללו את האבן, Obadias de Bartenora.

which ſtone was once rolled thither, the whole funerall action was perform'd, and the ſepulture completed: ſo that it was not * lawfull by the cuſtome of the *Iewes* any more to open the ſepulchre, or diſturbe the interred body.

Thirdly, two eminent perſons did concurre unto the buriall of our Saviour, a † Ruler and a Counſellour, men of thoſe orders among the *Iews* as were of greateſt authority with the people; *Ioſeph* of *Arimathea*, rich and honourable, and yet inferiour to *Nicodemus*, one of the great Council of the *Sanhedrim*: theſe two, though fearfull

* *This hath bin obſerved by the Jews themſelves,* אסור לפתוח הקבר אחר שנסתם הגולל: *It is prohibited for any man to open the ſepulchre after it is ſhut with the rolled ſtone.*

† *So they are ſtyled in the Scriptures,* Joſeph βουλευτὴς, & Nicodemus ἄρχων: *& theſe two powers ruled all then at* Jeruſalem *under the* Romans. *As appeared when* Agrippa *prevented a warre by the ſudden raiſing of a Tax.* Εἰς δὲ τὰς κώμας οἵ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταὶ μεσιδιόντες φόρους ζωλεγον. Joſeph. *l.* 2. *c.* 29.

while he lived, to acknowledge him, are brought by the hand of providence to interre him; that ſo the prediction might be fulfilled which was delivered by *Iſaiah*, to this purpoſe. The counſell of his enemies, the deſigne of the *Iews*, *made his grave with the wicked*, that he might be buried with them which were crucified with him: but *becauſe he had 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 counſell of his Father, the deſign of heaven, put him *with the rich in his death*, and cauſ'd a Counſellour and a Ruler of the *Jews* to bury him. Iſa. 53. 9.

The neceſſity of this part of the Article appeareth, firſt, in that it gives a teſtimony and aſſurance of the truth, both

of Christs death preceding, and of his resurrection following. Men are not put into the earth before they dye: *Pilate* was very inquisitive, whether our Saviour *had bin any while dead*, & was fully satisfied by the Centurion, before he would *give the body to Ioseph* to be interred. Men cannot be said to rise who never dyed, nor can there be a true Resurrection, where there hath not bin a true dissolution. That therefore we might believe Christ truly rose from the dead, we must be first assured that he dyed; and a greater assurance of his death then this we cannot have, that his body was deliver'd by his enemies from the cross, and laid by his disciples in the grave.

Mar. 15. 44, 45.

Secondly, a profession to believe that Christ *was buried* is necessary, to work within us a correspondence and similitude of his buriall. For we are *buried with him in Baptisme*, even *buried with him by Baptisme 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 newnesse 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 soules, and represented in our spirits.

Coloss. 2. 12.

Rom. 6. 4.

† Quicquid gestum est in cruce Christi, in sepultura, in resurrectione tertio die, in ascensione in cœlum, & in sede ad dextram Patris, ita gestum est, ut his rebus non mystice tantum dictis, sed etiam gestis, configuraretur vita Christiana quæ hic geritur. Nam propter ejus crucem dictum est, *Qui autem Iesu Christi sunt, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitiis & concupiscentiis*; propter sepulturam, *Consepulti enim sumus cum Christo per baptismum in mortem*; propter resurrectionem, *Ut quemadmodum Christus resurrexit à mortuis per gloriam Patris, ita & nos in novitate vitæ ambulemus*; propter ascensionem in cœlum, sedemque ad dextram Patris, *Si autem resurrexistis cum Christo, quæ sursum sunt quærite, ubi Christus est ad dextram Dei sedens.* S. Augustin. *Enchirid. ad* Laur.

Thirdly, it was most convenient that those pious solemnities should be performed on the body of our Saviour, that his disciples might for ever learn what honour was fit to be receiv'd and given at their funeralls. When *Ananias* dyed, though for his sin, yet they *wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him.* When *Stephen*

Act. 5. 6.

was

was ſtoned, *devout men carried him* to his buriall, *and made great lamentation over him*: and when *Dorcas* dyed, they *waſhed her*, and *laid her in an upper chamber*. So carefull were the Primitive Chriſtians of the rites of buriall. Before, and at our Saviours time, the *Greeks* did much, and *Romans* more, uſe the burning of the bodies of the dead, and reſerved onely their aſhes in their urnes: but when Chriſtianity began to encreaſe, the funerall flames did ceaſe, and after a few † Emperours had received baptiſme, 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 Saviours funerall: * 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 which interred Chriſt, and the enumeration of their vertues, and the everlaſting commendation of her who brake the box of precious

Act. 8. 2. 9. 37.

† *This appeareth by* Macrobius, *who lived in the time of* Theodoſius *junior*, *and teſtifieth thus much*: Licet urendi corpora defunctorum uſus noſtro ſæculo nullus ſit, lectio tamen docet, eo tempore quo igni dari honor mortuis habebatur, *&c. l.* 7. *c.* 7. *That this was done by the Chriſtians is certain, becauſe the Heathens anciently did object it to the Chriſtians*; Inde videlicet & execrantur rogos, & damnant ignium ſepulturas. *And the anſwer given to this objection was*, Nec, ut creditis, ullum damnum ſepulturæ timemus, ſed veterem & meliorem conſuetudinem humandi frequentamus. *Minut. Felix* in Octavio. *And* Tertul. Et hoc etiam in opinione quorundam eſt; propterea nec ignibus funerandum aiunt, parcentes ſuperfluo animæ. Alia eſt autem ratio pietatis iſtius, non reliquiis animæ adulatrix, ſed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine averſatrix, quod & ipſum homo non utique mereatur pœnali exitu impendi. *De Anima, cap.* 51. At ego magis videbo vulgus tunc quoque, cum ipſos defunctos atrociſſime exurit, quos poſtmodum guloſiſſime nutrit, iiſdem ignibus & promerens & offendens. O pietatem de crudelitate ludentem! ſacrificat, an inſultat, cum crematis cremat? *Idem de Reſurr. Carn.* cap. 1.

* *The heathens objected it to the Primitive Chriſtians*, Reſervatis unguenta funeribus. *Minutius Felix. And* Tertullian *confeſſeth it*: Thura plane non emimus. Si Arabiæ quæruntur, ſciant Sabæi pluris & cariores ſuas merces Chriſtianis ſepeliendis profligari, quam Diis fumigandis. *Apolog. c.* 42. *And ſpeaking of ſpices* lib. de *Idololat.* Etiam hominibus ad pigmen-

ta medicinalia, nobis quoque insuper ad solatia sepulturæ usui sunt. So Clemens Alexand. Μυείζοντα δὲ οἱ τοιχεῖοι. *And again,* Αἱ δὲ ἀπείρατοι χεῖρες τῶν μύρων κηδείας, ἢ συμβιάσιος ἀποτίνουν. *Pædag. l. 2. c. 8.*

† Ipse Dominus die tertio resurrecturus religiosæ mulieris bonum opus prædicat, prædicandumque commendat, quod unguentum pretiosum super membra ejus effuderit, atque hoc ad eum sepeliendum fecerit. Et laudabiliter commemorantur in Evangelio, qui corpus ejus de cruce acceptum diligenter atque honorifice tegendum sepeliendumque curarunt. Verum istæ authoritates non hoc admonent, quod insit ullus cadaveribus sensus: sed ad Dei providentiam, cui placent etiam talia pietatis officia, corpora quoque mortuorum pertinere significant, propter fidem resurrectionis astruendam. *S. Augustin. de Civitate Dei, l. 1. c. 13.*

cious ointment for his buriall, have bin † thought sufficient grounds and encouragements for the careful and decent sepulture of Christians. Who while they looked upon our bodies living as temples of the Holy Ghost, and bought by Christ, to be made one day like unto his glorious body, they thought them no wayes 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 this decent

" Nec ideo tamen contemnenda & abjicienda sunt corpora defunctorum, maximeque justorum atque fidelium, quibus tanquam organis & vasis ad omnia bona opera Sanctus usus est Spiritus. Si enim paterna vestis & annulus, ac si quid hujusmodi tanto charius est posteris, quanto erga parentes major extitit affectus; nullo modo ipsa spernenda sunt corpora, quæ utique multo familiarius atque conjunctius quam quælibet indumenta gestamus. Hæc enim non ad ornamentum vel adjutorium quod adhibetur extrinsecus, sed ad ipsam naturam hominis pertinent. *S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 1. c. 13.* Ταῦτα πλάσας ὁ ἱεροδέχης ἀποθήσειν ἐν οἴκῳ τιμίῳ τὸ σῶμα μεθ' ἑτέρων ὁμοταγῶν ἱερῶν σωμάτων. Εἰ δὲ ἐν ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι τὴν θεοφιλῆ ζωὴν ὁ κεκοιμημένος ἐβίω, τίμιον ἴσως μετὰ τῆς ὁσίας ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ ζωπλάστησαν αὐτῇ σῶμα κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν ἱδρῶτας, ἔνθεν ἡ θεία δικαιοσύνη μετὰ τῆς σφετέρου σώματος αὐτῇ δωρεῖ τὰς ἀμοιβαίας λήξεις, ὡς ὁμοπορεύτῳ καὶ συμμέτοχῳ τῆς ὁσίας ἢ τῆς ἐναντίας ζωῆς. Dionys. *Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7.*

custome of the Primitive Christians was so acceptable unto God, that by his providence it proved most * effectuall in the conversion of the Heathens, and propagation of the Gospell.

Thus

* *This was observed by* Julian *the Apostate, who writing to an Idolatrous High priest, puts him in mind of those things by which he thought the Christians gain'd upon the world, and recommends them to the practice of the Heathen Priests. Of these*

be

he reckons three: The gravity of their carriage, their kindneſſe to ſtrangers, and their care for the burial of the dead. Τί οὖν ἡμεῖς οἰόμεθα ταῦτα ἀρκεῖν, ὃν ἀποβλέποιμεν ὃ μάλιστα τὴν ἀθεότητα (ſo he calls Chriſtianity, because they rejected all the Heathen Gods) ζωντύξησιν, ἢ περὶ τοὺς ξένους φιλανθρωπία, ἢ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς σὺν νεκρῶν περιμήκεια, ἢ ἀπαλαμνὴν σιμνότης καὶ τὸν βίον; ὧν ἕκαστον οἶομαι λέγειν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀμηδῶς ἐπιδεύειν. Epiſt. 49. ad Arſacium. 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 Apoſtate, comparing his Funerall with his Predeceſſors. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ (that is* Conſtantius,*) μεγαλόπρεπτος παρὰ πᾶσιν εὐημερίας τε καὶ πομπῆς, καὶ τάφοις καὶ τοῖς ἡμετέροις σώμασι, φιλοῦσι παννύχοις καὶ φαιδρυγμοῖς, αἷς χειρίστοις τιμᾶν μετέσχεν εὐσεβῶν νομίζομεν· καὶ γίνεται παλίμψυχος μετὰ πολὺ ἢ ἀκμὴ τῷ σώματι. But as for* Julian, *μέλει γελοίων ἦσαν αὐτῷ, καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς σκιᾶς αἰσχρὰν ἐπομωμύετο .... ὡς ἡ Ταρσέων αὐτὸν ὑποδέχεται πόλις ... ἔνθα γὰρ οἱ τίμιον καὶ ἄτιμον, καὶ τάφου ἐξάγιος καὶ ἀπόπτυστος, καὶ ὕδατος ξυμβαῖν ὄλεσι. Steliteut. 2.*

Thus I believe the onely-begotten and eternall 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 cuſtome of the *Jews*, prepared for a funerall, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in ſpices; and after that accuſtomed preparation, depoſited in a Sepulchre hew'n out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and by the rolling of a ſtone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Chriſt *was buried.*

Article V.

He deſcended into hell: the third day he roſe again from the dead.

THe former part of this Article, of the *Deſcent into Hell*, hath not bin ſo † anciently in the Creed, or ſo univerſally, as the reſt. The firſt place we find it uſed in,

† *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 in out of* Clemens *his Conſtitutions. In the*

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 materiall in this cause, It is not to be found in the Rules of Faith delivered by* Irenæus, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. *by* Origen, *lib.* περὶ ἀρχῶν, in procem. *or by* Tertullian *adv. ſ.* Praxeam, *cap.* 2. *de Virg. veland. cap.* 1. *de Præſcript. adv. Hæret. c.* 13. *It is not expreſſed in thoſe Creeds which were made by the Councills as larger explications of the Apoſtles Creed: not in the* Nicene, *or* Conſtantinopolitane; *not in that of* Epheſus *or* Chalcedon; *not in thoſe Confeſſions made at* Sardica, Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmium, *&c. It is not mentioned in ſeverall Confeſſions of Faith delivered by particular perſons: not in that of* Euſebius Cæſarienſis *preſented to the Council of* Nice, Theodoret. *l.* 1. *c.* 2. *not in that of* Marcellus *Biſhop of* Ancyra *delivered to Pope* Julius, Epiphan. *Hær.* 72. *not in that of* Arius *and* Euzoius *preſented to* Conſtantine, Socrat. *l.* 1. *c.* 19. *not in that of* Acacius *Biſhop of* Cæſarea *delivered into the Synod of* Seleucia, Socrat. *l.* 2. *c.* 40. *not in that of* Euſtathius, Theophilus *and* Silvanus, *ſent to* Liberius, Socrat. *l.* 4. *c.* 12. *There is no mention of it in the Creed of S.* Baſil, *Tract. de Fide in* Aſceticis: *in the Creed of* Epiphanius, *in* Ancorato *c.* 120. Gelaſius, Damaſus, Macarius, *&c. It is not in the Creed expounded by S.* Cyril, (*though ſome have produced that Creed to prove it;*) *it is not in the Creed expounded by S.* Auguſtine, *de* Fide & Symbolo; *not in that* De Symbolo ad Catechumenos, *attributed to S.* Auguſtine; *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. l.* 6. *neither is it to be ſeen in the MSS. Creeds ſet forth by the learned Arch-Biſhop of* Armagh. *Indeed it is affirmed by* Ruffinus, *that in his time it was neither in the* Roman *nor the Oriental Creeds:* Sciendum ſane eſt, quod in Eccleſiæ Romanæ ſymbolo non habetur additum, *deſcendit ad inferna*; ſed neque in Orientis Eccleſiis habetur hic ſermo. *Ruff.* in Expoſit. Symboli. *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 Orientall Creeds.*

in was the Church of *Aquileia*; and the time we are ſure it was uſed in the Creed of that Church was leſſe then 400. years after Chriſt, After that it came into the * *Roman* Creed, and † others, and hath bin acknowledged as a part of the Apoſtles Creed ever ſince.

* *That the Deſcent into hell came afterwards into the* Roman *Creed*

Indeed *appeareth, not onely because we find it there of late, but becauſe we find it often in the* Latine *Church many ages ſince. As in that produced by* Etherius *againſt* Elipandus *in the year* 785. *in the* 115 *Sermon* de Tempore *falſly aſcribed to S.* Auguſtine *where it is attributed to S.* Thomas *the Apoſtle. In the Expoſition of the Creed falſly aſcribed to S.* Chryſoſtome.

† *As in the Creed attributed to* Athanaſius, *which though we cannot ſay was his, yet we know was extant about the year* 600. *by the Epiſtle of* Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis *ad* Claudium Ducem. *It was alſo*

also inserted into the Creed of the Council of Ariminum, Socr. l. 2. c. 37. and of the fourth Council of Toledo held in the year 633. and of the fifteenth Council of the same Toledo held in the year 693.

Indeed the *Descent into the Hell* hath *alwayes bin 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 conteined, 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 six, with reference to an expresse place of Scripture interpreted of this *Descent*. *That the body of Christ lay in the grave untill his Resurrection; but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detein'd in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in S. Peter testifieth.* So likewise after the same manner in the Creed set forth in Meeter after the manner of a Psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this staffe,

And so he dyed in the flesh,
But quickned 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 darknesse were
The true light of their hearts.

* Quis nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum? S. *Aug. Ep.* 99.

1 Pet. 3. 19. Nam Corpus usque ad Resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit; Spiritus ab illo emissus cum spiritibus qui in Carcere sive in Inferno detinebantur fuit, illisque prædicavit, ut testatur Petri locus, &c. *Anno* 1552.

But in the Synod ten yeares after, in the dayes 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,

Article 3. 1562.

in these words. *As Christ dyed 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 S. *Peter's* words, which before it intimated; being it hath not delivered that as the onely place of Scripture to found the *Descent into hell* upon; being it hath alledged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other explication to expound it; we may with the greater liberty passe on to find out the true meaning of this Article, and to give our particular judgement in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

First then, it is to be observed, that as this Article was first in the *Aquileian* Creed, so it was delivered there, not in the expresse and formall terme 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 in the *Greeks*, some translating *inferna, hell*, others the * *lower parts*: the first with relation to S. *Peter*, a *thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*; the second referring to S. *Paul*, b *he descended into the lower parts of the earth.*

† Descendit in inferna, *or* ad inferna, *is the generall writing in the Ancient* Mss. *as the learned Archbishop testifieth of those in the* Benedictine *and* Cottonian *Libraries: we see the same likewise in that of* Elipandus, Descendit ad inferna.

* So the *Ancient* Mss. *in* Bennet *Colledge Library*, Κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα: *and the Confession made at* Sirmium, εἰς τὰ κατώτατα καταλθόντα. *Since that it is*, Descendit ad inferos, *and* κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδου, *or* Descendit ad infernum, *as* Venantius Fortunatus. *For* τὰ κατώτατα *is a fit interpretation, if we take* inferna *according to the Vulgar Etymology, as* S. Augustine, Inferi eo quod infra sint Latine appellantur, *De Gen. ad lit. l.* 12. *c.* 34. *Or as* Nonius Marcellus, Inferum abimo dictum, unde inferi quibus inferius nihil. *Again,* Inferna *may well be translated* ᾅδης, *if it be taken according to the true Origination, which is from the* Greek Ἔνερθε, *with the* Æolick digamma, *from which Dialect mist of the* Latine *language came.* Ἔνερθε, Inferi. *Now* Ἔνερθε *according to the* Greek *composition is nothing else but* ὑποχθόνιοι. Etym. Ἔνερθε, οἱ νεκροὶ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἕρᾳ κεῖσθαι, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν τῇ γῇ. *And* Suidas Ἔνερθε, νεκροῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἕρᾳ κεῖσθαι. Ἕρα *is anciently the earth, from whence* Ἔραζε, χαμᾶζε, *to the earth; so* Ἔνερθε *then are in the earth, as they supposed the Manes or Spirits of the dead to be; from whence* Homer *Iliad.* α'. Αἴδης ἐνέρεσσιν ἀνάξων, *of* Pluto; *and in imitation of him* Æschylus *in* Persis, Γῆ

Second-

τα δ' Ἐφεσῶ, βασιλεῦ τ' ἐνέργων, Πέμψατ' ἔπεσιν ψυχὰ εἰς ᾍδαο. *And as* Epesi *are the soules of the dead in the earth, ſo are* Inferi *in the firſt acception, that is* Manes. *Pomponius Mela,* Augilæ manes tantum Deos putant; *which* Pliny *delivers thus,* Augilæ inferos tantum colunt; *and Solinus,* Augilæ vero ſolos colunt inferos. Inferi *were then firſt* Ἔπεσι, *the ſoules of men in the earth: and as* Manes *is no. only taken for the ſoules below, but alſo for the place, as in the Poet,*

——— Manesque profundi,

and, Hæc Manes veniat mihi fama ſub imos;

ſo Inferi *is moſt frequently uſed for the place under ground, where the ſoules departed are: and the* inferna *muſt then be thoſe regions in which they take up their habitations; and ſo* Deſcendit ad inferna, κατῆλθεν εἰς ᾅδου, *and* Deſcendit ad Inferos *are the ſame.* a Act. b Epheſ. 4. 9.

Secondly, I obſerve that in the *Aquileian* Creed, where this Article was firſt expreſs'd, there was no mention of Chriſts buriall; but the words of their Confeſſion ran thus, † *crucified under* Pontius Pilate, *he deſcended* in inferna. From whence there is no queſtion 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 onely to expreſſe the buriall of our Saviour, or the deſcent of his body into the grave. But although they were firſt put in the *Aquileian* Creed to ſignifie the buriall of Chriſt, and thoſe which had onely the buriall in their Creed did confeſs as much as thoſe which without the buriall did expreſſe the *Deſcent*; yet ſince the *Roman* Creed hath added the *deſcent* unto the *buriall*, and expreſs'd that deſcent by words ſignifying more properly *hell*, it cannot be imagin'd that the Creed, as now it ſtands, ſhould ſignifie onely the

† *So are the words cited in* Ruffinus, Crucifixus ſub Pontio Pilato, deſcendit in inferna. *And his Obſervation upon them is this,* Sciendum ſane eſt, quod in Eccleſiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habetur additum, Deſcendit ad inferna: ſed neque in Orientis Eccleſiis habetur hic Sermo; vis tamen verbi eadem 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 onely obſervable in theſe two, but alſo in the Creed made at* Sirmium, *and produced at* Ariminum, *in which the words run thus,* σταυρωθέντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀποθανόντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα. *Where though the Deſcent be expreſs'd, and the Buriall be not mentioned, yet it is moſt*

certain, those even which made it (Heretiks indeed, but not in this) did not vnderstand his buriall by that descent; and that appears by addition of the following words, οἷς τὰ κατα χθόνια κατῆλθε, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε οἰκονομούμενα, ἂν πυλωροὶ ᾅδου ἰδόντες ἔφριξαν. 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 corps lying in the sepulchre.

the buriall 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 buriall; being *Ruffinus* himself, though he interpreted those words of the buriall onely, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviours death, makes mention of his descent into Hell, beside and distinct from his sepulture; being those who in after ages added it to the buriall 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.

Thirdly, I observe again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed we therefore believe because it is conteined in the Scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is conteined 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 intepretation of them, and the generall consent of the Church of God. Now these words as they lye in the Creed, *he descended into Hell*, are no where formally and expresly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said in expresse and plain terms that Christ as he dyed and was buried, so *he descended into hell.* Wherefore being these words of the Creed are not formally expres'd in the Scripture, our enquiry must be in what Scriptures they are conteined virtually, that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same doctrine, in what words soever, which is conteined and to be understood in this expression, *He descended into hell.*

Now

Now several places of Scripture have bin produced by the Ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not: but three there are which have bin alwayes thought of greatest validity to confirm this Article. First, that of S. *Paul* to the *Ephesians* seems to come very near the words themselves, and to expresse the same almost in † terms. *Now that he ascended what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the* Ephes. 4. 9.

† *For the first expression which we find in* Rufinus, Descendit in inferna, *comes most neer to this quotation, especially if we take the ancient Greek Translation of it,* κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτατα. *For if we consider that* κατώτερα *may well have the signification of the superlative, especially being the* LXX *hath so translated* Psal. 63. 9. εἰσπλεύσονται εἰς τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς· *and* Psal. 139. 15. ἡ ὑπόστασίς μου οὐ κρύπτεται ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τῆς γῆς· *what can be nearer then these two,* κατελεύσονται εἰς τὰ κατώτατα, *and,* κατέβης εἰς τὰ κατώτατα; *or these two,* κατέβητε εἰς τὰ κατώτερα, *and,* καταβάντα εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς;

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 confess'd so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it. Those lower parts of the earth may signifie hell, and Christs descending thither may be, that his soul went to that place

* *This appeareth by their quotation of this place to prove or expresse the Descent into Hell, as* Irenæus *does, l.* 5. *c.* 26. Origen *Hom.* 35. *in* Matth. Athanasius *Epist. ad Epict. tom.* Hilarius *in Psal.* 67. Jerome *upon the place,* Inferiora autem terræ infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit. *So also the Commentary attributed to* S. Ambrose *&* S. Hilary. Si itaque hæc omnia Christus unus est neque alius est Christus mortuus, alius sepultus aut alius descendens ad inferna, & alius ascendens in cœlo, secundum illud Apostoli, Ascendit autem quid est, *&c.* De Trinit. *l.* 10.

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 it self will not manifest. For we cannot be assured that the descent of Christ, which S. *Paul* speaketh of, was performed after his death; or if it were, we cannot be assured that the *lower parts of the earth* did signifie

hell, or the place where the ſouls of men were tormented after the ſeparation from their bodies. For as it is written, Joh. 3. 13. *No man aſcendeth to heaven, but he that deſcended from heaven*, ſo this may ſignifie 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 ſignifie no more then the place *beneath*; as when our Saviour ſaid, Joh. 8. 32. *Ye are from beneath, I am from above: ye are of this world, I am not of this world*: or as God ſpake by the Prophet, *I will ſhew wonders in heaven above, and ſignes in the earth beneath.* Nay they may well referre Pſal. 119. 15. to his Incarnation, according to that of *David*, *My ſubſtance was not hid from thee when I was made in ſecret, & curiouſly wrought in the loweſt parts of the earth*: or to his Buriall, according to that of the ſame Prophet, Pſal. 63. 9. *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*, Job 1. 21. *Naked came I out of my mothers 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 ſignifie the end of that Deſcent, and that part of his humanity by which he deſcended. For Chriſt, ſaith S. *Peter*, was *put to death in the fleſh, but 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 joyes 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 croſſe. 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 man-

† *As* Irenæus *l.* 4 *c.* 45. Clemens Alex. *Stromat. l.* 6. Orig. *Hom.* 35. *in* Matth. *S.* Athanaſ. *de Incarn.* Epiphan. *Hæreſ.* 77. *S. Cyril de recta fide ad Theodoſium, l.* 12. *in* Johannem. *Orat. Paſch.* & alibi ſæpius. Author Comment. *Ambroſ.* aſcript. ad Rom. 10. *Ruff.* in Explic Symb.

manner to the proof of this Article. But yet thoſe words of S. *Peter* have no ſuch power of probation; 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 S. *Auguſtine*, and cauſed him at laſt to think that theſe words of S. *Peter* belonged not unto the doctrine of Chriſts 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 the fleſh, but quickned 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 S. *Paul* expreſſeth it, a *Though he was crucified through weakneſſe, yet he liveth by the power of God*: in reſpect of which he preached to thoſe which were diſobedient in the dayes of *Noah*, as we have already ſhewn.

† *For in his Anſwer to* Euodius, *Epiſt.* 99. *He thus begins*, Quæſtio quam mihi propoſuiſti ex Epiſtola Apoſtoli Petri, ſolet nos, ut te late e non arbitror, vehementiſſime commovere, quomodo illa verba accipienda ſint tanquam de inferis dicta. Replico ego tibi eandem quæſtionem, ut ſive ipſe potueris, ſive aliquem qui poſſit invenieris, auferas de illa atque finias dubitationem meam. *Then ſetting down in order all thoſe difficulties which occurr'd to that time in that Expoſition of the Deſcent into hell, He concludes with a Expoſition of another nature.* Conſidera tamen, ne forte totum illud quod de concluſis in carcere ſpiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apoſtolus dicit, omnino ad Inferos non pertineat, ſed ad illa potius tempora quorum formam ad hæc tempora tranſtulit.

The

a 2 Cor. 13. 4.

* Quid eſt enim quod *vivificatus eſt ſpiritu*, niſi quod eadem caro qua ſola fuerat mortificatus, vivificante ſpiritu reſurrexit? Nam quod fuerat anima mortificatus Ieſus, hoc eſt, eo ſpiritu qui hominis eſt, quis audeat dicere? cum mors animæ non ſit niſi peccatum, à quo ille omnino immunis fuit cum pro nobis carne mortificaretur. *S. Aug.* Epiſt. 99. *& ibid.* Certe anima Chriſti non ſolum immortalis ſecundum cæterarum naturam, ſed etiam nullo mortificata peccato vel damnatione punita eſt; quibus duabus cauſis mors animæ intelligi poteſt, & ideo non ſecundum ipſam dici potuit Chriſtus *vivificatus ſpiritu*. In ea re quippe vivificatus eſt in qua fuerat mortificatus. Ergo de carne dictum eſt: ipſa enim revixit anima redeunte, quia ipſa erat mortua anima recedente. *Mortificatus* ergo *carne* dictus eſt, quia ſecundum ſolam carnem mortuus eſt: *vivificatus* autem *Spiritu*, quia

quia illo ſpiritu operante, in quo ad quos (*ſcg.* eos) veniebat & prædicabat, et am ipſa caro vivificata ſurrexit, in qua modo ad homines venit. Pag. 223, 224.

The third but principall Text is that of *David*: applied by S. *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 rejoyce 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, ſpake 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 vertue of that promiſe and propheticall expreſſion, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it reſted in hope untill his reſurrection; ſo his ſoul which was not left in hell, by vertue of the like promiſe or prediction, was in that hell, where it was not left, untill the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the reſurrection. We muſt therefore confeſſe from hence that the ſoul of Chriſt was in hell; and no Chriſtian can deny it, ſaith S. *Auguſtine*, it is ſo clearly delivered in this Propheſie of the Pſalmiſt, and application of the Apoſtle.

Act. 2. 25, 26, 27, 30, 31.

† Dominum quidem carne mortificatum veniſſe ininfernum ſatis conſtat. Neque enim contradici poteſt vel prophetiæ quæ dixit, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in Inferno* (Quod ne aliter quiſquam ſapere auderet, in Actibus

The

bus Apoſtolorum idem Petrus exponit) vel ejuſdem Petri illis verbis quibus eum aſſerit ſolviſſe inferni dolores, in quibus impoſſibile erat eum teneri. Quis ergo niſi infidelis negaverit fuiſſe apud inferos Chriſtum? *Epiſt. 99.*

The onely 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 queſtion'd is not eaſily determined. Different opinions there have bin 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 conteined. I muſt therefore look for ſuch an explication as may conſiſt with the other parts of the Creed, and may withall be conformable unto that Scripture upon which the truth of the Article doth rely: And conſequently, whatſoever Interpretation is either not true in it ſelf, 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.

† Cum Articulus ſit, Chriſtum ad Inferos deſcendiſſe, & non poſſit intelligi ratione Divinitatis, ſecundum quâ eſt ubique; nec ratione corporis, ſecundum quod fuit in ſepulchro; reſtat quod intelligatur ratione animæ: quo ſuppoſito, videndum eſt qualiter anima Chriſti deſcendit ad infernum, *Durand. l. 3. diſt. 22. q. 3.*

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 ſignifie the place where the ſouls of dead men were in cuſtody: but he maketh a metaphor in the word *deſcended*, as not ſignifying any locall motion, nor inferring any reall preſence of the ſoul of Chriſt in the place where the ſoules of dead men were; but onely including a virtuall motion, and inferring an efficacious preſence, by which deſcent the effects of the death of Chriſt were wrought upon the ſoules in Hell: and becauſe the merit of Chriſts death did principally depend upon the act of his ſoul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his ſoul as the prin-

principall 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 farre as it is distinct from others.

But although a virtuall influence of the death of Christ may be well admitted in reference to the soules 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 Scholastick subtilty, nor the place of *David* expounded by S. *Peter* 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 onely 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 soules deteined there, is to be rejected as not expositive of the Creeds confession, nor consistent with the Scriptures expression.

† *Calvin* Instit. *l.* 2. *c.* 16. §. 10. Si Christus ad inferos descendisse dicitur, nihil mirum est, cum eam mortem pertulerit quæ sceleratis ab irato Deo infligitur; *which he expresseth presently in another phrase*, cum diros in anima cruciatus damnati ac perditi hominis pertulerit.

The next Opinion later then that of *Durandus*, is, that the † Descent into Hell is the suffering of the torments of hell; that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatned by the Law unto them which depart this life in their sinnes and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and born by Christ; that he dyed a true supernaturall death, the second death, the death of *Gehenna*; and this dying the death of *Gehenna* was the descending into Hell; That those which are now saved by vertue of his death, should otherwise have endured the same torments in hell which now the damned doe and shall endure, but that he being their surety, did himself suffer the

Quid igitur? Christus persona sua secundum humanitatem pœnam gehennalem nobis debitam passus est, anima principaliter, corpore secundario, utro-

utroque cauſaliter ad merendum, ad nos ſuoipſius merito liberandos, *Parkerus* de Deſcenſu, *l.* 3. §. 48. & ſtatim §. 49. Deſcendiſſe namque Servatorem, modo ſupra memorato, ad Haden mortis gehennalis innumeris pater argumentis.

the ſame for them; even all the torments which we ſhould have felt, and the damned ſhall.

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 formall ſenſe; for in that acception 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 dyeth, which could not lodge within his breaſt, that is, a remorſe of conſcience ſeated 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 ſinnes of thoſe which otherwiſe had bin 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 horrour in the ſoul of Chriſt, which we have expreſſed in the explication of his ſufferings antecedent to his crucifixion, had reference to the ſinnes and puniſhment of men, to the juſtice and wrath of God, but clearly of a nature different from the ſting of conſcience in the ſoules condemned to eternall flames. Again, an eſſentiall 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 compleat diſpair 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 croſſe, 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 expreſſe promiſe of God, that after 1000 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 eternall 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 ſinnes: becauſe hope and confidence & relying upon God would not onely mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguiſh of diſpair. 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 then he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and ſhould continue no longer in his paſſion then he had himſelf determined; he who by thoſe torments was aſſured to overcome all the powers of Hell, cannot poſſibly be ſaid to have bin 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 Metaphoricall ſenſe, for thoſe terrours and horrours of ſoul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernall torments, becauſe they are of greater extremity then any other tortures of this life, and becauſe they were accompanied with a ſenſe of the wrath God againſt the unrighteouſneſſe 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 infernall, or metaphorically ſuch) were antecedent to his death; part of them in the garden, part on the Croſſe; but all before he commended 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 ſtands

now

now in the Creed, ſignifieth ſomething commenced after his death, contra-diſtinguiſh'd to his buriall; and as it is conſidered in the Apoſtles explication, is clearly to be underſtood of that which immediately preceded his reſurrection; and that alſo grounded upon a confidence totally repugnant to infernall pains. For it is thus particularly expreſs'd, *I foreſaw the Lord alwayes before my face; for he is on my right hand that I ſhould not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoyce; and my tongue was glad. Moreover alſo my fleſh ſhall reſt in hope, becauſe thou wilt not leave my ſoul in hell:* where the faith, hope, confidence, and aſſurance of Chriſt is ſhew'n, 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.

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 then 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*, which the Pſalmiſt uſed, and in the *Greek*, which the Apoſtle uſed, and we tranſlate the ſoul, is elſewhere uſed for the body of a dead man, and tranſla-

† *The Hebrew word is* נפש, *& the Greek* ψυχή, לא תעזב נפשי לשאול

ὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδου, Pſal. 16. 10. *But both* נפש *and* ψυχή, *are uſed for the body of a dead man*, Numb. 6. 6. *and it is ſo tranſlated; For* Moſes *ſpeaking there of a* Nazarite, *gives this law*, All the dayes that he ſeparateth himſelf unto the Lord, he ſhall come at no dead body, *in the Originall* על נפש מת לא יבא, *and in the* LXX ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυίᾳ οὐ εἰσελεύσεται. *In the ſame manner the law for the High Prieſt*, Levit. 21. 11. Neither ſhall he go in to

in to any dead body, ועל כל נפשת מת לא יבא, Καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυίᾳ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται. *And the generall law*, Lev. 22. 4. And who ſo toucheth any thing that is unclean *by* the dead, והנגע בכל טמא נפש, ὃς ἂν ἅψηται ὧν ἐὰν ἀποθάνῃ ἀκαθαρσίας ψυχῆς. *which is further cleared by that of* Numb. 12. 11. He that toucheth the dead body of any man, Qui tetigerit cadaver hominis; *and verſe* 13. Whoſoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead. Omnis qui tetigerit humanæ animæ morticinum: *therefore the* נפש *and* ψυχὴ *in* Levit. 22. 4. *doe ſignifie the* cadaver *or* morticinum; *as alſo* Num. 5. 2. Whoſoever is defiled by the dead, כל טמא לנפש πάντα ἀκάθαρτον ἐπὶ ψυχῇ, pollutum ſuper mortuo. *And* נפש טמא נפש, ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐπὶ ψυχῇ, Hag. 2. 13. *is rightly tranſlated*, one that is unclean by a dead body. *Thus ſeven all times* נפש *and* ψυχὴ *are taken for the body of a dead man; that body which polluted a man under the law by the touch thereof. And* Maimonides *hath obſerved, that there is no pollution from the body till the ſoul be departed; therefore* נפש *and* ψυχὴ *did ſignifie the body after the ſeparation of the ſoul. And this was anciently obſerved by S.* Auguſtine, *that the Soul may be taken for the body onely.* Animæ nomine corpus ſolum poſſe ſignificari, modo quodam locutionis oſtenditur, quo ſignificatur per id quod continetur illud quod continet; ſicut ait quidam, Vina cotonant, cum coronarentur vaſa vinaria, vinum enim continetur & vas continet. Sicut ergo appellamus Eccleſiam Baſilicam qua continetur populus, qui vere appellatur Eccleſia, ut nomine Eccleſiæ, id eſt, populi qui continetur ſignificemus locum qui continet: ita quod animæ corporibus continentur, intelligi corpora filiorum per nominatas animas poſſunt. Sic enim melius accipitur etiam illud, quod Lex inquinari dicit eum qui intraverit ſuper animam mortuam, hoc eſt, ſuper defuncti cadaver; ut nomine animæ mortuæ mortuum corpus intelligatur, quod animam continebat; quia & abſente populo, id eſt Eccleſia, locus tamen ille nihilominus Eccleſia nuncupatur. *Epiſt.* 157. *ad* Optatum, *de Animarum Origine.*

tranſlated ſo. And when we read in *Moſes* of a prohibition given to the High-Prieſt, or to the *Nazarite*, of going to or coming near a dead body, & of the pollution by the dead; the *dead body* in the *Hebrew* and the *Greek* is nothing elſe but that which elſewhere ſignifieth the *ſoul*: and Mr. *Ainſworth*, who tranſlated the *Pentateuch* nearer the letter then the ſenſe, hath ſo delivered it in compliance with the Originall 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. For a ſoul he ſhall not defile himſelf among his peoples*, that is, *There ſhall none be defiled for the dead among his people. He that toucheth any* thing that is *unclean* by *a ſoul*, that is, *by the dead. Every*

Levitic. 19. 28.
21. 1.
22. 4.

one

one defiled by a ſoul, that is, *by the dead. He ſhall not come at a dead ſoul*, that is, *he ſhall come at no dead body*. Thus *Ainſworths* Tranſlation ſheweth that in all theſe places the Originall word is that which uſually ſignifieth the ſoul, and our Tranſlation teacheth us that though in other places it ſignifieth 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*, and the Apoſtle in *Greek*, and is tranſlated *Hell*, doth certainly in ſome other places ſignifie no more then the *grave*, and is tranſlated ſo. As where Mr. *Ainſworth* following the Numb. 5. 2. 6. 6.

† *The* Hebrew *word is* שאול, *the* Greek ᾅδης, כי לא תעזב נפשי לשאול Ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ᾅδην, (*or* εἰς ᾅδου, *as it is read in the* Acts, *and in the* Pſalmes *alſ*, *by the ancient* MS. *at S.* James's.) *And theſe generally run together, and ſometimes ſignifie no more then the grave, as* Gen. 37. 35. *where* Jacob *thinking that his ſon* Joſeph *had bin dead, breaks out into this ſad expreſſion*, כי ארד אל בני אבל שאלה, Ὅτι καταβήσομαι πρὸς τὸν υἱόν μου πενθῶν εἰς ᾅδου, *which we tranſlate*, For I will goe down into the grave unto my ſon mourning, *upon the authority of the ancient* Targums. *For although that of* Onkelos *keep the Originall word* לשאול; *yet the* Jeruſalem *Targum and that of* Jonathan *render it* לבי קבורתא, *in domum ſepulchri; and the* Perſian *Targum to the ſame purpoſe*, בגור, *as alſo the* Arabick *Tranſlation*, Imo deſcendam ad pulverem mœſtus de filio meo. *So* Gen. 42. 38. והורדתם את שבתי ביגון שאולה, κατάξετέ μου τὸ γῆρας μετὰ λύπης εἰς ᾅδου; *which we tranſlate* Then ſhall ye bring down my grey hairs with ſorrow to the grave. *Where the* Jeruſalem *Targum and that of* Jonathan *have it again* לבי קבורתא, *and the* Perſian *again* בגור, in ſepulchrum; *the* Arabick אלי אלתרי, ad pulverem, *or* ad terram. *And it is obſerved by the* Jewiſh *Commentators that thoſe Chriſtians are miſtaken, who interpret thoſe words ſpoken by* Jacob, *I will goe down into* Sheol, *of Hell, obſerving that* Sheol *there is nothing elſe but the grave.*

word, *For I will goe down unto my ſon, mourning to hell.* Our Tranſlation aiming at the ſenſe rendreth it, *For I will goe down into the grave unto my ſon mourning*. So again he, *Ye ſhall bring down my grey hairs with ſorrow unto Hell*, that is, *to the grave*. And in this ſenſe we ſay, *the Lord killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up.* Gen. 37. 35. 42. 38. 1 Sam. 2. 6.

Now being the *Soul* is ſometimes taken for the body deſerted by the ſoul, and *Hell* is alſo ſometimes taken for the

the grave the receptacle 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 then 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.

This Exposition hath that great advantage, that he which first mentioned this Descent in the Creed did interpret it of the Buriall; and where this Article was expressed there that of the Buriall was omitted. But notwithstanding those advantages, there is no certainty of this Interpretation: First, because * he which did so first interpret it, at the same time and in the tenure of that exposition, did acknowledge a descent of the soul of Christ into hell; and those other † Creeds which did likewise omit the buriall and expresse the descent, did shew 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 buriall was express'd 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.

* Ruffinus, *who first mentioned this Article, did interpret it of the grave, as we have already observed, but yet he did believe a Descent distinct from that, in the Exposition of the Creed.* Sed & quod in infernum descendit, evidenter prænunciatur in Psalmis, *&c. and then citing that of* S. Peter, Unde & Petrus dixit, Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu, In ipso ait, Et eis qui in carcere inclusi erant in diebus Noe, in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declaratur.

† *I shewed before, that in the Creed made at* Sirmium *there was the Descent mentioned, and the buriall omitted, and yet that Descent was so expressed, that it could not be taken for the buriall: besides now I adde, that it was made by the Arrians, who in few yeares before had given in another Creed, in which both the Buriall and the Descent were mentioned; as that of* Nice in Thracia, ἀποθανόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ κατα χθόνια κατελθόντα, ὃν αὐτὸς ὁ ἅδης ἐτρόμαξεν, Theodoret. *Histor. lib.* 2. *cap.* 21. *and not long after gave in another at* Constantinople *to the same purpose,* συνταφέντα, καὶ συνκατελθόντα

νόντα καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια διῆλυθότα, ὃν τίνα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἅιδης ὑπῆξεν, Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 4.

The next opinion is, that the Soul may well be understood either for the nobler part of man distinguish't from the body; or else for the person of man consisting of both soul and body, as it often is; or for the living soul as it is distinguish'd from the immortall spirit: but then the term *Hell* shall signifie no place, neither of the man, nor of the body, nor the soul; but onely the state or condition of men in death during the separation of the soul from the body. So that the Prophecie shall run thus, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, that is, Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, to be long deprived of my naturall life, to continue without exercise, or power of exercising my vitall faculty: And the Creed will have this sense, that Christ was crucified, dead, and buried, and *descended into Hell*, that is, he went unto the dead, and remained for a time in the state of death, as other dead men doe.

But this Interpretation supposeth that which can never appear, that *Hades* signifieth not death it self, nor the place where soules departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their permansion in death; which is a Notion wholly new, and consequently cannot interpret that which representeth something known and believed of old, according to the Notions and conceptions of those times. And that this Notion is wholly new, will appear, because not any of the ancient Fathers is produced to avow it, nor any of the Heathen Authors which are produced doe affirm it: Nay, it is evident that the *Greeks* did alwayes by *Hades* understand a place into which the souls of men were carried and conveyed distinct and separate from that place in which we live; and that their different opinions shew, some placing it in the earth, some under it, some in one unknown place of it, some in another. But especially *Hades* in the judgement of the ancient

Greeks cannot consist with this notion of the state of death, and the permansion in that condition, because there were many which they believed to be dead, and to continue in the state of death, which yet they believed not to be in Hades; † as those who dyed before their time, and those whose bodies were unburied. Thus likewise the Ancient Fathers differed much concerning the place of the *Infernus*,

† *The Opinion of the Ancient Greeks in this case is excellently expreſs'd by* Tertullian, *who shewes three kinds of men to be thought not to descend* ad inferos *when they dye: the first* Insepulti, *the second* Aori, *the third* Biæothanati. Creditum est, insepultos non ante ad inferos redigi quam justa percepetint. *De Anima, cap.* 56. Aiunt & immatura morte præventas eousque vagari isthic donec reliquatio compleatur ætatis, quacum pervixissent, si non tempestive obiissent. *Ibid.* Proinde extorres inferum habebuntur, quas vi ereptas arbitrantur, præcipue per atrocitates suppliciorum; crucis dico & securis & gladii & feræ. *Ib. The soules then of those whose bodies were unburied, were thought to be kept out of* Hades *till their funeralls were perform'd, and the soules of them who dyed an untimely or a violent death, were kept from the same place until the time of their naturall death should come. This be further expresst in the terms of the* Magicians, *whose art was conversant about soules departed.* Aut optimum est hic retineri secundum ahoros (*i. e.* ἀώρους) aut pessimum, secundum Biæothanatos (βιαιοθανάτους) ut ipsis jam vocabulis utar, quibus auctrix opinionum istarum Magica sonat, Hostanes & Typhon & Dardanus, & Damigeron & Nectabis & Bernice. Publica jam literatura est quæ animas etiam justa ætate sopitas, etiam proba morte disjunctas, etiam prompta humatione dispunctas evocaturam se ab inferum incolatu pollicetur, *cap.* 57. *Of that of the* Insepulti, *he produceth the example of* Patroclus, *Secundum* Homericum Patroclum sunus in somnis de Achille flagitantem, quod non aliàs adire portas inferum posset, arcentibus eum longè animabus sepultorum. *The place he intended is that* Iliad. Ψ.

Θάπτέ με ὅττι τάχιστα πύλας Ἀΐδαο περήσω,
Τηλέ με εἴργουσιν ψυχαὶ, εἴδωλα καμόντων,
Οὐδέ μέ πω μίσγεσθαι ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο ἐῶσιν.

In the same manner he describes Elpenor, *Odyss.* λ.

Πρώτη δ' ψυχὴ Ἐλπήνορος ἤλυθεν ἑταίρου,
Οὐ γάρ πω τί ἐτάφη ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης ἐυρυοδείης.

Where it is the observation of Eustathius, Ὅτι δόξα ἦν τοῖς Ἕλλησι τὰς τῶν ἀδεκάστων ψυχὰς μὴ ἀναμίγνυσθαι ταῖς λοιπαῖς: Legimus præterea in Sexto, insepultorum animas vagas esse, Servi*in Æneid.* 3. *The place which he intended I suppose is this*

Hæc omnis, quam cernis inops, inhumataque turba est;
Portitor ille Charon; hi quos vehit unda sepulti;
Nec ripas datur horrendas, nec rauca fluenta

Trans-

Transportare prius quam sedibus ossa quierunt;
Centum errant annos, volitantque hæc littora circum.

but never any doubted but that it signified some place or other; and if they had conceived any such notion, as the state of death & the permansion of the dead in that state, they needed not to have fallen into those 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 dye, as other men are wont

Thus he is to be understood in the description of the Funerall of Polydorus Æneid. 3.

Ergo instauramus Polydoro funus, & ingens
Agger tur tumulo tellus, animamque sepulchro
Condimus.

Not that anima *does there signifie the body, as some have observed, but that the soul of* Polydorus *was then in rest when his body had received funerall rites; as* Servius. Legimus præterea in Sexto inſepultorum animas vagas esse, & hinc constat non legitime sepultum fuisse. Rite ergo reddita legitima sepultura, redit ad quietem sepulchri, *saith* Servius; *or rather in the sense of* Virgil, ad quietem inferni, *according to the petition of* Palinurus,

Sedibus ut saltem placidis in morte quiescam.

And that the soul of Polydorus *was so wandring about the place where his body lay unburied, appeareth out of* Euripides in Hecuba, *where he speaketh thus,*

Νῦν γοῦν ἀπὸ σπαρτῆς ἐβλήθης Ἑκάβης, αἰαῖ, Ξάνθ' ἡηνιόχου κλιδών, Τετρώου πλησίον ἀλιρρύτου. *And in the* Troades *of the same Poet this* ἔξοδος, *or* erratio vagabunda inſepultorum, *is acknowledged by the Chorus in these words,*

Ὦ φίλος, ὅν ποτ' ἐγὼ, Σὺ μὲν φροῦδος ἀλαλὰς Ἄιδαν θανὼν. *And when their bodies were buried, then their soules passed into* Hades, *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 & implicita, quæ corpus ævo terraque putrefactum nuda & exesa reliquerat vinculis: collecta publice sepeliuntur; domus postea rite conditis manibus caruit. Plin. *l.* 7. *Epist.* 27. *This was the case of the* Inſepulti: *and for that of the* Biæothanati, *it is remarkable that* Dido *threateneth* Æneas,

——— sequar atris ignibus absens,
Et cum frigida mors animā seduxerit artus,
Omnibus umbra locis adero. ———

Upon which place Servius *observes,* Dicunt Physici Biothanatorum animas non recipi in originem suam, nisi vagantes legitimum tempus fati compleverint; quod Poetæ ad sepulturam transferunt, ut *Centum errant annos.* Hoc ergo nunc dicit Dido, Occisura me ante diem sum; vagantem mihi dabis pœnas; Nam te persequar, & adero quamdiu errabis vero semper.

to doe, and that after expiration he was in the ſtate or condition of the dead; in deadlyhood, as ſome have learn't to ſpeak; yet the Creed had ſpoken as much as this before, when it delivered that he *was dead*. And although 'tis true that he might have dyed, and in the next minute of time reviv'd, and conſequently his death doth not, preciſely taken, ſignifie any permanſion or duration in the ſtate of death, and therefore it might be added, *he deſcended into hell*, to ſignifie further a permanſion or duration in that condition; yet if Hell doe ſignifie nothing elſe but the ſtate of the dead, as this opinion doth ſuppoſe, then to *deſcend into hell*, is no more then to be dead, and ſo notwithſtanding any duration implyed 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 dyed. Being then to *deſcend into Hell*, according to this Interpretation, is no more then to be dead; being no man ever doubted but that perſon was dead who dyed; being it was before delivered in the Creed that Chriſt dyed, or as we render it, *was dead*; we cannot imagine but they which did adde this part of the Article to the Creed, did intend ſomething more then this, and therefore we cannot admit this Notion, as a full or proper Expoſition.

There is yet left another Interpretation grounded upon the generall opinion of the Church of Chriſt in all ages, & upon a probable expoſition of the Prophecy of the Pſalmiſt, taking the *ſoul* in the moſt proper ſenſe, for the ſpirit or rationall part of Chriſt; that part of man which according to our Saviours doctrine the *Jews* could not kill; and looking upon *hell* as a place diſtinct from this part of the world where we live, & diſtinguiſhed from thoſe heavens whether Chriſt aſcended, into which place the ſoules 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

which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the crosse, but resigned into thy hands, when it shall goe into that place below where the soules of men departed are deteined; I say, thou shalt not suffer that soul to continue there as theirs have done; but shalt bring it shortly from thence and reunite it to my body.

For the better understanding of this Exposition, there are severall 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 dyeth, dyeth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure, according to the ground of our Saviours counsell, *Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul.* Mat. 10. 28. That better part of us therefore in and after death doth exist and live, either by virtue of it's spirituall and immortall nature, as we believe, or at least by 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 spirituall, 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 soul 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 vitall actions, in that separate existence after death must not be conceiv'd to sleep, or be bereft and stript of all vitall 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 soules of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace, and rest, joy, and happinesse, others by the justice of the same God, left to sorrow, pains, and misery.

As there was this different ſtate and condition before our Saviours death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the juſt, the elect and reprobate; ſo there was two ſocieties of ſoules after death, one of them which were happy in the preſence of God, the other of thoſe which were left in their ſinnes, and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous *Abel* the firſt man placed in this happineſſe, and the ſoules of them that departed in the ſame faith to be gathered to him. Whoſoever it was of the ſonnes of *Adam* which firſt dyed in his ſinnes, was put into a place of torment; and the ſoules of all thoſe which departed after with the wrath of God upon them, were gathered into his ſad ſociety.

Now as the ſoules 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 liv'd. 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 is another receptacle, or habitation, and manſion for our ſpirits. From whence it followeth, that in death the ſoul doth certainly paſſe by a reall 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 alotted to it. And not at preſent to enquire into the difference and diſtance of thoſe ſeverall habitations (but for methods ſake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the Infernall parts, or the Manſions below) it will appear to have bin the generall judgement of the Church, that the ſoul of Chriſt contradiſtinguiſh'd from his body, that better and more noble part of his humanity, his rationall and intellectuall ſoul after a true and proper ſeparation from his fleſh, was really and truly carried into thoſe parts below, where the ſoules of men before departed were deteined;

teined; and that by ſuch a reall tranſlation of his ſoul he was truly ſaid to have deſcended into Hell.

Many have bin 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 then this which I have already affirm'd, a reall deſcent of the ſoul of Chriſt unto the habitation of the ſoules departed. The perſons to whom and end for which he deſcended they differ in, but as to a locall deſcent into the infernall parts they all agree. Who were then in thoſe parts they could not certainly define; but whoſoere were there, that Chriſt by the preſence of his ſoul was with them they all determined.

That this was the Generall opinion of the Church, will appear not onely by thoſe many teſtimonies of thoſe † ancient writers which lived ſucceſſively, and wrote in ſeverall ages, and delivered this expoſition in ſuch expreſſe terms as are not capable of any other interpretation; but alſo becauſe it was generally uſed as an Argument againſt the Apoli-

† As Irenæus l. 5. c. 26. Cũ enim Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit ubi animæ mortuorum erant, poſt deinde corporaliter reſurrexit.... manifeſtum eſt, quia & diſcipulorum ejus, propter quos & hæc operatus eſt Dominus, animæ abibunt in inviſibilem locum definitum eis à Deo, &c. Clemens Alexandrinus *was ſo clearly of that opinion, that he thought the ſoul of Chriſt preached ſalvation to the ſoules in hell.* Strom. lib. 6. *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.* De Anima, *cap.* 55. Quod ſi Chriſtus Deus, quia & homo mortuus ſecundum ſcripturas, & ſepultus ſecundum eaſdem, hic quoque legi ſatisfecit forma humanæ mortis apud Inferos functus, nec ante aſcendit in ſublimiora cœlorum quam deſcendit in interiora terrarum, ut illic Patriarchas & Prophetas compotes ſui faceret; habes & regionem Inferum ſubterraneam credere, & illos cubito pellere, qui ſatis ſuperbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas. Γυμνὴ σώματος γινομένη ψυχὴ ταῖς γυμναῖς σωμάτων ἁρμόζει ψυχαῖς. Orig. *contra Celſum*, l. 2. Ipſa anima, ciſi fuit in abyſſo, jam non eſt, quia ſcriptum eſt non derelinques animam meam in inferno. *S.* Ambroſ. *de Incarn. ap.* 5. Si ergo ſecundum hominem quem Verbum Deus ſuſcepit putamus dictum eſſe *Hodie mecum eris in Paradiſo*, non ex his verbis in cœlo exiſtimandus eſt eſſe Paradiſus. Neque enim ipſo die in cœlo futurus erat homo Chriſtus Jeſus, ſed in inferno ſecundum animam, in ſepulchro autem ſecundum carnem. Et de carne quidem, quod eo die in ſepulchro ſit poſita, manifeſtum-

nifeſtum eſt Evangelium. Quod vero illa anima in infernum deſcenderit, Apoſtolica doctrina prædicat. Quandoquidem B. Petrus ad hanc rem teſtimonium de Pſalmis adhibet, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno, neque dabis ſanctum tuum videre corruptionem.* Illud de anima dictum eſt, quia ibi non eſt derelicta unde tam cito remeavit; illud de corpore, quod in ſepulchro corrumpi celeri reſurrectione non potuit. *S.* Auguſt *Epiſt. 57. ad Dardanum.* Καταβὰς μέχρι τῶν ἀδύτων Ἐπιδημίας ἰσαμέσης, Κατίβας δ' ἀπὸ τάφου, Ψυχῶν ἔδει μυεῖα θάνατος γλυκὺ ἴδρεα. Φέξεν σι γλαυκῶπις Ἀΐδας ὁ παλαιχθὴς, Καὶ λαοβόρος κώων Ἀνεχάσατο βηλῶ. Syneſ. *Hymn.* 9. Ψυχὴ ἡ θεία πρὸς αὐτὸν λαχοῦσα σωθρομίως τι ἐνωσιν κατωφοίτησε μὴ εἰς ᾅδου, διοπρεπῶς ἡ δυνάμις ἐξουσία χωμὴν ἡ τοῦ ὀνείου πνεύματος κατεφαίνετο. Cyril Alex. *Dial. de Incarn.* Ὁ μὲν ᾅδης αὐτῆς σῶμα μόνον κατεδέξατο, ψυχὴ δ' μόνον ὁ ᾅδης. Anaſtaſ. *apud* Euthy. *Panopl.* Poſtquam igitur exaltatus eſt, id eſt, à Judæis in cruce ſuſpenſus, & ſpiritum reddidit, unita ſuæ Divinitati Anima ad inferorum profunda deſcendit, *Autor. Serm. de Tempore.* Corpore in ſepulchro ſepoſito, *Divinitas* cum anima hominis ad infernalia deſcendens vocavit de locis ſuis animas ſanctorum. Gaudentius Brix. *Tract.* 10. In hoc Divinitas Chriſti virtutem ſuæ impaſſibilitatis oſtendit, quæ ubique ſemper & ineſtabiliter præſens, & ſecundum carnem ſuam in inferno ſine doloribus fuit, & ſecundum animam ſuam in ſepulchro ſine corruptione jacuit; quia nec carni ſuæ defuit, cum animam ſuam in inferno dolere non ſineret; nec animam ſuam in inferno deſeruit cum in ſepulchro carnem ſuam à corruptione ſervaret, *Fulgent. ad* Traſimund. *l.* 3. *c.* 31.

Apollinarian Hereſie. Then which nothing can ſhew more the generall opinion of the Catholicks and the Hereticks, and that not onely of the preſent but of the precedent ages. For it had bin little leſſe then ridiculous to have produced that for an argument to prove a point in Controverſie, which had not bin clearer then that which was controverted, and had not bin ſome way acknowledged as a truth by both. Now the errour of *Apollinarius* was, that Chriſt had no proper intellectuall or rationall ſoul, but that the Word was to him in the place of a ſoul: and the † Argument produced by the Fathers for the conviction of this errour was, that Chriſt deſcended into Hell; which the *Apollinarians* could not deny, and that this deſcent

† *what the Apollinarian Hereſie was is certainly known, they denyed that Chriſt had an humane ſoul, affirming that the word was to him in the place of a ſoul.*

Apollinariſtas Apollinaris inſtituit, qui de anima Chriſti à Catholicis diſſenſerunt, dicentes, ſicut Arriani, Deum Chriſtum carnem ſine anima ſuſcepiſſe. In quæſtione teſtimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem qua rationalis eſt anima homi-

non

non fuisse in anima Christi, sed pro hac ipsum verbum in ea fuisse dixerunt. S. Aug. de Hæres. *Against this Heresie the Catholicks argued from the Descent into Hell, as that which was acknowledged by them all, even by the Arrians (with whom the Apollinarians in this agreed) as we have shewn before by three several Creeds of theirs in which they expressed this Descent. This is the Argument of Athanasius in his fourth Dialogue de Trinitate, which is particularly with an Apollinarian;* Ὥσπερ οὖν ἠδύνατο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν μνήματι εἶναι ὃν παρῆν ἅδης, εἰ μὴ ἔμελλεν τὸ ἰδιάζον σῶμα, ὅπως ἐκ τοῦ ἅδου ἔχοντα καινοῦ τοῦ σώματος πνεῦμα ὂν καὶ τὰ πάντα φρόνιμον εἰ μὴ ἔμελλεν χωρὶς ὀφθῆναι ψυχὴ, μηδ' οὕτως ἐν τοῖς ἐν ἅδου εὐαγγελίσατο, διὰ τοῦτο ἀναχωρεῖν τοῦ σώματος λέγει καὶ ἐν ἅδου γεγονέναι· καὶ τοῦτο ὅτι τὸ ἐκεῖσε ἡμᾶς ἐν ἅδου ἦλθε διὰ τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἐν μνήματι τεθῆναι διὰ τὸ σῶμα. *But because these Dialogues may be questioned as not genuine, the same Argument may be produced out of his book* de Incarnatione Christi *written particularly against* Apollinarius. Πεφώνηται οὖν, ὅτι ὁ ἴσμεν ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὅλον ἦν ψυχὴ· τοῦτο καὶ τῶν πρώτων πλάσιος δείκνυσιν, καὶ τὰ ἑβδομήκοντα διαλύσιος ἀλύσεως, ἃ μόνον ἐφ' ἡμῶν τούτων δείκνυμένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σωτῆρι Χριστῷ ἐπεδείκνυτο· τὸ μέντοι, μὴ χείρω τάφον φθάσῃς· ἢ ὅ, μὴ χείρω ἅδου διαβᾶσα· διαιρετῶν ὄντων τῶν τόπων πολλῷ μᾶλλον, καὶ τῆς μὲν τάφου σωματικὴν ὅλως δεχομένης τὴν ἐπιβαίνουσαν, ἐκείσε παρὴν ἰδοῦσα· τῆς δ' ἅδου ἀσώματον· πῶς ἐνεῖ παρὼν ὁ Κύριος ἀσωμάτως, ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐνομίσθη κατὰ τῆς σωτῆρος; ἵνα ψυχαῖς τοῖς ἐν Δαμοῖς κατοικημένοις, μοχθηρὰν ἰδίας ψυχῆς ἀναπλήσῃ ἕξιν καὶ δεσμῶν τῶν σωτῆρος παρῇς παρούσης, ἐναρρήξῃ τε δεσμὰ ψυχῶν καὶ ἐν ἅδου κατεχομένων. *Thus* Euthymius *in his Commentary upon the words of the Psalmist,* Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, Τί δηποτ' ἐπάνω τῆς αἰτίας, Καὶ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις, φησὶ, τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς ἅδου, ὅπου καὶ κατελύθησαν αἱ ψυχαὶ κατ' ἐμέ; τόπος γὰρ ὁ ἅδης ὑπὸ γῆν ἀποκλῃόμενος πᾶς τῶν ἀποθνησκόντων ψυχάς· πῶς οὖν ὁ λῆρος Ἀπολλινάριος, ὁ τὴν περιληφθεῖσαν σάρκα δογματίζων ἄψυχον καὶ ἄνουν, ὡς ἀνθρώπου; *And from hence we may understand the words of* Theodoret, *who at the end of his exposition of this Psalm, thus concludes,* Οὕτως ὁ Δαυὶδ καὶ τὴν Ἀρείου, καὶ τὴν Εὐνομίου καὶ Ἀπολλιναρίου φρενοβλάβειαν ἐλέγχει, *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 Incarnatione Christi corrigens, *as* Gennadius *observeth, and particularly disavowing that of the* Arrians *and* Apollinarians, Deum hominemque commixtum & tali confusione carnis & Verbi quasi aliquod corpus effectum, *does thus expresse the reality and distinction of the soul and body in the same Christ;* Tam Christus filius Dei tunc mortuus jacuit in sepulchro, quam idem Christus filius Dei ad inferna descendit. Sicut beatus Apostolus dicit, *Quod autem ascendit quid est nisi quod descendit prius in inferiores partes terræ?* Ipse utique Dominus & Deus noster Jesus Christus unicus Dei qui cum anima ad inferna descendit, ipse cum anima & corpore ascendit ad cœlum, *Libel. Emendationis. And* Capreolus *Bishop of* Carthage *writing against the* Nestorian *Heresie, proveth that the soul of Christ was united to his Divinity when it descended into hell, and followes that Argument, urging it at large. In which discourse among the rest he hath this passage,* Tantum abest, Deum Dei filium incommutabilem atque incomprehensibilem

henſibilem ab inferis potuiſſe concludi, ut nec ipſam adſumptionis animam aut exit abiliter ſuſceptam aut tenaciter derelictam, ſed nec carnem ejus credimus contagione alicujus corruptionis infectam. Ipſius namque vox eſt in Pſalmo, ſicut Petrus interpretatur Apoſtolus, *Non derelinques animam meam apud inferos, neq; ſanctum tuum videre corruptionem*, Epiſt. *ad* Hiſpanos. *Laſtly, the true Doctrine of the Incarnation 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 ſepulchro fuit, nec tota in inferno; ſed in ſepulchro ſecundum veram carnem Chriſtus mortuus jacuit, & ſecundum animam ad infernum Chriſtus deſcendit, & ſecundum eandem animam ab inferno ad carnem, quam in ſepulchro reliquerat, rediit: ſecundum divinitatem vero ſuam, quæ nec loco tenetur nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in ſepulchro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima; ac pro hoc plenus fuit ubique Chriſtus, quia non eſt Deus ab humanitate quam ſuſceperat ſeparatus, qui & in anima ſua fuit, ut ſolutis inferni doloribus ab inferno victrix rediret, & in carne ſua fuit, ut celeri reſurrectione corrumpi non poſſet. *Ad Traſimund. lib.* 3. *cap.* 34.

ſcent was not made by his divinity or 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 bin anſwer'd by the Hereticks, as now it is by many, that his deſcent into Hell had no relation to his ſoul, but to his body onely, which deſcended into the grave; or that it was not a reall but onely virtuall deſcent, by which his death extended to the deſtruction of the powers of hell; or that his ſoul was not his intellectuall ſpirit or immortall 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 bin affixed to this Article, the *Apollinarians* anſwer might have bin ſound, and the Catholicks Argument of no validity. But being thoſe Hereticks did all acknowledge this Article; being the Catholick Fathers did urge the ſame to prove the reall 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 ſoules below; it followeth that it was the gene-

rall

rall doctrine of the Church, that Christ did descend into hell, by a locall motion of his soul, separated from his body, to the places below where the souls of men departed were.

The onely question which admitted any variety of discrepance among the Ancients, was, who were the persons to whose soules the soul of Christ descended, and that which dependeth on that question, what was the end and use of his descent. In this indeed they differed much, according to their severall apprehensions of the condition of the dead, and the nature of the place into which the soules before our Saviours death were gathered. Some looking on that name, which we translate now hell, *Hades* or *infernus*, as the † common receptacle of the soules of all men, both the just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those which departed in the true faith and fear of God, the soules of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, and the people of God. But others

† *Some of the Ancient Fathers did believe that the word ᾅδης in the Scriptures had the same signification which it hath among the* Greeks, *as comprehending all the soules both of the wicked and the just, and so they took* Infernus *in the same latitude. As therefore the ancient* Greeks *did assigne one ᾅδης for all which dyed;* Πάντας ὁμοῦ θνητοὺς εἰς ἀΐδας δέχεται· *and* Εἰς κοινὸν ᾅδην πάντας ἤξειν βροτοὺς· *As they made within that one ᾅδης two severall receptacles, one for the good and vertuous, the other for the wicked and unjust, according unto that of* Diphilus, Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ᾅδου δύο τεθῆναι νομίζομεν, Μίαν δικαίων, κἀτέραν ἀσεβῶν ὁδόν: *and that of* Plato, Οὕτω δὴ ἀπᾴδειν τελευτήσαντι, δικάσαντι ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ, ἐξ ἧς φέρεσθον τὰς ὁδούς, ἣ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἣ δ' εἰς τάρταρον· *and that of* Virgil,

Hic locus est partes ubi se via findit in ambas;
Dextera quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit:
Hac iter Elysium nobis; at læva malorum
Exercet pœnas, & ad impia Tartara mittit.

As they did send the best of men to ᾅδης there to be happy, and taught rewards to be received there as well as punishments; Λέγεται δὲ καὶ τῷ μαλιστα Πινδάρου πασῶν ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ εὐσεβίᾳ ἐν ᾅδου, Τοῖσι λαμπρὰ μὲν μένος ἀελίου τὰ ὑπὸ δεῖα νύκτα κάτω, φοινικοβόλλα τε λειμῶνες ὑπὲρ πρανέος αὐγᾷ, &c. Plut. *de Consolat. ad* Apollon. Ὦ τεισάλβιοι Κῆνοι βροτῶν, οἱ ταῦτα δ' ἐρχθέντες τέλη Μολόντ' ἐς ᾅδου· πῆσι δὴ δίκαιοις ὀνὴρ Ζῆν ἐστὶ τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πανταχοῦ κακά, Sophocles. *So did the*

the Jews also before and after our Saviours time. For Josephus sayes the soule of Samuel was brought up ἐξ ᾅδου, and delivers the opinion of the Pharisees after this manner, Antiq. Jud. l. 18. c. 2. Ἀθανάτου τε ἰσχὺν πίστις αὐτοῖς ἔνι καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαίοις τε καὶ πρὸς οἷς ἀρετῆς ἡ καλὴ ὁμιλία ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε: and of the Sadduces after this manner, Ψυχῆς τε τὸν διαμονὴν, καὶ τὰς καθ' ᾅδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι. Therefore the Jews, which thought the soules immortall, did believe that the just were rewarded as well as the unjust punished ὑπὸ χθονὸς, or κατ' ᾅδου. And so did also most of the Ancient Fathers of the Church. There was an Ancient book written de Universa natura, which some attributed to Justine 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 Hœschelius in his Annotations upon Photius, delivering the state of ᾅδης at large. Περὶ δ' ᾅδου ἐν ᾧ σωιέχοντα ψυχαὶ δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν. Here then were the just and unjust in Hades, but not in the same place; Οἱ δίκαιοι ἐν τῷ κατ' ᾅδην νάπῃ ἔνεχονται, ἀνὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ οἱ καὶ δίκαιοι. Μία γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον κάθοδος, &c. There was but passage into that Hades, saith he; but when that gate was past, the Just went on the right hand to a place of happinesse (Τούτῳ δ' ὄνομα κεκλήσθω νῦν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ) and the Unjust on the left to a place of misery. Οὗτος ὁ περὶ ᾅδου λόγος, ἐν ᾧ ψυχαὶ πάντων κατέχονται ἄχρι καιροῦ ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ὥρισεν. Tertullian wrote a Tract de Paradiso, now not extant, in which he expresses thus much, Habes etiam de Paradiso à nobis libellum, quo constituimus omnem animam apud Inferos sequestrari in diem Domini, De Anima cap. 55. S. Jerome in the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, Ante adventum Christi omnia ad Inferos pariter ducebantur: Unde & Jacob ad inferos pariter descensurum se dicit; & Job pios & impios in Inferno queritur retentari; & Evangelium, Chaos magnum inter positum apud Inferos; & Abraham cum Lazaro, & divitem in suppliciis esse testatur. Τὸ πρότερον ὁ Θάνατος εἰς τὸν ᾅδην κατῆγε· νυνὶ δ' ὁ Θάνατος πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν παραπέμπει. S. Chrys. Panegyr. ad Sanctas Mart. And in his Tractate proving that Christ is God, he makes this exposition of Isaiah 45. 2. Πύλας χαλκᾶς συνθλάσω, καὶ μοχλοὺς σιδηροῦς συντρίψω, καὶ ἀνοίξω σοι θησαυροὺς σκοτεινοὺς, ἀποκρύφους, ἀοράτους ἀναδείξω σοι· τὸν Ἅδην ἅπαν καλῶν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ᾅδης ἦν, ἀλλ' ψυχὰς ἐκεῖθεν ἁγίας καὶ σεβασμίαν τιμὴν τὸν Ἀβραὰμ, τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, τὸν Ἰακὼβ, διὸ καὶ θησαυροὺς ἀνέλαβε. 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 onely so, but under the power of Satan. Thus Justine Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, Φαίνῃ δέ μοι καὶ τοῦτο ἀγνοῶν, ὅτι πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀδίκων καὶ πονηρῶν ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν ὑπῆλθον τοῦ τοιούτων δαιμόνων, οἵους δὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖ. Who was followed in this by Origen, Anastasius Antiochenus, and others.

‡ S. Augustine began to doubt of that generall reason ordinarily given of Christs Descent into Hell to bring the Patriarchs and Prophets thence,

‡ others there were who thought Hades or Infernus was never taken in † the Scriptures for any place of happinesse, and

upon

upon this ground, that he thought the word Infernus *was never taken in the Scriptures with a good sense*; Quanquam illud me nondum invenisse confiteor, Inferos appellatos ubi justorum animæ acquiescunt, *De Genesi ad literam*, *l.* 12. *c.* 33. Proinde, ut dixi, nondum inveni, & adhuc quæro: nec mihi occurrit Inferos alicubi in bono posuisse Scripturam duntaxat Canonicam. *Ibid.* Non facile alicubi Scripturarum Inferorum nomen positum invenitur in bono, *Epist.* 57. Præsertim quianc ipsos quidem Inferos ubique Scripturarum locis in bono appellatos potui reperire. Quod si nusquam in divinis authoritatibus legitur, non utique sinus ille Abrahæ, id est, secretæ cujusdam quietis habitatio, aliqua pars inferorum fuisse credenda est: quanquam in his ipsis tanti Magistri verbis, ubi ait dixisse Abraam, *Inter vos & nos chaos magnum firmatum est*, satis, ut opinor, apparet non esse quandam partem & quasi membrum Inferorum tantæ illius felicitatis sinum, *Epist.* 99.

and therefore they did not conceive the soules of the Patriarchs or the Prophets did passe into any such infernall 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 bin onely said that Christ had gone unto the bosome of *Abram*, or to Paradise, no man would have ever believed that he had descended into hell; so being it is onely 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 anciently in respect of the persons unto whose soules 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 generall place which comprehended all the soules of men (as well those which dyed in the favour of God as those which departed in their sinnes) † some of them thought that Christ descended to that place of *Hades*, where the soules of all the faithfull, from the death of the righteous *Abel* to the death of Christ, were detained, and there dissolving all

† *This is the Opinion generally received in the Schools, and delivered as the sense of the Church of God in all ages: but though it were not so generall, as the Schoolmen would perswade us, yet it is certain that many of the Fathers did so understand it.* Ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν ἐκ μακρῶν παρεῖς ἐκ μακρῶν αἰῶνος τὴν ἀφιξιν ποιεῖται πρὸς αὐτούς, Euseb. *de Demonst. Evang. l.* 10. Καταλῦσαι δὲ τὰ κατὰ ᾅδου ἵνα κατ-

κῶν δεν λυτρώσηται τοὺς δικαίους. Cyril. *Catech.* 4. Ἤμελλε γὰρ ἡ θεότης τελειοῦν τὰ πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ πάθους, καὶ σὺν τῇ ψυχῇ καταλθὼν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ἵνα τοὺς ἐκεῖσε τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προκεκοιμημένων σωτηρίαν, φημὶ δὴ ἁγίων πατριαρχῶν. Translatus erat Enoc, raptus Elias; sed non est servus supra Dominum. Nullus enim ascendit in Cœlum, nisi qui descendit de cœlo. Nam & Moysen, licet corpus ejus non apparuerit in terris, nusquam tamen in gloria cœlesti legimus, nisi postquam Dominus suæ resurrectionis pignore vincula solvit inferni, & piorum animas elevavit. *S.* Ambros. *l.* 4. *de Fide ad Gratianum.* Qui in eo loco detinebantur sancti, vinculorum solutionem in Christi adventu sperabant. Nemo enim ab Inferni sedibus liberatur nisi per Christi gratiam. Eo igitur post mortem Christus descendit. Ut Angelus in caminum Babylonis ad tres pueros liberandos descendit, ita Christus ad fornacem descendit Inferni, in quo clausæ justorum animæ tenebantur. Postquam eo descendit, inferorum claustra perfodit, dissipuit, vastavit, spoliavit, vinctas inde animas liberando, *S.* Hieron. *in Ecclesiasten.*

all the power by which they were detein'd below, transl'ated them into a farre more glorious place, and estated them in a condition farre more happy in the heavens above. Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the soules of all men are † deteined below still, and shall not enter into heaven untill the generall 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.

† Justine Martyr *in his Dialogue with* Trypho *first begins*

Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀπεθνήσκειν φημὶ πάσας ἁπλῶς ψυχὰς ἐγώ (ἔρμιππον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς) ἀλλὰ τί; τὰς μὲν εὐσεβῶν ἐν κρείττονι που χώρῳ μένειν, τὰς δὲ ἀδίκων καὶ πονηρῶν ἐν χολέρᾳ, τὸν τότε κείσεως ἐκδεχομένας χρόνον τότε. *After him* Irenæus, *l.* 5. 26. Cum Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, & post resurrectionem assumptus est, manifestum est quia & discipulorum ejus, propter quos & hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in invisibilem locum definitum eis à Deo, & ibi usque ad resurrectionem commorabuntur, sustinentes resurrectionem; post recipientes corpora & perfecte resurgentes, hoc est, corporaliter, quemadmodum & Dominus resurrexit, sic venient in conspectum Dei. Nemo enim est discipulus super magistrum; perfectus autem omnis erit sicut magister ejus. Quomodo ergo Magister noster non statim evolans abiit, sed substinens definitum à Patre resurrectionis suæ tempus (quod & per jonam manifestum est) post triduum resurgens assumptus est; sic & nos substinere debemus definitum à Deo resurrectionis nostræ tempus prænuntiatum à Prophetis, & sic resurgentes assumi, quotquot Dominus

Dominus hoc dignos habuerit. Tertullian *followeth* Irenæus *in this particular*, Habes & regionem Inferum ſubterraneam credere, & illos cubito pellere qui ſatis ſuperbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas, ſervi ſuper Dominum & diſcipuli ſuper magiſtrum, aſpernati ſi forte in Abrahæ ſinu expectandæ reſurrectionis ſolatium carpere. *De Anima, cap.* 55. Nulli patet cœlum terra adhuc ſalva, ne dixerim clauſa. Cum tranſactione enim mundi reſerabuntur regna cœlorum, *Ibid.* Eam itaque regionem ſinum dico Abrahæ, etſi non cœleſtem, ſublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus juſtorum, donec conſummatio rerum reſurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat. *Adv. Marci. l.* 4. *c.* 34. Omnes ergo animæ penes Inferos? inquis. Velis & nolis, & ſupplicia jam illic & refrigeria habes, pauperem & divitem. Cur enim non putes animam & puniri & foveri in inferis, interim ſub expectatione utriuſque judicii in quadam uſurpatione & candida ejus? *De Anima, cap.* 58. S. Hilary *in his Commentary upon thoſe words of the Pſalm*, Dominus cuſtodiet & introitum tuum & exitum tuum ex hoc & uſque in ſæculum, Non enim temporis hujus & ſæculi eſt iſta cuſtodia, non aduri ſole atque luna, & ab omni malo conſervari, ſed futuri boni expectatio eſt cum exeuntes de corpore ad introitum illum regni cœleſtis per cuſtodiam Domini fideles omnes reſervabuntur, in ſinu ſcilicet interim Abrahæ collocati; quo adire impios interjectum Chaos inhibet, quouſque introeundi rurſum in regnum cœlorum tempus adveniat. Cuſtodit ergo Dominus exitum, dum de corpore exeuntes ſecreti ab impiis interjecto Chao quieſcunt. Cuſtodit & introitum, dum nos in æternum illud & beatum regnum introducit. *And at the end of the* 2. *Pſalm*, Judicii enim dies vel beatitudinis retributio eſt æterna vel pœnæ: tempus vero mortis habet unumquemque ſuis legibus, dum ad judicium unumquemque aut Abraham reſervat aut pœna. *Thus* Gregory Nyſſen *ſtill leaves the Patriarchs in* Abrahams *boſome, in expectation of admittance into heaven*, Καὶ γὰρ οἱ πάλαι τὸν Ἀβραὰμ παρεῖδεν ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τὸν Λάζαρον ἔχοντα, οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν ὀπτῆσαι τὸν ἀπηνέστατον πλοῦτον· καθώς φησιν ὁ Ἀπόστολος· Ἀμὴν ἔμενε ἐν τῇ ὑπείξει τῶν τοῦ κρείττονος, τῷ Θεῷ χρώμενον περὶ ἡμῶν προβλεψαμένῳ, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου φωνὴν, ἵνα μὴ, φησὶ, χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι. *De Hominis Opificio, cap.* 22. *Theſe therefore which conceived that the ſoules of the godly now after Chriſts aſcenſion do goe unto the boſome of* Abraham, *where the Patriarchs and Prophets were and are, and that both remain together till the generall Reſurrection, did not believe that Chriſt did therefore deſcend into hell that he might tranſlate the Patriarchs from thence into heaven.*

But ſuch as thought the place in which the ſoules 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 ſoules from thoſe miſeries which they felt, and to tranſlate them to a place of hap-

happineſſe 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 †Hereticks; but to believe that many were delivered, was both by them and many others counted Orthodox.

† S. Auguſtine *in his book de Hæreſibus reckons this as the ſeventy ninth Hereſie.*

The Alia, deſcendente ad Inferos Chriſto credidiſſe incredulos, & omnes inde exiſtimat 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* Euodius *propounded it to* S. Auguſtine, *as a queſtion in which he deſired ſatisfaction,* an deſcendens Chriſtus omnibus evangelizavit, omneſque à tenebris & pœnis per gratiam liberavit, ut à tempore reſurrectionis Domini judicium expectetur exinanitis inferis. *And in his answer to that queſtion, he looks not upon the affirmative part as an Hereſie, but as a doubtfull 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 fuiſſe conceſſum, Abel, Seth, Noe, & domui ejus, Abraam, Iſaac, & Jacob, aliiſque Patriarchis & Prophetis, ut cum Dominus in infernum veniſſet, illis doloribus ſolverentur. Sed quonam modo intelligatur Abraam, in cujus ſinum pius etiam pauper ille ſuſceptus eſt, in illis fuiſſe doloribus, ego quidem non video: explicant forſitaſſe qui poſſunt, *Epiſt. 99. ad* Euodium: *& paulo poſt,* Unde illis juſtis qui in ſinu Abrahæ erant, cum ille in inferna deſcenderet, nondum quid contuliſſet inveni, à quibus eum ſecundum beatificam præſentiam ſuæ divinitatis nunquam 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 credi videtur; antiquos etiam ſanctos qui venturi Chriſti tenuerunt fidem, locis quidem à tormentis impiorum remotiſſimis ſed apud inferos fuiſſe, donec eos inde ſanguis Chriſti & ad ea loca deſcenſus erueret, *&c. De Civit. Dei, l. 20. c. 15. His ſecond Reſolution was, that Chriſt did by his deſcent relieve ſome out of the paines of hell, taking hell in the worſt ſenſe.* Quia evidentia teſtimonia & infernum commemorant & dolores, nulla cauſa occurrit cur illuc credatur veniſſe ſalvator niſi ut ab ejus doloribus ſalvos faceret, *Epiſt. 99.* Quamobrem teneamus firmiſſime, quod fides habet fundatiſſima authoritate firmata, quia Chriſtus mortuus eſt ſecundum ſcripturas & quia ſepultus eſt, & quia reſurrexit tertia die ſecundum ſcripturas; & cætera quæ de illo, teſtante veritate, conſcripta ſunt. In quibus etiam hoc eſt, quod apud Inferos fuit ſolutis eorum doloribus, quibus cum erat impoſſibile teneri; à quibus etiam recte intelligitur ſolviſſe & liberaſſe quos voluit, *Ibid. 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.* Sed utrum omnes quos in eis invenit, an quoſdam quos illo beneficio dignos judicavit, adhuc requiro, *Ibid.* Hoc ſcilicet quod ſcriptum eſt, *Solutis doloribus Inferni,* non in omnibus, ſed in quibuſdam

dam accipi poteſt, quos ille dignos iſta liberatione judicabat; ut neque fruſtra illuc deſcendiſſe exiſtimetur, nulli eorum profuturus qui ibi tenebantur incluſi; nec tamen ſit conſequens, ut quod Divina quibuſdam miſericordia juſtitiaque conceſſit, omnibus conceſſum eſſe putandum ſit, *Ibid.* Poteſt & ſic ut eos dolores eum ſolviſſe credamus, quibus teneri ipſe non poterat, ſed quibus alii tenebantur quos ille noverat liberandos Verum quinam iſti ſunt temerarium eſt definire. Si enim omnes omnino dixerimus tunc eſſe liberatos qui illic inventi ſunt, quis non gratuletur ſi hoc poſſimus oſtendere? *Ibid.* *Thus the opinion of S. Auguſtine is clear, that thoſe which departed in the faith of Chriſt were before in happineſs, and the beatifical preſence of God, and ſo needed not the aſſiſtation by the deſcent of Chriſt; and of thoſe which were kept in the pains of Hell, ſome were looſed and delivered from them, ſome were not, and this was the proper end or effect of Chriſts Deſcent into Hell.* Thus Capreolus, Ipſe in homine eſt viſitare inferorum dignatus abſtruſa, & præpoſitos mortis prælentia invictæ majeſtatis exterruit, & propter liberandos quos voluit inferorum portas referari præcepit, *Epiſt. ad Hiſpanos.* *And* S. Ambroſe, Ipſe autem inter mortuos liber remiſſionem in inferno poſitis ſoluta mortis lege donabat, *De Incarnat. cap.* 5. Ὅλον γὰρ ἐυθὺς σκυλεύσας τὸν ἅδην, καὶ τὰς ἀφύκτους πῖς ἦν κεκοιμημένους πνεύμασιν ἀναπετάσας πύλας, ἕνα μόνον τὸν μόνου ἀφεὶς ὀνήσῃ τὸν διάβολον ἄνδρα, S. Cyril. *Homil. Paſch.* 7. *He ſpeaks juſt as big as thoſe words of* Euodius, *or that Heretick whoſoever it was, which is mentioned though not named by* Philaſtrius. *For* ἕνα μόνον διάβολον, *is as much as* Inferi exinaniti; *and* κενώσας τῷ δυνάτῳ μυχῷ (*which he uſeth in another Homily*) *is the ſame.*

The means by which they did conceive that Chriſt did free the ſoules of men from hell, was the application of his death unto them, which was propounded to thoſe ſouls by † preaching of the Goſpell there. That as he revealed here on earth the will of God unto the ſonnes of men, and propounded himſelf as the object of their faith, to the end that whoſoever believed in him ſhould never dye; ſo after his death he ſhewed himſelf unto the ſoules departed, that whoſoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him, ſhould paſſe from death to life.

† *This preaching of the Goſpell to the dead was the generall opinion of the Fathers, as the end of his deſcent, or means by which that good was wrought for the ſoules below, which was effected by his death.*

Thus propter Dominum in ea quæ ſub terra deſcendiſſe evangelizantem & illis adventum ſuum, remiſſam peccatorum exiſtentem his qui credunt in eum. Crediderunt autem in eum omnes qui ſperabant in eum, id eſt, qui adventum ejus prænunciaverunt, & diſpenſationibus ejus ſervierunt, juſti & Prophetæ & Patriarchæ, quibus ſimiliter ut nobis remiſit peccata, Irenæus, *l.* 4. *c.* 45. Ἐπορεύθη γὰρ οἶμαι καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς ἐκεῖσε λόγον αὐτοῦ ποιήσῃ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως βεβλημένοις

λημμένους διὰ τῦ κηρύγματος, ὅποι ποτ' ἔτυχον γεγονότες, ἑλκύσας εἰς σωτηρίαν. Εἰ γ' οὖν ὁ Κύριος διὰ τῦτ' ἦλθεν ἔτερον εἰς ᾅδου καταβάδην, ἵνα διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ἵνα καταβάδην, ἵνα πάντας εὐαγγελίσασθαι ἢ μόνους Ἑβραίους· Εἰ μὲν οὖν πάντες, σωθήσονται πάντες οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καὶ ὅσοι ἐνθεῦν ὄντες πλημμελήσαντες ὁμολογήσωσιν ἐν τῷ ἅδῃ ἐκεῖ, Clem. Alexand. *Stromat. l.* 6. Τειθέμενος γὰρ ἀναβίω κυρίως καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι. Πληρεστάτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ φιλανθρωπίας ἐπίδειξις ἦν, τῷ μὴ μόνον ἀναστῆναι, φησὶ, καὶ ὅτι ζῶντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἅδῃ κατοικημένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀβύσσου μυχοῖς καθημένοις ἐπιστῆναι, καὶ τὸ γεγενημένον διακηρύξαι πᾶσιν ἀφεσιν, *S. Cyril. in Joan. l.* 12. Πολλαχοῦ διαμαρτύρεται ἡ γραφὴ, ὃν πρόσκομα τοῖς πνεύμασι ζῶσα ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾅδῃ διὰ Χριστοῦ πᾶσι παραγενέσθαι. Λέγει γὰρ ὁ τῶν μαθητῶν κορυφαῖος, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκήρυξε καὶ ἀνέστη ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ· καὶ πάλιν, τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξε πνεύμασιν, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν σαρκὶ, ζῶσι δὲ πνεύματι· τετέχθαι, ὅπως οἱ μὲν ἄπιστοι, καὶ διὰ τῦτο ἀμάρτωλοι, μεμψιμοιρίας καταπαυσῶσιν, ἅτε δικαίως σάρξ γεγονότες, καὶ δικαιωμένοις τὸ πνεύματος, ὅσοι καλῶν ἅδου Χριστῷ τῇ ἀνακαινούσῃ πεπιστεύκασι, τῆς πνευματικῆς εὐφροσύνης ἀπολαύσωσι, Jobius *apud* Photium, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 38.

Thus did they think the ſoul of Chriſt deſcended into Hell to preach the Goſpell 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 Chriſts deſcent; nor can I look upon it as any illuſtration of this Article, for many reaſons. For firſt, I have already ſhew'd that the place of S. *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 S. *Peter* in that manner, but becauſe other Apochryphal writings led them to that interpretation, upon the authority whereof this opinion onely can rely. A place of the Prophet *Jeremy* was firſt † produced, that *The Lord God of Iſrael remembred his dead, which ſlept in the land of the grave, and deſcended unto them to preach unto them his ſalvation.* But

† Juſtine Martyr *in his Dialogue with* Trypho *the* Jew,

Καὶ ἀπὸ τῦ λόγων τῦ αὐτῦ Ἱερεμίου ἐμοίως ταῦτα πεποίηται, Ἐμνήσθη ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χώματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτῦ. This place is firſt brought by Iſtenius to prove that he which dyed for us was not onely man but God. Et quoniam non

non ſolum homo erat qui moriebatur pro nobis, Eſaias a't, *Et commemoratus eſt Dominus Sanctus Iſrael mortuorum ſuorum qui* (leg. *qui*) *dormierant in terra ſepultionis, & deſcendit ad eos evangelizare ſalutem quæ eſt ab eo, ut ſalvaret eos.* Adv. Hæreſ. *l.* 3. 23. *Onely he names* Eſaias *inſtead of* Jeremias, *whom he rightly names again, l.* 4. 39. *Sicut Hieremias ait*, Recommemoratus eſt Dominus Sanctus Iſrael mortuorum, *&c. and as there, ſo more plainly, l.* 5. *c.* 26. *applyes it to the ſoul of Chriſt while it was abſent from his body*, Nunc autem tribus diebus converſatus eſt ubi erant mortui, quemadmodum Prophetia ait de eo, *Commemoratus eſt Dominus Sanctorum*, (lege *Sanctus Iſrael*) *mortuorum ſuorum, eorum qui ante dormierunt in terra ſtipulationis* (lege *ſepultionis*) *& deſcendit ad eos evangelizare eos, & ſalvare eos. Thus did* Irenæus *make uſe of this verſe, to ſhew Chriſt preached unto the dead, rather then that of S.* Peter; *and yet there is no authority in it. For it is not to be found in the* Hebrew Text, *and* Irenæus *charges the* Jewes *onely of raſing it out of the* LXX, *which how they could doe out of thoſe Copies which were in the Chriſtians hands is not intelligible; and yet it is not now to be found there. And if it ever were, as many additions as patches have bin in that Tranſlation, it could be of no authority having no foundation in the Original.*

But 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 raſed out from thence by the *Jewes*; which as it can ſcarce be conceived true, ſo if it were, it would be yet of no authority, as being never found in the *Hebrew* Text. And *Hermas* in his book called the *Paſtor*, was * thought to give ſufficient ſtrength to this opinion, whereas the book it ſelf is of no authority, and in this particular is moſt extravagant; for he taught that not onely the ſoul of Chriſt, but alſo the ſoules of the Apoſtles preached to the ſpirits below, that as they followed

* Clemens Alexandrinus *firſt brings a ſtrange place of Scripture to prove Chriſts preaching in Hell*, Stromat. *l.* 6. Διόπερ ὁ Κύριος ἐνηγγελίσατο καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾅδου. Φησίν· ὦ ὑμῶν ἡ χαρὰ, Λέγει ὁ ἅδης τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ, πλὴν ἐμοῦ ἐκ ἐδόμην, φωνὴν ἡ αὐτῆ ἠκούσαμεν· *which he thus interprets*, ἐχ ὁ τῶν ὅλων δὲ τὴν φωνὴν λαβὼν ἔστιν τὸ περιειρημένον, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐν ᾅδου καταπαύσαντες καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν αὐτὸν ἐκβιάσαντες καὶ ἐν τῷ νεκρῷ εἰς θάλασσαν ἐκπεσόντες ὑπὸ βαρέος· αὐτοὶ τοίνυν εἰσὶν οἱ ἐγκεκυφότες ἡ θείας διδαχῆς καὶ φωνῆς· *and then ſeeming to aim at the place of S.* Peter, *he paſſes to another proof which he had produced in his ſecond book*, Δέδεικται ἡμῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ συγγράμματι τὸν Ἀποστόλους ἀκολούθως τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τοὺς ἐν ᾅδου εὐηγγελισμένους· *which he there proved, by the authority of the book called* Paſtor, *and attributed to* Hermes. Ὁ Ἑρμῆς ἡ.... φησὶ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους καὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους, τοὺς κηρύξαντας τὸ ὄνομα τῦ υἱῦ τῦ Θεῦ καὶ κοιμηθέντας τῆ πίστει κηρύξαι τοῖς πεκοιμημένοις, Strom. *l.* 12. *and ſupplyes*

that authority with a reason of his own, that as the Apostles were to imitate Christ, while they lived, so did they also imitate him after death, Ἔχθην δὲ, φησὶ, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, οὕτως ἡ κάθοδος, τοὺς ἀρίστους τῆς μαθητῆς μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τοῦ διδασκάλου, Stromat. *l. 6. and therefore they preached to the souls in hell, as Christ did before them. This is the doctrine of* Clemens Alexandrinus *out of his Apocryphall authorities.*

lowed his steps here, so did they also after their death, and therefore descended to preach in Hell. Nor is this onely 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 it self, 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 onely which are in this life) and as incongruous to the state and condition of those soules to whom Christ is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all Saints before departed, 'tis certain they were never *disobedient in the dayes of Noah*, nor could they need the publication of the Gospel after the death of Christ, who by vertue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptation had receiv'd a reward long before. If we look upon them which dyed in disobedience, and were in torments for their sinnes, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the Gospel preach'd. The rich man whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, least 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 *hear'd not Moses and the Prophets*, would *not be perswaded though one rose from the dead*, surely those which had bin disobedient unto the Prophets, should never be perswaded after they were dead. Whether therefore we consider the Authorities first introducing this opinion, which were Apocryphal; or the testimonies of Scripture, forc'd

Luke 16. 31.

forc'd 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 onely to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of Chriſts Deſcent; but the effect it ſelf 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 ſhew'n before, that Chriſt did therefore deſcend into hell that he might deliver the ſoules of ſome which were tormented in thoſe flames, and tranſlate them to a place of happineſſe; yet this opinion deſerveth no acceptance, neither in reſpect of the ground or foundation on which 'tis built, nor in reſpect of the Action or Effect it ſelf. The Authority upon which the ſtrength of this doctrine doth rely, is that place of the Acts, *whom God hath raiſed up looſing the paines of hell*, for ſo they read it: from whence the Argument is thus deduced, God did looſe the paines of hell, when Chriſt was raiſed: but thoſe paines did not take hold of Chriſt himſelf, who was not to ſuffer any thing after death; and conſequently he could not be looſed from, or taken out of thoſe paines, in which he never was. In the ſame manner the Patriarchs and the Prophets and the Saints of Old, if they ſhould be granted to have bin in a place ſometimes called Hell, yet were they there in happineſſe, and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the looſing of the paines of hell. It followeth then, that thoſe alone which dyed in their ſinnes were involved in thoſe paines, and when thoſe paines 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 ſoules from their torments there.

But firſt, though the *Latine* Tranſlation render it ſo, *the paines of hell*; though ſome Copies and other Tranſlations, and divers of the Fathers read it in the ſame manner; yet the Original and Authentick *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 paines in which he was deteined any time, much leſſe that the ſoul of Chriſt delivered the ſoules of any other; but † onely that he was preſerved from enduring them.

† *The Vulgar Latine rendreth it thus*, Quem Deus ſuſcitavit, ſolutis doloribus inferni: *ſo alſo the Syriack*, ושוא חבליהו דשיול: *So ſome of the ancient Fathers read it, as* Irenæus *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *or rather his Interpreter*, Quē Deus excitavit ſolutis doloribus inferorum, Capreolus *Biſhop of* Carthage, Reſolvere, ſicut ſcriptum eſt, inferorum parturitiones: *And before theſe* Polycarpus, ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου, Quem reſuſcitavit Deus diſſolvens dolores inferni, *Epiſt. ad* Philip. *whom I ſuppoſe* Grotius *underſtood when he cited* Barnabas: *and thus S.* Auguſtine *read it, & laid the ſtreſſe of his Interpretation upon this reading*, Quia evidentia teſtimonia & internum commemorant & dolores, *&c. But in the Originall* Greek *it is generally written* ὠδῖνας θανάτου, *and in all theſe many Copies of it, onely that of* Petrus Fraxardus, *and 2. of the 16. Copies which* Robertus Stephanus *made uſe of, read it* τοῦ ᾅδου: *and this miſtake was very eaſie; for in the eighteenth* Pſalm, *verſe the 5. there is* חבלי מות, ὠδῖνες θανάτου, *and verſe the ſixt* חבלי שאול, ὠδῖνες ᾅδου. * Quod ſi movet aliquem quemadmodum accipiendum ſit Inferni ab illo ſolutos dolores. Neque enim coperat in eis eſſe tanquam in vinculis, & ſic eos ſolvit tanquam ſi catenas ſolviſſet quibus fuerat alligatus; facile eſt intelligere ſic eos ſolutos, quemadmodum ſolvi poſſunt laquei venantium, ne teneant, non quia tenuerunt, S. Auguſt. *Epiſt.* 99.

Again, as the Authority is moſt uncertain, ſo is the Doctrine moſt incongruous. The ſoules of men were never caſt into infernall torments to be delivered from them. The dayes 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

to them, that this life is unto us. We may as well believe the Devils were sav'd, as those soules which were once tormented with them. For it is an *everlasting fire*, an *everlasting punishment*, a *worm* that *dyeth not*. Nor does this onely belong to us who live after the death of Christ, as if the damnation of all sinners now were ineluctable and eternall, 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 fulnesse of time in which our Saviour came into the world, should have bin farre more † happy and advantagious then it hath bin since. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternall flames, except we obtain the favour of God before we be swallowed by the jawes of death. *We must all appear before the judgement 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 Christs descent into hell which were numbred amongst the damned before his death, at the day of the generall judgement they must be returned into hell again; or if they be received then into eternall happinesse, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to those flames at first, according to the generall 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 judgement, reflecting on the life that's past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never dye; he that believeth though

Mat. 25. 41, 46. Mar. 9. 44.

† *This is the Argument of* Gregory *the Great*, Si fideles nunc sine operibus bonis non salvantur, & infideles ac reprobi, sine bona actione, Domino ad Inferos descendente, salvati sunt; melior illorum fors fuit qui incarnationem Domini minime viderunt, quam horum qui post incarnationis ejus mysterium nati sunt. Quod quantæ fatuitatis sit dicere, ipse Dominus testatur discipulis dicens, *Multi Reges & Prophetæ voluerunt videre quæ vos videtis, & non viderunt*, l. 6. Epist. 179.

2 Cor. 5. 10.

though he dye, yet ſhall he live; but he that dyeth 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 foundations of the world. I therefore conclude, that the end for which the ſoul of Chriſt deſcended into Hell, was not to deliver any damned ſoules, or to tranſlate them from the torments of hell unto the joyes of heaven.

The next conſideration is, whether by vertue of his deſcent the ſoules 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 & ſtate far more glorious and happy. This hath bin in the later ages of the Church the vulgar opinion of moſt men, and that as if it followed neceſſarily from the deniall of the former; He delivered not the ſoules of the damned, † therefore he delivered the ſoules of them which believed, and of them alone. Till at the laſt the Schools have followed it ſo fully, that they deliver it as a point of * faith and infallible certainty, that the ſoul of Chriſt by deſcending into hell did deliver from thence all the ſoules of the Saints which were in the boſome of *Abraham*, and did conferre upon them actuall and eſſentiall beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds; firſt, that

† *So* Gregory the Great, *after he had proved that none of the damned were releaſed by Chriſts deſcent, thus inferres & concludes,* Hæc itaque omnia pertractantes, nihil aliud teneatis, niſi quod vera fides per Catholicam Eccleſiam docet; quia deſcendens ad Inferos Dominus illos ſolummodo ab inferni clauſtris eripuit, quos viventes in carne per ſuam gratiam in fide & bona operatione ſervavit, *l. 6. Epiſt. 179.* *So* Iſidore Hiſpalenſis *by way of oppoſition,* Ideo Dominus in infernо deſcendit ut his qui ab eo non pœnaliter detinebantur, viam aperiret revertendi ad cœlos. *So* Venerable Bede *upon the place of* S. Peter, Catholica fides habet quia deſcendens ad inferna Dominus non incredulos inde, ſed fideles tantummodo ſuos educens ad cœleſtia ſecum regna perduxerit; neque exutis corpore animabus & inferorum carcere incluſis, ſed in hac vita vel per ſeipſum, vel per ſuorum exempla ſive verba fidelium quotidie viam vitæ demonſtret.

* *Theſe are the words of* Suarez *in* 3am Thomæ *Diſputat.* 43. *Sect.* 3. Primo ergo, certum eſt Chriſtum deſcen-

descendendo ad Inferos animabus sanctis, quæ in sinu Abrahæ erant, essentialem beatitudinem & cætera animæ dona, quæ illam consequuntur, contulisse. Hoc de fide certum existimo; quia de fide est illas animas non vidisse Deum ante Christi mortem. Ideinde est de fide certum, Christum per mortem aperuisse hominibus januam regni: ideoque de fide etiam certum est, animas Sanctorum omnium post Christi mortem decedentium (si nihil purgandum habeant) statim videre Deum. Ergo idem est de prædictis animabus.

that the Soules 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 generall as it hath bin, 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 farre from believing that the end of Christs 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 Christs death, untill the generall resurrection. Others, as we have also shewen, thought the bosome 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 infernall mansions, did not think so exclusively, or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be sav'd as well as the Patriarchs were, and * doubted whether all were not so sav'd or no. Indeed I think there were very few (if any) for above 500 yeares after Christ, which did so believe Christ delivered the Saints out of Hell, as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion can not be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the Ancients believed not that they were remov'd at all, and so few acknowledged that they were remov'd alone. And

† *We have shew'd this before to have bin the opinion of the most ancient, producing the expresse testimonies of* Justine Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen. *So also* Novatian *l. de Trinitate*, Nec infra terram jacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis & ordinatis poenitentiaribus vacua. Locus enim est quo piorum animæ impiorumque ducantur, ubi futuri judicii præjudicia sententiæ.

* *We have already shewn that many did believe all the damned soules were saved then; and S.* Augustine *had his* adhuc requiro, *when he wrote to* Euodius *concerning that opinion. Beside the doubt of that great Divine,* Gregory Nazianzene, *is very ob-*

observable, wherein his Oration de Paschate hath these words, "Αν τις ἀπιστήσῃ τοῦτο γενόμενον τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστηρίᾳ τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τῆς σωτηρίας καταβάσεως; τίς ὁ λόγος; ἀπλῶς σωζομένους ἐπαινεῖ, 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 universall law, that none of the damned should be saved, An vero ex speciali privilegio sua voluntate & arbitrio aliquem damnatum ex Gehenna Christus eduxerit, dubitari quoquo modo potest. . . . Et juxta hæc possent intelligi Nazianzenus & Augustinus. But this will by no means salve their authorities; for neither of them did doubt or question whether some of the damned were released, but whether all were released or some one: 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 satisfie no man else. Whereas 'tis clear that it was a doubt in his age, as we have before shew'n, and that he would leave it still a doubt and undetermined. And as for the other, Augustinus recte potest intelligi de animabus Purgatorii, it is certainly false, unlesse they will enlarge that Purgatory as wide as Hell; for the question was of emptying that.

And if the Authority of this opinion in respect of it's antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be lesse. For first, if it be not certain that the soules of the Patriarchs were in some place called *hell* after their own death, and untill the death of Christ; if the bosome of *Abraham* were not some infernall mansion; then can it not be certain that Christ descended into hell to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the soules 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 bosome of *Abraham* might well be in the heavens above, farre from any region where the Devil and his Angells were; the Scriptures no where 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 Angells carried the poor mans 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

ven to convey the ſoules 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 *Abram* ſhould be in any worſe place or condition then *Enoch* was, having as great *a teſtimonie that he pleaſed God*, as *Enoch* had.

Secondly, it cannot be certain that the Soul of Chriſt delivered the Soules of the Saints of old from Hell, and imparted to them the beatificall viſion, except it were certain that thoſe ſoules are in another place and a better condition now then they were before. But there is no certainty that the Patriarchs and the Prophets are now in another place and a better condition then they were before our bleſſed Saviour dyed; 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 actuall acceſſion of happineſſe and glory already paſt. *Many ſhall come from the Eaſt and Weſt, and ſhall ſit down with Abraham, and Iſaac, and Jacob in the kingdome of heaven*; there then did the Gentiles which came in to Chriſt find the Patriarchs, even in the Kingdome of heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them any where elſe then *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 Kingdome of God, and you* your ſelves *thruſt out*. For as the Rich man *in hell lift up his eyes being in torments, and ſeeth Abraham afarre off*, 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.

Mat 8. 11.

Luke 13. 28.

Thirdly, though it were certain that the ſoules of the

Saints had bin in a place called Hell, as they were not; though it were alſo certain that they were now in a better condition then they were before Chriſts 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 dependance on his deſcenſion. 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 ſoules 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 powerfull and effectuall for the Redemption of the Saints before him, as for thoſe which follow him; being *they did all eat the ſame ſpirituall meat, and did all drink the ſame ſpirituall drink*; being *Abraham* is the *Father of us all*, and we now after Chriſts Aſcenſion are called but *to walk in the ſteps of the faith* of that *Father*; being the boſome of *Abraham* is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the bleſſed Angels before the death of Chriſt convey'd the ſoules of thoſe which departed in 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 boſome of *Abraham*, and yet it is a com-

1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

Rom. 4. 12, 16.

† *Although the Boſome of Abraham in expreſs and formall termes be ſpoken onely of* Lazarus, *whom Chriſt being yet alive in the fleſh ſuppoſed dead; yet the ſame Boſome is virtually and in termes equivalent promiſed to thoſe which afterwards ſhould believe. For the joyes of the life to come are likened to a Feaſt, in which, according to the cuſtome then in uſe, they lay down with the head of one toward the breaſt of the other, who is therefore ſaid to lye in his boſome, as we read of S.* John, ἦν ἀνακείμενος ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἰησοῦ *i. was in that heavenly Feaſt in the Kingdome of God,* Lazarus *is* ἀνακείμενος ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἀβραάμ. *And in the ſame Chap. Chriſt ſaith, that* Many ſhall come from the Eaſt and from the Weſt, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ, *diſcumbent cum Abrahamo*, ſit down with Abraham, *as we tranſlate it after our cuſtome, a: the ſame feaſt, that is,* ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν ταῖς,

τοῖς κόλποις τῦ Ἀβραὰμ, &c. as Euthymius, Quia Deus Abraham, cœli conditor, Pater Chriſti eſt; idcirco in regno cœlorum eſt & Abraham, cum quo accubitaræ ſunt nationes, quæ crediderunt in Chriſtum filium creatoris.

comfort ſtill * to us that we ſhall goe to him, and while we hope ſo never fear that we ſhall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of Chriſts deſcent into hell, to convey the ſoules 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.*

* *S.* Auguſtine *often ſhewes the comfort which he had in going to the boſome of* Abraham: *As in the caſe of his friend* Nebridius, Nunc ille vivit in ſinu Abraham. Quicquid illud eſt quod illo ſignificatur ſinu, ibi Nebridius meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus, tuus autem, Domine, adoptivus ex liberto filius ibi vivit. Nam quis alius tali animæ locus? *Confeſſ. l. 9. c. 3. And he feats it as place (as under and as beſore) where it was before.* Poſt vitam iſtam parvam nondum eris ubi erunt Sancti, quibus dicetur, *Venite benedicti Patri, percipite regnum quod vobis paratum eſt ab initio mundi.* Nondum ibi eris, quis neſcit? Sed jam poteris ibi eſſe ubi illum quondam ulceroſum pauperem dives ille ſuperbus & ſterilis in mediis ſuis tormentis vidit à longe requieſcentem *Concio 1. in Pſal. 36. And this he muſt neceſſarily take for a ſuffi ient comfort to a dying Chriſtian, who feats that place* in conſpectu Domini, *de Civit. Dei l. 1. c. 12. and looked upon them which were in it, as upon thoſe* à quibus Chriſtus ſecundum beatificam præſentiam nunquam receſſit, *Epiſt 99.*

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 ſpoyled principalities and powers, he made a ſhew of them openly, triumphing over them*: And, *When he aſcended upon 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 Chriſts deſcent clearly deſcribed in this manner. Ye were *buried with* Chriſt *in baptiſme, with whom ye were* Col. 2. 15. Eph. 4. 8, 9. B. Bilſon p. 294. Col. 2. 12, 13, 14, 15.

alſo raiſed; and when ye were dead in ſinnes, he quickned you together with him, forgiving your ſinnes, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was againſt us & ſpoyling powers and principalities, he made an open ſhew of them, triumphing over them in himſelf. That is, ſay they, ye dyed and were buried with Chriſt, who faſtened the hand-writing of ordinances to the Croſſe, that he might aboliſh it, from having any right to tye or yoke his members. Ye likewiſe were quickned, and raiſed together with Chriſt, who riſing ſpoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own perſon. So that theſe words, *ſpoyling principalities and powers*, are not referred to the Croſſe, but to Chriſts reſurrection. This Triumph over Satan and all his Kingdome, the ſame Apoſtle to the *Epheſians* ſetteth down as a conſequent to Chriſts 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 Apoſtles 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, ev'n in hell, did lead captivity captive, and triumphed over Satan.

Eph. 4. 8, 9.

But notwithſtanding, I cannot yet perceive either how this Triumph in hell ſhould be delivered as a certain truth in it ſelf, or how it can have any conſiſtency with the denyall 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 ſoules of the damned

ned were taken out of the torments of hell, or that the ſoules 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 Croſſe but to the Reſurrection, cannot be prov'd; the coherence cannot inforce ſo much; no Logick can inferre ſuch a diviſion, that the *blotting out of the hand writing* belongeth preciſely to our *buriall with him*, and the *triumphing over principalities and powers* particularly to our being *quickned together with him*; or that the *blotting out* was performed at one time, and the *triumphing* at another. Our preſent Tranſlation attributeth it expreſſely to the Croſſe, rendring the laſt words, *triumphing over them in it*, that is, in the Croſſe, mentioned in the former verſe; and though † anciently it have bin read, *triumphing over them in himſelf*, yet ſtill there are theſe two great advantages on our ſide; firſt, that if we read, *in it*, it proves the triumph ſpoken of in this place perform'd upon the Croſſe; and if we read, *in himſelf*, it proveth not that the triumph was performed in any other place, becauſe he was *himſelf* upon the Croſſe. Secondly, the Ancient * Fathers of the *Greek* Church read it as we doe, *in it*, and interpret the triumph of his death, and thoſe others of the *Latine* Church, which did read it otherwiſe, did alſo acknowledge with the *Greeks* the Croſſe not onely to be the place in which the victory over Satan was obtained, but alſo to be the trophie of that victory

† So the Vulgar Latine, Palam triumphans illos in ſemetipſo; *as alſo the* Syriack, בהנוסרה: So Novatianus *de Trin.* triumphatis illis in ſemetipſo. *S. Hilary*, triumphans eos in ſemetipſo. So Ambroſe, Auguſtine, and Pacianus.

* Oecumenius *ſheweth their reading*, Θειαμβεύσας αὐ᾽τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ, *and Interpretation*, Θειαμβῶν λέγει ἐπὶ τῷ ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ τὸν πόλεμον ἐνίκησε. Ἐθριάμβευσεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, τυπικῶς, ὡς κατ᾽ αὐτὸν θριαμβεύσαντα τοὺς ἀντιστάντας. Ἐν αὐτῷ ibenis διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, *and this* Θριαμβῶν *ſpeaks of the Croſſe will no way agree with his actuall triumph in hell. but* Theophylact *yet more clearly*, Θειαμβεύσας αὐτὰς ἐν αὐτῷ, τυπικῶς, ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τὰς δαίμονας ὑπωμότους ἀνέξας. Θειαμβῶν γὰρ λέγεται ὅταν τις ἀπὸ νίκης πολλῶν ἐπικρατήσῃ δημοσίᾳ πομπῇ τινὶ, τὰς ὑπηκόους δαμάσας πάσας δυνάμεις. Ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ οὖν τὸ τρόπαιον στήσας ὁ Κύριος, ὥσπερ ἐν δημοσίῳ θεάτρῳ

διάζωμα Ἑλλήνων, Ῥωμαίων, Ἰουδαίων, τὰς διλώσεις ἐφιέμβδυτι. *And this Expoſition they received from S.* Chryſoſtome, *who makes the* διγματισμὸς *of the Croſſe, to conſiſt in the death upon it,* Ἐκεῖ τῷ πληγὴν ἔλαβον ὁ διάβολος καὶ σώματος νεκροῦ τὴν χαρίεσσαν λαβών. *Where it is to be obſerved that the triumph is not attributed to the ſoule departed from the body and deſcended into hell, but rather to the body left by the ſoul and hanging on the Croſſe,* διὰ τῷ οἰκείου σώματος πᾶσιν ἡμῖν τὴν νίκην αὐτοῦ χαριζόμενος νίκλων, ſay Theodoret *And before all theſe* Origen *moſt expreſſely,* Viſibiliter quidem Filius Dei in carne crucifixus eſt, inviſibiliter vero in ea cruce diabolus cum principatibus ſuis & poteſtatibus affixus eſt cruci. Non tibi hoc videbitur verum, ſi tibi horum teſtem produxero Apoſtolum Paulum? Quod erat contrarium nobis, tulit illud de medio affigens cruci ſuæ, exuens principatus & poteſtates traduxit libere, triumphans eas in ligno crucis. Ergo duplex Dominicæ crucis eſt ratio; una illa, qua dicit Petrus quod Chriſtus crucifixus nobis reliquit exemplum & hæc ſecunda, qua crux ipſa trophæum Diaboli fuit, in quo & crucifixus eſt & triumphatus, *in Jeſu m.* Requievit ut Deo, cum in cruce poſitus principatus & poteſtates exuit, & triumphavit eos cum ligno crucis, *Idem.*

† *Te tull.* Serpentis ſpolium, devicto Principe mundi, Affixit Deus refugarum immanitatum. *Prudentius.* Dic trophæum paſſionis, hic triumphalem crucem, *Cat. ℈. Hymn.* 10. *S.* Hilary *moſt expreſſy,* Manus ejus [illegible] ad ſolum ſunt cum vicit ſæculum. *Ego enim,* ait, *vici mundum,* cum extenſus in crucem invictiſſimis armis ipſius paſſionis inſtruitur. *Et poſuiſti,* inquit, *ut arcum æreum brachia mea,* cum de omnibus virtutibus ac poteſtatibus in ipſo trophæo glorioſæ crucis triumphat, & principatus & poteſtates *adducit cum fiducia triumphans in ſemetipſo,* in Pſalm. 143. *Where it is obſerved that the Father does read it* in ſemetipſo, *and interprets it* in cruce. Nos quoniam trophæum jam videmus, & quod currum ſuum triumphator aſcendit, conſideremus quod non arborum, non quadrijugis plauſtri manubias de mortali hoſte quæſitas, ſed patibulo triumphali captiva de ſæculo ſpolia ſuſpendit, *S. Amb. l.* 10. *in cap.* 23. *S.* Lucæ; *and amongſt the reſt of the captives he reckons afterwards,* captivum principem mundi; & ſpiritalia nequitiæ quæ ſunt in cœleſtibus. *To this allu es* Fulgentius

ctory, † and the triumphall chariot. This place then of S. *Paul* to the *Coloſſians* cannot prove that Chriſt deſcended into Hell, to triumph over the Devil there; and if it be not proper for that purpoſe of it ſelf, it will not be more effectuall by the addition of that other to the *Epheſians.* For firſt we have already ſhew'n, that the *deſcending* into the *lower parts of the earth*, doth not neceſſarily ſignifie 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 ſignifie Hell, and this Article of our Creed were contained in them, yet would

gentius *l.* 3. *ad Thrasim.* Sic oportuit peccatorum noſtrorum chirographum deleri, ut dum vetus homo noſter ſimul cruci affigitur, tanquam in trophæo triumphatoris victoria panderetur. *Wke ber therefore we read it* σταυῷ *with the* Greeks, *that is* ὲν σωρῷ, *or* ἐν αὐτῷ *with the* Latines *in ſeipſo, it is the ſame; for he triumphed over the Devil by himſelf upon the Croſſe as in the ſame caſe it is written* Eph. 2. 16. ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

would it not follow from that Scripture, that Chriſt triumphed over Satan while his ſoul was in hell; for the conſequence would be onely 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 Apoſtles words will evince. Nay further yet, the Aſcent mentioned by S. *Paul* cannot be that which immediately followed the Deſcent into Hell, for it evidently ſignifieth the aſcenſion which followed fourty dayes 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 *farre above all heavens.* Now the *leading captivity captive* belongeth 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 bin led before: But it is † expreſly 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 prov'd then this, that Chriſt triumphed

† The Originall words doe manifeſtly ſhew that this triumphant act did not precede this aſcent. For had it bin αἰχμαλωτίσας αἰχμαλωσίαν ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, we might well have expounded it thus, Chriſt did lead ſinne and death and Satan captive; and when he had done ſo, aſcended up on high: but being it is written ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος, that is having aſcended up on high αἰχμαλώτισεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, he captivated

vated a captivity, the Ascent must here precede the captivation, 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 expresse it thus, by ascending he led captive a captivity.

umphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the Crosse, and led captivity captive at his ascension into heaven. Which is so farre from proving that Christ descended into hell to triumph there, that it is more proper to perswade the contrary. For why should he goe to hell to triumph over them, over whom he had triumphed on the crosse? why should he goe to captive that 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 removall of the Saints to heaven, & 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 withall 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 soules 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 soules from thence, he had not

† *So S. Hierome on that place of the Ephesians,* Inferiora autem terræ infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut Sanctorum animas quæ ibi tenebantur inclusæ, secum ad cœlos victor abduceret. *And on* Mat. 12. 29. Alligatus est fortis, & religatus in Tartarum, & Domini contritus pede; & direptis sedibus Tyranni, captiva ducta est captivitas. *So* Arnoldus Carnotensis *is to be understood*, De Unctione Chrismatis, Passus est rex illudi, & vita occidi, descendensque ad inferos, captivam ab antiquo captivitatem reduxit; *Applying it to the custome of the Church*, Omnino convenit, ut eo tempore quo Christus captivos eduxit ab inferis, reconciliati peccatores ad Ecclesiam reducantur, *Ibid.*

Thus

Thus Athanaſius *when he ſpeaks of Chriſts triumphing over Satan in Hell, he mentions* τ ᾅδου σκυλα δηλα, *hell ſpoyled, to wit, of thoſe ſoules which before it kept in hold. Otherwiſe in the ſame Oration* in Paſſionem & crucem, *he acknowledgeth the Triumph on the Croſſe,* Ἔδει γὰρ νικητὴν τ θριαμβεύοντα (*not* θριαμβεύσοντα) χρ τῷ διαβόλῳ, μὴ ἀφῆ συλχωρῆν, ἀφ ἑαυτῆ βασαζειν τὸ ζῶπαιον. *Thus* Leo *the Emperour,* Χριστὸς αὖθις τὸν ᾅδου αἰχμαλωτίσας, καὶ τοῖς αἰχμαλώτοις εὐθηγίαν χαρίζας, *Hom. de* Reſur. *And thus* Macarius *ſuppoſeth* Chriſt *victoriouſly ſpeaking unto hell and death,* Κελεύω σοι ᾅδη καὶ σκότῳ καὶ θανατε, λαβὲ τὰς ἐσκυλευμένας ψυχάς. Author libelli de Paſchate, *under the name of* S. Ambroſe, Expers peccati Chriſtus cum ad Tartari ima deſcenderet, ſeras inferni januaſque confringens, vinctas peccato animas, mortis dominatione deſtructa, è diaboli faucibus revocavit ad vitam. Atque ita divinum triumphum æternis characteribus eſt conſcriptum, dum dicit, Ubi eſt, Mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi eſt, Mors, victoria tua? *Cap.* 4. *And the Commentaries under the ſame name,* Gratia Dei abundavit in deſcenſu Salvatoris, omnibus dans indulgentiam, cum triumpho ſublatis eis in cœlum, *Ad Rom.* 5. 14. Secundum animam deſcendit ad inferna & ſpoliavit principes tenebrarum ab animabus electorum, *Ecbert.* Serm. 9. contra Catharos. *Thus ſtill the Fathers which ſpeak of ſpoyling hell, of leading captivity captive, of triumphing over Satan in his own quarters, are to be underſtood in reſpect to thoſe ſoules which they thought were taken out of the cuſtody, poſſeſſion, or dominion of Satan, whether juſt or unjuſt.*

not ſpoyled 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 Soules 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 infernall habitations, as others did conceive; being we have already thought fit not to admit either of theſe two as the effect of Chriſt's Deſcent, it followeth that we cannot acknowledge this as the proper end of the Article. Nor can wee 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 infernall ſtrength, redeeming the priſoners, leading captivity captive, and victoriouſly triumphing over death, and hell, and Satan. In ſumme, 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 it ſelf 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 it ſelf contradictory to dereliction.

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 ſhew'n the ſubſtance of the Article to conſiſt in this, that the ſoul of Chriſt, really ſeparated from his body by death, did truly paſſe unto the places below where the ſoules of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did ſo, was, that he might undergoe the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the ſimilitude of ſinfull 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 ſoules of other perſons uſe to be. All, which was neceſſary for our redemption by way of ſatisfaction and merit, was already performed on the Croſſe; and all, which was neceſſary for the actuall 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 ſatisfie the law of death. This he undertook to doe, and did: and though the Ancient Fathers by the ſeverall additions of other ends have ſomething obſcured this, yet it may be ſufficiently obſerved in their writings, and is certainly

* Irenæus ſo calls his deſcent, legem mortuorum ſervare, l. 5. c. 6. and S. Hilary expreſſes that which I intend, very clearly, Morte non interceptus eſt unigenitus Dei filius; ad explendam quidem hominis naturam etiam morti ſe, id eſt, diſceſſioni ſe tanquam animæ corporiſque ſubjecit, & ad infernas ſedes, id quod homini debitum videtur eſſe, penetravit, Enarr. in Pſalm 53. And before him Tertullian, Chriſtus Deus quia & homo mortuus ſecundum Scripturas, & ſepultus ſecus eaſdem,

dem, huic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus, *De Anima cap.* 55. Ἦλθεν αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν πάντων σωτὴρ, καὶ τὰς ἡμῶν χρεωκοπίας πεμείας εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ἡμῶν, ἀντ' ἡμῶν, ὡσὰ ἡμῶν ἀναμάρτητον αὐτὸν ὑπεδέξατο σάρκα. Καταφρόνησεν μετὰ λόγου δυνατοῦ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην· ἀνεδέξατο καὶ τοῦτο, καὶ κατῆλθεν ἑκουσίως εἰς αὐτὸν, Gelasius *Act. Concil. Nicæ l.* 2. *c.* 32. *This S.* Austin *calls* proprietatem carnis, *Contra Felicianum c.* 11. Scio ad inferos Divinitatem Filii Dei descendisse proprietate carnis, scio ad cœlum ascendisse carnem merito deitatis. *And afterwards he calls it* injuriam carnis. Erat uno atq; eodem tempore ipse totus etiam in inferno, totus in cœlo: illic patiens injuriam carnis, hic non relinquens gloriam deitatis, *c. p.* 14. Impleta est Scriptura quæ dicit, *Et cum iniquis reputatus est.* Quod & altius intelligi potest, dicente de semetipso Domino, *Reputatus sum cum descendentibus in lacum; factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber.* Vere enim reputatus est inter peccatores & iniquos ut descenderet ad infernum, *S. Hieron.* in *Isaiæ cap.* 53. *ver.* 12. Ruffinus *in his Expositon of the Creed, descanting upon that place of the Psalms*, factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber; Non dixit homo, sed sicut homo. *Sicut homo* enim erat quia etiam descenderat in infernum; sed *inter mortuos liber* erat, quia à morte teneri non poterat. Et ideo in uno natura humanæ fragilitatis, in alio divinæ potestas majestatis ostenditur. *And yet more pertinently* Fulgentius, Restabat ad plenum nostræ redemptionis effectum ut illuc usq; homo sine peccato a Deo susceptus descenderet, quousque homo separatus à Deo peccati merito cecidisset, id est, ad infernum, ubi solebat peccatoris anima torqueri, & ad sepulchrum ubi consueverat peccatoris caro corrumpi, *Ad Trasim. cap.* 30. Εἰ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς εἶλθε, κεῖ ὢν τῇ πιστὸς, καὶ λαιπὸς, καὶ φῶς ἦν ἐν σκότει, καὶ ζωὴ ἦν ἀπαίτων, δυνάτε γεύσασθαι, καὶ τὴν εἰς ᾅδην καταβασιν ὑπεδέξαθε, ὡς ἂν κατὰ πάντα ἡμῖν ὁμοιωθῇ χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, &c. *Andreas Cret.* Serm. in vitam humanam. *I conclude this with that Expositon of S.* Hilary *upon those words of the Psalm* 138, If I goe down into hell thou art there also; Humanæ ista lex necessitatis est, ut consepultis corporibus ad Inferos animæ descendant: Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit, *Psal.* 138.

tainly most conformable to that propheticall 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.*

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 darkenesse that our soules 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* Heb. 2. 14. *destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil*, and by his actuall descent into the dominions of him so destroyed, secured all which have an interest in him of the same freedome which he had. Which truth is also still preserved (though among many other strange conceptions) † in the writings of the Fathers. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that Christ *Descended into Hell.*

† As well of the opinion of Tertullian's time, though not of his; Sed in hoc, inquiunt, Christus inferos adiit ne nos adiremus. Cæterum quod discrimen Ethnicorum & Christianorum, si carcer mortuis idem? *De Anima cap.* 55. Aut ipsius vox est hic, *Et eruisti animam meam ab inferno inferiori*, aut nostra vox per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum; quia ideo ille pervenit usque ad infernum, ne nos remaneremus in inferno, *S. August.* in *Psal.* 85. Πάσων γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνέλαβε, καὶ πάντων αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἔξαρε, καὶ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην κατεβαίνων, ἡμᾶς ἀνίστησι, *S. Athan. in* Omnia mihi trad *&c.*

HE ROSE AGAIN.

WHatsoever variations have appeared in any of the other Articles, this part of Christ's resurrection hath bin constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or † diminution. The whole matter of it is so necessary and essentiall 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

† For though Eusebius Gallicanus and Venantius Fortunatus leave out the last word à mortuis, and some Copies in Ruffinus have it not; yet is it generally expres'd in all the rest which are more ancient then Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the Author or the Scribe, then to the usage of the Church in their age. Quod die tertio resurrexit à mortuis Dominus Christus, nullus ambigit Christianus, *S. Aug. Serm. in Vigiliis Paschæ.*

presented with three Particulars: First, the Action it self,

ſelf, 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, he roſe from the dead *the third day.*

For the illuſtration of the firſt Particular, and the juſtification of our belief in Chriſts Reſurrection, it will be neceſſary firſt to ſhew the promiſed *Meſsias* was to riſe from the dead; and ſecondly, that Jeſus, whom we believe to be the true and onely *Meſsias*, did ſo riſe as it was promiſ'd 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* ſuffer'd both by his own people and by the nations round about him; which he expreſs'd of himſelf, and foretold of the *Meſsias* in thoſe words, *The Kings of the earth ſet themſelves, and the rulers take counſell together againſt the Lord and againſt his anointed*, that is, his Chriſt. From whence it came to paſſe, 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 doe whatſoever the hand and the counſell of God determined before to be done*, which was to crucifie 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 onely to a depreſſion of him, and therefore his exaltation was a ſetling in the kingdome; ſo being the conſpiration againſt the *Meſſias* amounted to a reall 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, & the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore

Pſal. 2. 2.

Act. 4. 27, 28.

Pſalm. 2. 6, 7.

fore 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.

But becauſe this prediction was ſomething obſcured in the figurative expreſſion, therefore the Spirit of God hath cleared it further 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 thy 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 had ſworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loynes 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 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.

Pſal. 16 10.

Act. 2. 31.

Again, leaſt any might imagine that the *Meſſias* dying once might riſe from death, and living after death yet dye again, there was a further Propheſie to aſſure us of the excellency of that reſurrection and the perpetuity of that life to which the *Meſſias* was to be raiſ'd. 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 ratifie it by his death) and adding this expreſſion, *even the ſure mercies of David*, could ſignifie no leſſe then that the Chriſt who was given firſt unto us in a frail and mortall condition in which he was to dye, ſhould afterwards be given in an immutable ſtate, and conſequently that he being dead ſhould riſe unto eternall life. And thus by virtue of theſe three predictions we

Iſa. 55. 3.

are

are assured that the *Messias* was to rise again, as also by those types which did represent and presignifie 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 Christs 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 shew that Christ should truly dye, and truly live again. And *Abraham* offered him up, a *accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure.* In *Abrahams* intention *Isaac* dyed, in his expectation he was to rise from the dead, in his acceptation being spared he was received from the dead, and all this acted to * presignifie, that the onely son of God was really and truly to be sacrificed and dye; and after death was really and truly to be raised to life. What was the intention of our Father *Abraham* not perform'd, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfill'd. And thus the Resurrection of the *Messias* was represented by types, and foretold by propheſies.

† Post duos annos dierum, tertio incipiente, de carcere educitur Joseph. Et noster Joseph Christus Dominus die tertio à mortuis resurrexit. Præsentatur Pharaoni, mundo resurrectio declaratur. Data est Joseph à Pharaone in tota Ægypto potestas. Et noster Joseph Christus Dominus post resurrectionem

dicit, Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo & in terra, *Prosper.* de Promiſ. & Prædic. *p.* 1. *c.* 29. *a* Heb. 11. 19. * Ideo Isaac immolatus non est, quia resurrectio Filio Dei servata est, *Prosper.* de Prom. & Præd. *p.* 1. *c.* 17. Οὕτως τῷ ἀληθινῷ πνεύματι τὸ μέγα μυστήριον τυπικῶς ἀμφοτέρως ἐπιμελήσατος, τοῦ τε ἠγαπημένου υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ συμπαραδεχθέντος πρεσβύτου, ὡς ἀναχθῆναι ἐν τῷ πρεσβύτῃ τὸ τοῦ παιδὸς μυστήριον, ἐν ᾧ τὸ μονογενὲς τὴν ζωὴν, τὴν μὲν ἀναχθησομένην τοῦ παιδός, Greg. Nyss. *Orat.* 1. *in Resur.*

That Jesus, whom we believe to be the truly and onely *Messias*, did rise from the dead according to the Scriptures, is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us and confirmed by testimonies humane, angelicall, and divine. Those pious women which thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, *held him by the feet*

and worship'd 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 shew'd himself after his passion by many infallible*
Act. 1. 3. *proofs*; who *with great power gave witnesse of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus*, the principall part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of *Matthias* into the place of *Judas*, grounded
4. 33. upon this necessity. *Wherefore of these men which have*
1. 21, 22. *companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witnesse with us of his resurrection*. The rest of the Disciples testified the same, to whom he also appeared, even to *five*
1 Cor. 15. 6. *hundred brethren at once*. These were the witnesses of his own family, and such as worshipp'd him, such as believed in him. And because the Testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not onely his disciples but even his enemies to confirm it. Those soul-
D diers 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 rayment 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 shewed unto the Chief Priests all the things that were done*. Thus was the Resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest humane testimonies, both of his friends and enemies.

But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony then that of man: and therefore an Angell from heaven who was ministeriall in it, gave a present and infallible witnesse to it. He descended down, *and came and rolled back the stone*
Joh. 20. 12. *from the door, and sate upon it*. Nay *two Angells 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

Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is not here, but is risen. These were the witnesses sent from heaven, this the Angelicall testimony of the resurrection.

And *if we receive the witnesse of men or Angells, the witnesse of God is greater*, who did sufficiently attest this Resurrection; not onely 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 testifie of me*; adding these words to his Apostles, *and ye shall bear witnesse, because ye have bin with me from the beginning*. The Spirit of God sent down upon the Apostles did thereby testifie that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were inlightned, comforted, confirm'd, and strengthned in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus, *and shewed 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*. And thus, as it was foretold of the *Messias*, did our Jesus rise; which was the first part of our enquiry.

For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christs Resurrection, expressed in that term *from the dead*, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essentiall characters and proprieties of a true resurrection, and secondly to shew how those proprieties doe belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper Notion of the Resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantiall 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 Angell, and make the same man or Angell 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 totall production. This change

is called a ſubſtantiall change, to diſtinguiſh it from all accidentall alterations: he which awaketh from his ſleep ariſeth from his bed, and there is a greater change from ſickneſſe to health, but neither of theſe is a Reſurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath bin corrupted, becauſe things immateriall 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 materiall 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 irrationall ſoules when they are corrupted ceaſe to be, and therefore if they ſhould be reproduced out of the ſame matter yet were not this a proper reſurrection, becauſe thereby they would not be the ſame individuall which was before, but onely a reſtitution of the *ſpecies* by another individuall. But when a rationall ſoul is ſeparated from it's body, which is the corruption of a man, that ſoul ſo ſeparated doth exiſt, and conſequently is capable of conjunction and reunion with the body; and if theſe two be again united by an eſſentiall and vitall union, from which life doth neceſſarily flow, then doth the ſame man live which liv'd before; and conſequently this reunion is a perfect and proper reſurrection from death to life, becauſe the ſame individuall perſon, conſiſting of the ſame ſoul and body, which was dead, is now alive again.

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 humane nature a true and proper life, producing vitall actions as we doe. 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 reunited to the ſame body, and ſo he liv'd again the ſame man

man. For the truth of which, two things were neceſſary to be ſhewn, 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 my ſelf*; 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 faithleſſe but believing.* The body then in which he roſe, muſt be the ſame in which he liv'd before, becauſe it was the ſame with which he dyed. And that we might be aſſured of the ſoul as well as of the body, firſt he 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 broyled fiſh & of an honey comb, and he took it and did eat before them:* ſecondly, of the ſenſitive part, converſing with them, ſhewing himſelf, ſeeing and hearing them: thirdly, he gave evidence of his rationall and intellectuall 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 ſhew, that the body which they ſaw was truly and vitally informed with an humane ſoul. And that they might be yet further * aſſured that it was the ſame ſoul by which that body liv'd 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

Luc. 23. 37. 39.

† Palpandam carnem Dominus præbuit, quam januis clauſis introduxit, ut eſſe poſt reſurrectionem oſtenderet corpus ſuum & ejuſdem naturæ & alterius gloriæ, *Greg. Hom. 26. in Evang.* Reſurrexit Chriſtus, abſoluta res eſt. Corpus erat, caro erat, pependit in cruce, poſitus eſt in ſepulchro, exhibuit illam vivam qui vivebat in illa, *Serm. 158. De Tempore.*

* Ideo clauſis ad diſcipulos oſtiis introibat, & flatu ſuo dabat Spiritum Sanctum, & dato intelligentiæ lumine ſanctarum Scripturarum occulta pandebat; & rurſus idem vulnus lateris, fixuras clavorum, & omnia recentiſſimæ paſſionis ſigna monſtrabat, ut agnoſceretur in eo proprietas divinæ humanæque naturæ individua permanere, *Leo Serm. 1. De Reſurrectione.*

ſſles 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 down from heaven the Son of man which was in heaven*, being the divinity was never ſo united to any humane ſoul but onely in that perſon, it appeared to be the ſame ſoul with which he liv'd & wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being Chriſt appeared after his death with the ſame body in which he dyed, and with the ſame ſoul united to it, it followeth that he roſe from the dead by a true and proper Reſurrection.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of Chriſts 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 Croſſe, 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 liv'd united and dyed ſeparated.

† Ut mediator Dei & hominum homo Chriſtus Jeſus reſurrectione clarificaretur, prius humiliatus eſt paſſione: non enim à mortuis reſurrexiſſet ſi mortuus non fuiſſet. Humilitas claritatis eſt meritum, claritas humilitatis eſt præmium, *S. Aug.* Tract. 104. in Joh.

The Efficient cauſe of the Reſurrection of Chriſt is to be conſidered either as Principall or Inſtrumentall. The Principall 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*

God raiſed up, ſaith the Apoſtle, *whereof we all are witneſſes.* And generally in the Scriptures as our Lord 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 raiſ'd then by an eminent act of Gods omnipotency; which is excellently ſet forth by the Apoſtle, in ſo high an exaggeration of expreſſions as I think is ſcarce to be parallell'd in any Author, *That we may know what is the exceeding greatneſſe of his power to us ward 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

Act. 2. 32.

Eph. 1 19. Κατὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. *Which words our Tranſlation comes far ſhort of, and I doub. our language can ſcarce reach it. For firſt, here are δυνάμεις and ἰσχὺς, two words to expreſſe the power of God and the validity and ſtrength of it, but not ſufficient; wherefore there is an addition to each of them, μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως, and κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος, two words more to expreſſe the eminent greatneſſe of this power and force, but not ſufficient yet; and therefore there is another addition to each addition, τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος, and ἣν ἐνήργησεν to ſet forth the eminence and activity of that greatneſſe; and all yet as it were but flat and dull, till it be quickned with an active verb ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. All which be ſet on work, all which be actuated in Chriſt when he raiſed him from the dead.*

is a divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone; being no leſſe power then infinite could raiſe our Saviour from the dead; it followeth, that whatſoever inſtrumentall action might concurre, God muſt be acknowledged the principall 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 man, 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 acknow-

Galat. 1. 1.

acknowledged to have raiſed him. And becauſe we have already prov'd that the eternall Son of God is of the ſame eſſence, and conſequently of the ſame power with the Father, & ſhall hereafter ſhew 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 onely true by virtue of this ratiocination, but it is alſo delivered expreſly of the Son, and that by himſelf. It is a weak fallacy uſed by the *Socinians*, who maintain that God the Father onely raiſed Chriſt, and then ſay they teach as much as the Apoſtles did, who attribute it alwayes either generally unto God or particularly to the Father. For if the Apoſtles taught it onely 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 S. *Paul* hath taught them ſo, and we believe the ſame; they will not be-

† Quis niſi ſolus Filius reſurrexit, quia ſolus mori potuit qui carnẽ habuit? & tamen ab hoc opere quo ſolus Filius reſurrexit non erat Pater alienus; de quo ſcriptũ eſt, *Qui ſuſcitavit à mortuis Ieſum.* An forte ſe ipſe non ſuſcitavit? Et ubieſt quod ait, *Solvite templum hoc, & triduo ſuſcitabo illud*; & quod *poteſtatem habere* ſe dicit *ponendi & iterum ſumendi animam ſuam*? Quis autem ita deſipiat, ut Spiritum Sanctum reſurrectionem hominis Chriſti dicat non cooperatum, cum ipſum hominem Chriſtum fuerit operatus, S. *Auguſt.* Contra Serm. Arria. *cap.* 15.

lieve 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 dayes 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 fulneſſe of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily.* And *when he was riſen from the dead, his diſciples remembred 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 raiſ'd himſelf; for in thoſe words there is no perſon mentioned but himſelf.

Joh. 2. 19.

21.

Coloſſ. 2. 9.

A

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 palſey raiſ'd himſelf from the bed, or as we ſhall raiſe our ſelves out of the graves when the trump ſhould ſound: and this was all which Chriſt did or could doe. But if this were true, and nothing elſe were to be underſtood in thoſe words of our Saviour, he might as well have ſaid, [a]*Deſtroy this temple, and in three dayes 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 raiſ'd it out of the grave, and have ſhew'n it alive. This anſwer therefore is a meer 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 mortall body. [b] *For as the Father raiſeth up the dead and quickeneth them, even ſo the Son quickeneth whom he will.* He then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiſeth them, he alſo quickned 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 Chriſts body was diſſolved when his ſoul was ſeparated, nor was it any other way diſſolved then 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 *de-*

† Aliter Deus Chriſtum ſuſcitavit, aliter Chriſtus corpus ſuum: Deus Chriſto vitam reſtituendo, Chriſtus vita recuperata corpus ſuum levando, & è ſepulchro prodeundo, ſeque poſt mortem vivum ſiſtendo præbendoque. Sic & Paralyticus ille erexerat corpus ſuum, accepta à Chriſto ſanitate: ſic & omnes mortui ſurgent,

& ex monumentis prodibunt, recepta ab eodem Chriſto vita, *Confeſſionis Socinianæ Vindices.*

[a] Joh. 2. 19. [b] Joh. 5. 21. * Ἐγείρει γὰρ νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ ὁ υἱὸς *and ſheweth that Chriſt raiſeth and quickneth whom he will, which demonſtrateth his infinite and abſolute power.* Καὶ ἵνα τὸ, ἐὰν θέλῃ, δώσει ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς πεῖν, πᾶς, ὃς θέλῃ, ἐναντίον ὄφιν. Εἰ γὰρ ὃς θέλῃ, δώσει ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς πιεῖν· τὸ γὰρ θέλειν ἐξουσίας· εἰ δὲ ἃ δώσει ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς, ἐκεῖνα ὃς θέλῃ. Τὸ ἴσον γὰρ, ὥσπερ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει, τῆς δυνάμεως δείκνυσι τὴν ἀπεριλληξίαν· τὸ δὲ, ὃς θέλει, τῆς ἐξουσίας τὴν ἰσότητα, *S. Chryſ. Hom. 38. in Joh.*

ſtred to be diſſolved and to be with Chriſt, ſo the temple of Chriſts 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 quickning of the body. If the body of Chriſt had bin laid down in the ſepulchre alive, the temple had not bin diſſolved; therefore to lift it up out of the ſepulchre when it was before quickned was not to raiſe a diſſolved temple, which our Saviour promiſed he would doe, and the Apoſtles believ'd he did.

† Si peccati confeſſor revixit à morte, quis eum ſuſcitavit? Nullus mortuus eſt ſuiipſius ſuſcitator. Ille ſe potuit ſuſcitare qui mortua carne non mortuus eſt. Etenim hoc ſuſcitavit quod mortuum tuerat. Ille ſe ſuſcitavit qui vivebat in ſe, in carne autem ſuſcitanda mortuus erat. Non enim Pater ſolus Filium ſuſcitavit, de quo dictũ eſt ab Apoſtolo, *Propter quod eum Deus exaltavit*, ſed etiam Dominus ſeipſum, id eſt, corpus ſuum: unde dicit, *Solvite templum hoc, & in triduo ſuſcitabo illud.* S. Aug. *De Verbis Domini*, Serm. 8.

a Joh. 10. 17, 18.

Again, it is moſt certainly falſe that our Saviour had power onely to lift up his body when it was revived, but had no power of himſelf to reunite his ſoul unto his body, and thereby to revive it. For Chriſt ſpeaketh expreſly of himſelf, a *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 my ſelf. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again.* The laying down of Chriſts life was to dye, and the taking of it again was to revive: and by this taking of his life again he ſhewed himſelf to be the *Reſurrection and the life.* 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 holineſſe, by the reſurrection from the dead.* But if Chriſt had done no more in the reſurrection, then 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 in 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 reunite 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 onely that God the Father raiſ'd the Son, but alſo that God the Son raiſ'd himſelf.

From this conſideration of the Efficient cauſe of Chriſts Reſurrection we are yet further aſſured, that Chriſt did truly

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 controverſie that he raiſed his own Son: and as while he was here alive, God ſpake from heaven ſaying, *This is my well beloved Son*; 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.* 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 riſe in ſoul and body by that Divinity which was never ſeparated either from the body or from the ſoul. And thus we have ſufficiently prov'd our ſecond Particular, the verity, reality, and propriety of Chriſts Reſurrection, conteined in thoſe words, *He roſe from the dead.*

The third Particular concerns the time of Chriſts Reſurrection, which is expreſſ'd by *the third day*; and thoſe words affoord a double conſideration: one in reſpect of the diſtance of time, as it was after three dayes; the other in reſpect of the day, which was the third day from his paſſion, and the preciſe day upon which he roſe. For the firſt of theſe, we ſhall ſhew that the *Meſſias* who was foretold both to dye 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 untill, and did riſe from the dead upon the third day.

The typicall predictions of this truth were two, anſwering to our two conſiderations; one in reference to the diſtance, the other in reſpect of the day it ſelf. The firſt is that of the Prophet *Jonas*, who *was in the belly of the great fiſh three dayes and three nights*, and then by the ſpeciall command of God he was rendred ſafe upon the dry land, and ſent a preacher of repentance to the great city of *Nimive*. This was an an expreſſe type of the *Meſſias* then to come, who was to preach repentance and remiſ- Jon. 1, 17. and 2, 10.

Matth. 12. 38. sion of sinnes to all nations; that *as Jonas was three dayes and three nights in the whales belly, so should the Son of man be three dayes 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 dayes be taken out of the jawes 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

Lev. 23. 10. 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 hee lamb without blemish of the first yeere for a burnt offering unto the Lord.* For under the Leviticall 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 'twere 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.

Rom. 11. 16. *For if the first-fruits be holy, the lumpe is also holy.* And this was alwayes 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 dye, that Priest which dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the 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

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 ſhew that our Jeſus, whom we believe, and have already prov'd 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 ſheaf was waved, the day after that Sabbath mentioned in the law.

As for the diſtance between the Reſurrection and the death of Chriſt, it is to be conſidered firſt generally in it ſelf, as it is ſome ſpace of time; ſecondly, as it is that certain and determinate ſpace of three dayes. Chriſt did not would not, ſuddenly riſe, leaſt any ſhould doubt that he ever dyed. It was as neceſſary for us that he ſhould dye, 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 Croſſe before he dyed, but he would not, becauſe he had undertaken to dye for us. He might have rev.v'd himſelf upon the Croſſe, after he had given up the ghoſt, and before *Joſeph* came to take him down, but he would not, leaſt as *Pilate* queſtioned whether he were already dead, ſo we might doubt whether he ever dyed. The reward of his Reſurrection was immediately due upon his Paſſion, but he deferred the receiving of it, leaſt either of them being queſtion'd, they both might looſe their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore neceſſary that ſome ſpace ſhould intercede between them. Again, becauſe Chriſts 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 remiſ-

† De cruce deſcendere poterat, ſed differebat ut de ſepulchro reſurgeret, *S. Aug.* in *Iob. Tract.* 12.

* Ἡδύνατο μὲν καὶ παρ' αὐτὰ τὰ θανάτου τὸ σῶμα διαγεῖραι καὶ πάλιν ἀναζῶσαι· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο κελεύων περιεῖδεν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐπιποίνως. Εἶπε δὲ ἂν τις μηδ' ὅλως αὐτὸν τεθνηκέναι, ἢ μηδὲ πλέον αὐτὸν τῆς θανάτου ἐλαυνέσθαι, εἰ παρ' αὐτὰ ἦν ἀναστὰς ἢ ἐπιδείξας. Τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐν ἴσῳ τὸ διαστήμασιν ὄντων τοῦ τε θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἄδυλον ἐγίνετο τὸ περὶ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κλέος. Ὅθεν ἵνα διαχθῇ νεκρὸν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μέση ταφὴ μένῃ μέσην ὁ λόγος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸ πᾶσιν ἔδειξεν ἄφθαρτον, *S.* Athan. *de Incarnat. Verbi.* Καὶ διὰ τί ἡμᾶς διὰ τοῦτο σωτηρίας ἠξίωσεν, ἵνα πεισθῇ ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, ἐκ τοῦ σωθῆναι αὐτοῦ μόνον βεβαιοῦται, καὶ τῇ πάντων ὄψει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν, *S.* Chryſ. *Hom.* 43. *in Matth.*

ſion of ſinnes through his bloud, 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 why it ſhould any longer be deſert'd, when the verity of his death was once ſufficiently prov'd. Leaſt therefore his Diſciples ſhould be long held in ſuſpenſe, or any perſon after many dayes ſhould doubt whether he roſe with the ſame body with which he dyed, or no; that he might ſhew himſelf alive while the ſouldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouthes of the people, he would not ſtay † many dayes before he roſe. Some diſtance then of time there was, but not great, between his crucifixion and his reſurrection.

† Ἕνεκα δὲ οὐ τοῦ δεῖξαι θῆναι τὸν θάνατον ὃν τῷ σώματι τιτλὸν ἀνέστησε τοῦτο· ἵνα δὴ μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ διαμεῖναι καὶ φθορὰν τέλεον ὕστερον ἀναστὰς ἀπιστηθῇ, ὡς ἂν αὐτὸ δὴ ἕτερον σῶμα φέρων (ἔμελλε δὲ μὴ οὐ καὶ δι' αὐτὸν χρόνον ἀπιστεῖν τῷ φαινομένῳ καὶ ὅπλαις θάνατος ἦν ἡμιμόλιον) διὰ τοῦτο ὑπολίγον ἦν τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἐγένετο· ἵνα δὲ ὅτι πολὺ τοῦ ἀκάστους αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως παρέλκυσιν· ἅμα ἔτι ἦν ἀκοὴν αὐτῆς ἔναυλον ἐχόντων τὸν λόγον, καὶ ὅτι ἦν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῆς ἐκδεχομένων, καὶ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῆς ἠρτημένης, καὶ ζώντων ἐπὶ γῆς ἔτι καὶ ἐπὶ τόπου ὄντων ἦν θανατουμένων καὶ μυρομένων περὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Κυριακοῦ σώματος, αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς ὃν τριταίῳ διασύματι τὸ χωμόμιον νικηφόρον σῶμα ἔδειξεν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἄφθαρτον, *Ibid.*

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 expreſly in S. *Matthew*, that *as Jonas was three dayes and three nights in the whales belly, ſo ſhould the Son of man be three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth.* From whence it ſeemeth to follow, that Chriſts body was for the ſpace of three whole dayes and three whole nights in the grave, and after that ſpace of time roſe from thence. And hence ſome have conceived,

Mat. 12. 40.

ceived, that being our Saviour roſe on the morning of the firſt day of the week, therefore it muſt neceſſarily follow that he dyed and was buried on the fift 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 ſeemes to be, muſt be conſidered with the reſt in which the ſame truth is delivered; as when our Saviour ſaid, *After three dayes I will riſe again*: and again, *Deſtroy this temple and in three dayes I will build it up*, or, *within three dayes I will build another made without hands*. But that which is moſt uſed, both in our Saviours 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 dyed is one, and the day on which he roſe is another, and conſequently 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 childe eight dayes 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 dayes, 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 dayes 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 dayes. Chriſt then who roſe upon the firſt day of the week (as is confeſſed by all) dyed upon the ſixth day of the week before: or if he had dyed upon the fifth he had riſen not upon the third but the

Mat. 27. 63.
Mar. 8. 32.
Joh. 2. 19.
Mar. 14. 58.
Mat. 16. 21.
17. 23.
20. 19.
Mar. 9. 31.
10 34.
Luc. 9. 22.
18. 33.
24. 7 46.
Act. 10. 40.
1 Cor. 15. 4.

† The ſeverall phraſes are uſed; firſt, that Chriſt was in the heart of the earth τῇς γῆς ἡμέρας, καὶ τῇς νύκτας: ſecondly, that he was to riſe μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας: thirdly, that he would rebuild this temple ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, and διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν: and laſtly that he roſe τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, which is the moſt generall and conſtant form of ſpeech.

fourth

† Lazarus is *ſaid to be* τετραταῖος, *four dayes dead, that is, computing the day on which he dyed, and he day on which his ſiter ſpake ſo to our Saviour at his ſepulchre.*

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* and *Hebrews*; he cannot be ſaid to riſe to life on the third day, who dyed upon any other day between which and the day of his reſurrection there interven'd any more then one day: therefore thoſe other formes of ſpeech which are farre leſſe frequent,

And being he was raiſed then, he roſe τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ *the fourth day. Our Saviour roſe* τῇ ϛίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, *and therefore he was* ϛιταῖος *when he roſe; and ſo the Fathers call him, as you may obſerve in the words laſt cited out of* Athanaſius. *As we read in* Plutarch, Σολὼς ὁ Θεμιστοκλέους ... ὀξέως ἔφατο, ϗ ϛιταῖος ἤδη περὶ τὰς ταφὰς αὐτὰς ἀνήνεγκε, *De his qui ſero pun. And of that Spirit in a Boy poſſeſſed, who hated all women* ἐπεὶ ἡ γυνὴ περὶ τὴν ἐννάτην ὤβεσε, τριταῖος κλαυθμὸς γαμνιτὶς ἦσα ἐπέρα, Philoſtratus *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *What this* ϛιταῖος *is, the Greek Grammarians will teach us.* Πρὸς μὲν τὸ πόσα ἀπωτάτω τὸ τεῖα πυχὸν ἢ πέμπτον, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πόσον τὸ ϛίτον ἢ τέταρτον ἐπὶ τάξεως, πρὸς δὲ τὸ ποσαῖον τὸ ϛιταῖον ἢ τεταρταῖον· οὗ πρὸς τὸ, ποσαῖος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πάρει; ἀπαρτήσῃ τὸ, τεταῖος τυχὸν ἢ τεταρταῖος, ἤγουν τεῖην ἡμέραν ἔχω ἀφ' ἧς ἐπάρξαμεν ἢ τετάρτην, Schol. Eurip. Hecuba. Τεταῖος then, *in reſpect of his coming to or from any place, is that perſon which is now the third day in or from that place; which cannot be better interpreted, as to the* Greek *language, then 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 when e* ἔνδε μίαν, *and* τριταῖος ἡμέρας *is the ſame in the language of the Phyſitians. Thus is excellently expreſſed by* Alexander Aphrodiſæus *in that problem of all Queſtion,* Διὰ τί ὁ μὲ τριταῖος ὀνομᾶ χωμὰ γιγνόμενος, ϗ ἔχων μαζὸς ϗ κατελαύνων χολὴν, ἔνδε μίαν χωνεῖται· ὁ δὲ ἀμφιμερινὸς, ἔχων πεδὴν τὸ φλέγμα τῇ βαρύτητι ϗ ψυχρότητι καθ' ἡμέραν· ὁ δὲ τεταρταῖος διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων, Problem. 10. *l.* 2. *The* Quotidian ague *hath its acceſſions* καθ' ἡμέραν· *the* Tertian ἔνδε μίαν (ſub ἡμέραν) *after one day of perfect intermiſſion; the* Quartan διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων. *In the ſame manner he mentions the* πεμπταῖον, *the* ἑβδομαῖον, *and* ὀνταταῖον: *in all which this is conſtantly obſervable, that the dayes of perfect intermiſſion are fewer by two, then the number in the name of the fever: for if the Fever be a* τριταῖος *the day of intermiſſion is but one, if* τεταρταῖος *two, if* πεμπταῖος *three, if* ἑβδομαῖος *five, if* ὀνταταῖος *ſeven. Thus if our Saviour were one whole day in the grav, and dyed the day before, and roſe the day after, he did riſe* τριταῖος; *if he were two whole day s in the grave, he roſe* τεταρταῖος. *So* Ariſtotle, Διὰ τί ὁ νυκτεινὸς βορβὰς τριταῖος λήγει; πότερον ὅτι ἀπὸ μικρᾶς ϗ ἀδενώδους ἀρχῆς; ἢ τείτη ἡ κρίσιμος, Probl. 14. Sect. 26. Τῇ τείτῃ *therefore and* τριταῖος *is the ſame. For from* τείτη *comes* τριταῖος, *and from* τετάρτη, τεταρταῖος, *&c. in which* ἡμέρα *is alwayes* under-

underſtood. Τεταρταῖος, τεθαήμερος, Suidas. Τριταῖος *then is* τριήμερος· τυγχάνει τριταῖος, διὰ τρίτης· *and* τεταρταῖος, διὰ τετάρτης. *Thus being Chriſt did certainly riſe* τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, *he did riſe according to th.* Greeks τριταῖος· *and according to the ſame then he muſt alſo riſe* בְּתַר לֵילְיָא, *that is, one day onely intercedding between the day of his death, and the day of his reſurrection.*

quent, 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 dayes* he would raiſe the temple of his body, we muſt not imagine that he would continue the ſpace of three whole dayes dead, and then revive himſelf; but upon the third day he would riſe again: as *Joſeph* and his mother, *after three dayes found him in the temple*, that is, the third day after he tarried behind *in Jeruſalem.* And when we read, that he was three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth, we muſt not look upon thoſe nights as † diſtinct from the dayes, 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*, a *Unto two thouſand and three hundred evenings and mornings*, intending thereby ſo many dayes: nor muſt we imagine that thoſe three dayes were completed after our Saviours death, and before he roſe; but that upon the firſt of thoſe three dayes he dyed, and upon

Luc. 2. 46.

† *A night and a day in the Hebrew language, not uſ'd to compoſitions, is the ſame with the Greek* νυχθήμερον *or* ἡμερονύκτιον, יוהי ערב ויהי בקר יום אחד

The evening and the morning were the firſt day. For though God called the light Day, and the darkneſſe he called Night, yet at the ſame time that day and that night was called day. So that the ſame word יום *in the ſame verſe ſignifieth both the naturall and artificiall day. And the evening and the morning are ſometimes put inſtead of the day; as* Dan. 8. 14. עד ערב בקר אלפים ושלש מאות Unto two thouſand and three hundred dayes, *and* verſ. 26. ומראה הערב והבקר, *which we tranſlate, the viſion of the evening and the morning, but might be rather tranſlated in reference to the former, the Viſion of the dayes, viz. the* 2300. *dayes before ſpoken of. Now though a Day be thus diverſly taken, ie. in the meaſuring of any time which contineth in it both dayes and nights, a day is always taken in that ſenſe in which it comprehendeth both day and night. Thus* Galen *who is very punctuall and exact in all his language, and full of expoſitions of the words he uſes, to prevent miſtakes, being to ſpeak of the Criticall dayes, gives notice that by a day he underſtands not that ſpace of time which is oppoſed to the night, but that which comprehendeth both the night and day,* Ἡμέραν δὲ λέγω νῦν οὐ τὸν ἀπὸ μέσης

μένοις ἐκ ὀκτὼ ἡμέρας αὐτῆς μόνης σωθεῖσῆς, ἀμφὶ μὲν τὸ νυκτὸς χρόνου καθόλου καὶ μιᾶς πρὸς ὀκτὼ ἡμερῶν εἴη λεγομένη, ἓν μόνον τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ὃν ὑπὸ τῆς γῆς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνει περσαγορεύοντες ἡμέραν, ἀμφὶ μὲν τὸν τὸ νυκτὸς αὖ τοῦ παρεστῶτες, ὅπως δὲ πως καὶ τὸν ὁπωσοῦν πίντε καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίων ἡμερῶν εἴη φαμέν, De Crisibus l. 2. *This is observed by S.* Basil *to be also the custome of the Scriptures, upon those words in* Genesis, Ἐγένετο οὖν ἑσπέρα, ἐγένετο πρωΐ, τὴν ἡμεροννύκτιον λέγει· ὑκ ἄλλη περσηγόρευσεν, ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ, ἀμφὶ τοῦ ὁπωσοῦντι τὸν πᾶν περσηγορίαν ἀπήγαγε. Ταύτῳ αὖ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ γραφῇ τὴν σωμήσειαν εὑρεῖς ἐν τῇ τοῦ χρόνου μετρήσει, ἡμέρας ἠριθμημένας, ὑκὶ δὲ καὶ νύκτας μὴ πλὴν ἡμερῶν, In Hexam. Hom. 2. *Now being generally in all computations of time, as S.* Basil *observeth, ἐν τῇ τοῦ χρόνου μετρήσει, a day was taken for the whole space of day and night; and as the evening and the morning signifieth the same, that is, a day; and* 2300. *evenings and mornings no more then so many dayes; and so three dayes and three nights in the computation of time signifie no more then three dayes.* (For God called the light Day, and the darkneſſe 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 three dayes in the language of the Scripture are ſaid to be fulfil'd when the third day is come, though it be not wholly paſſed over; it followeth, that to be three dayes dead, or to be three dayes and three nights dead, in the* Hebrew *language, cannot neceſſarily inferre any more, then that the perſon ſpoken of did continue dead till the third day.* a Dan. 8. 14.

upon the laſt of thoſe three dayes he roſe. As we find that Luc. 2. 21. *eight dayes were accompliſhed for the circumciſion of the child*; and yet Chriſt was born upon the firſt and circumciſed upon the laſt of thoſe eight dayes: now were there any more then ſix whole dayes 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 dayes, whereas every week a new courſe ſucceeded, and there were but ſeven dayes ſervice for each courſe, (the Sabbath on which they began, and the Sabbath on which they went off being both reckon'd in the eight dayes;) ſo the day on which

† *As we read of the circumciſion of our Saviour,* ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ *ſo of Zachary,* ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ· *and though the number* ὀκτὼ *were not expreſs'd yet it is to be underſtood, according to the language of the Scripture in other caſes, and of* Joſephus *particularly in this,* Διέλαξε δὲ μίαν παρίαν διακοσίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπ' ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ, ἀπὸ Σαββάτου ἐπὶ σάββατον.

the

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 dayes. And thus did our Saviour riſe from the dead upon the third day properly, and was three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth * ſyn-ecdochically.

* So S. Hierome on Jonas 2. 1. Et erat Jonas in ventre piſcis tribus diebus & tribus noctibus. Hujus loci myſterium in Evangelio Dominus exponit, & ſuperfluum eſt vel idipſum vel aliud dicere. Hoc ſolum quærimus, quomodo tres dies & tres noctes fuerit in corde terræ. Quidam παροχὴν, quando Sole fugiente, ab hora ſexta uſque ad horam nonam nox ſucceſſit diei, in duas dies & noctes dividunt, & apponentes Sabbatum, tres dies & tres noctes æſtimant ſupputandas: nos vero συνεκδοχικῶς totum intelligamus à parte; ut ex eo quod ἐν παροχῇ mortuus eſt, unam diem ſupputemus & noctem, & ſabbati alteram; tertiam vero noctem, quæ diei & Dominicæ nuncupatur, referamus ad exordium diei alterius: nam & in Geneſi nox præcedentis diei (*adde* non) eſt ſed ſequentis, id eſt, principium futuri non finis præteriti. *To the ſame purpoſe* S. Auſtin, Ipſum autem triduum non totum & plenum fuiſſe Scriptura teſtis eſt; ſed primus dies à parte extrema totus annumeratus eſt; dies vero tertius à parte prima & ipſe totus; medius autem inter eos, id eſt, ſecundus dies abſolute totus viginti quatuor horis ſuis, duodecim nocturnis & duodecim diurnis. Crucifixus eſt enim primo Judæorum vocibus hora tertia, cum eſſet dies ſexta ſabbati. Deinde, in ipſa cruce ſuſpenſus eſt hora ſexta, & ſpiritum reddidit hora nona. Sepultus eſt autem cum jam ſero factum eſſet: ſic ſeſe habent verba Evangelii quod intelligitur in fine diei. Unde libet ergo incipias, etiamſi alia ratio reddi poteſt, quomodo non ſit contra Evangelium Johannis, ut hora tertia ligno ſuſpenſus intelligatur, totum diem primum non comprehendis. Ergo à parte extrema totus computabitur, ſicut tertius à parte prima. Nox enim uſque ad diluculum quo Domini reſurrectio declarata eſt, ad tertium diem pertinet, *De Trinit. l.* 4. *c.* 6.

This is ſufficient for the clearing the preciſe diſtance of Chriſts Reſurrection from his Crucifixion, expreſſed in the determinate number of three dayes: 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 & confirmed; the ſecond is the Evangeliſts expreſſion of the time on which Chriſt roſe.

The character of the day in which our Saviour dyed is undeniable, for it is often expreſly called the † *preparation*; as we read, they therefore laid Jeſus in the garden, *a because of the Jews preparation* day, *for the ſepulchre was nigh at hand.* And *b the next day that followed the preparation, the chief Prieſts and Phariſees* asked a guard.

† Παρασκευὴ, Paraſceue interpretatur præparatio, *ſaith S.* Auguſtine, *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* Luc. 23. 54. Καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευὴ· *and that preparation among the* Jews *for the ſabbath; as S.* Mark 15. 42. Ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευὴ ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον· *and in the Edict of* Auguſtus Cæſar, ἐγγύας τε μὴ ὀφείλειν ἐν σαββάτῳ, ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ ἀπὸ ὥρας ἐνάτης, Jud. Ant. l. 6. c. 10. *This* παρασκευὴ *of the* Hebrews *was a ſwerable to the* cœna pura *of the Gentiles, as the Old Gloſſary,* Cœna pura, προσάββατον. *&* in Gloſs. Latino-Arabico, Paraſceue, cœna pura, id eſt, præparatio quæ fit proſabbato. *From whence ſome of the Fathers did ſo interpret the Eeves of the* Jewiſh *Sabbaths, as* Tertullian, Dies obſervatis & menſes & tempora & annos & ſabbata, ut opinor, & cœnas puras, & jejunia & dies magnos, *Adv. Marcion. l. 5. c. 4.* Acce eratam vult intelligi ſepulturam ne adveſperaſceret, quando jam propter paraſceuen, quam cœnam puram Judæi Latine uſitatius apud nos vocant, facere tale quid non licebat, *S. Aug. Tract. 76. in Joh. And the Ancient Tranſlators of the* Greek *Fathers did uſe the* Latine cœna pura *for the* Greek προσαββατον. *As the Interpreter of S.* Chryſoſtome, *Serm. in Natalem. Joh. Bapt.* Qua enim die conceptus eſt Dominus eadem die & paſſus eſt; eadem ipſa dies cœna pura fuit, in qua & luna quartadecima occurrit. *Solikewiſe the Old Interpreter of* Irenæus, Paraſceue quæ dicitur cœna pura, id eſt, ſexta feria, quam & Dominus oſtendit paſſus in ea, *Iren. l. 5. c. 23. & lib. 1.* Moheni ſexta die dixiſſe, quæ eſt in cœna pura. *As therefore the* Cœna 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 ſignifie their ſanctification, and of the* Greek προσαββατον *to teſtifie the preparation of all things uſed on their holy dayes, upon the Eeve thereof, or day before.* Paraſceue Latine præparatio eſt, ſed iſto verbo Græco libentius utuntur Judæi in hujuſmodi obſervationibus, etiam qui magis Latine quam Græce loquuntur, *ſaith S.* Auſtin *Tract. 117. in Joh. So that the ſame Father teſtified that the* Jews *ſpeaking* Latine *in his time did ſometime uſe* paraſceue, *ſometime* cœna pura *for their Eeve of preparation. Otherwiſe in their own language they called it* ערוב, *or* ערובתא; *by which generally they underſtood the ſixt day of the week, the day before the Sabbath. For ſo they reckoned the dayes of the week in* Bereſhit Rabba, חד בשבתא *the firſt of the week,* תרי *the ſecond,* תלתא *the third,* ארבעתא *the fourth,* חמשתא *the fift,* ערובתא *the Eeve,* שבתא *the Sabbath. Thus in* Hebrew ערובתא, *in* Greek παρασκευὴ, *in* Latine Cœna pura, *were uſed by the* Jews *for the ſame day, the Friday or ſixt of the week; but not for that alone, but for the Eeve of any great Feſtivall which anſwered*

ſwered to a Sabbath, ſo that they had their ערב השבת, *and* ערב החם טוב *as* παρασκευὴ τῶν σαββάτων, *and* παρασκευὴ τοῦ Πάσχα. *And when a great Feſtivall fell upon the Sabbath, then as the Feſtivities were both one day, ſo the Eeve to both was the ſame Friday: And ſuch was the day of preparation on which our Saviour was crucified.* a Joh. 19. 42. b Mat. 27. 62.

Now this day of preparation was the day immediately before the Sabbath or ſome other great feaſt of the *Jews*, called by them the Eeve 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 feſtivall; according to that command in the caſe of *Manna*, *It ſhall come to paſſe that on the ſixth day they ſhall prepare that which they bring in, and it ſhall be twice as much as they gather dayly.* This preparation being uſed both before the Sabbath and other Feſtivalls, at this time it had both relations: for firſt, it was the preparation to a Sabbath, as appeareth by thoſe words of S. *Mark*, *Now when the Even was come, becauſe it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath*; and thoſe of S. *Luke*, *That day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.* Secondly, it was alſo the Eeve of a Feſtivall, even of the great day of the Paſchall ſolemnity, as appeareth by S. *John*, who ſaith, when *Pilate* ſet down in the judgement ſeat, *it was the Preparation of the Paſſeover.* And that the great Paſchall feſtivity did then fall upon the Sabbath, ſo that the ſame day was then the preparation or Eeve of both, appeareth yet further by the ſame Evangeliſt, ſaying, *The Jews therefore, becauſe it was the preparation, that the bodies ſhould not remain upon the Croſſe on the Sabbath day, for that Sabbath day was an high day*; that is, not onely an ordinary or weekly Sabbath, but alſo a great feſtivall even a Paſchall 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 Eeve thereof muſt neceſſarily be the ſixth day of the week, which from the day, and

Exod. 16. 5.

Mar. 15. 42.

Luc. 23. 54.

Joh. 19. 31.

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 firſt of the next week.

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 S. *Mark*, which was the day after the preparation on which he was buried, *very early in the morning the firſt day of the week. In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the firſt day of the week*, ſaith S. *Matthew*. *Upon the firſt day of the week early in the morning*, ſaith S. *Luke*. *The firſt day of the week early when it was yet dark*, ſaith S. *John*. 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 Eeve of the Sabbath, and continuing there the whole Sabbath following, which was the concluſion of that week, and further 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. Whereby it came to paſſe, that the obligation of the day, which was then the Sabbath, dyed and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnall tranſmutation reviv'd 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 appear'd upon which a far greater Redemption was confirm'd. 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 was't a ſervant in the land of Egypt, and that*

Mar. 16. 1, 2.

Mat. 28. 1.

Luc. 24. 1.

Joh. 20. 1.

Deut. 5. 15.

the

the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a ſtretched out arme, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day. Now this could not be any ſpeciall reaſon why the *Jews* ſhould obſerve a ſeventh day; firſt, becauſe in reference to their redemption, the number of ſeven had no more relation then any other number; ſecondly, becauſe the reaſon of a ſeventh day was before rendred in the body of the commandement it ſelf. There was therefore a double reaſon rendred by God why the *Jews* ſhould keep that Sabbath which they did; one Specificall, as to a ſeventh day, to ſhew they worſhipped that God who was the Creator of the world; the other Individuall, as to that ſeventh day, to ſignifie 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 then that of *Egypt*, and therefore a greater obſervance was due unto it then to that, the individuall determination of the day did paſſe upon a ſtronger reaſon to another day, alwayes to be repeated by a ſeventhly 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*: ſo at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the Hebdomadall 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 were all things created* that are *in heaven and that are in earth, all things were created by him and for him.* This day did the Apoſtles from the beginning moſt religiouſly obſerve, by their meeting together for holy purpoſes and

Exod. 12. 2.

Coloſſ. 1. 16.

to

a Joh. 20. 19.
b Joh. 20. 26.
c Act. 2. 1.
d 41.
e Act. 20. 7.
f Rev. 1. 10.
† Τῇ τῦ ἡλίυ λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρὸς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέρχεται, Just. Martyr Apol. 2. & paulo post, Τὴν δὲ τῦ Ἡλίυ ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τῶν συνόδων ποιύμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. Τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῦ Κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν Κρονικὴν, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἡλίυ φαινὸς τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις αὐτῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς, ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεβάλομεν. Nobis quibus Sabbata extranea sunt & neomenia & feriæ à Deo aliquando

to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God then any such inclination or intention of their own: For a *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.* The second observation was performed voluntarily, b *for after eight dayes again his Disciples were within, and Thomas with them*: 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 are all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and *Thomas* with them. Again, c *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*, and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, they spake with tongues, preached the Gospel, and the d *same day were added* unto them *about three thousand soules.* The same practice of convening we find continued in the following yeares. For e *upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them*: and the same Apostle gave expresse 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 prosper'd him.* From this Resurrection of our Saviour, & the constant practice of the Apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the *Lords day*, and is so called by S. *John*, who sayes of himself in the *Revelation*, f *I was in the Spirit on the Lords day.* And thus the observation of that day, which the *Jews* did sanctifie, ceased, and was buried with our Saviour, & 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 & so continued in all ages. This

commeant, ſtrenæ conſonant, luſus, convivia conſtrepunt. O melior fides nationum in ſuam ſectam, quæ nullam ſolennitatem Chriſtianorum ſibi vindicat, non Dominicum Diem, non Pentecoſten, *Tertul. de Idol. c.* 14. Cum in ſeptimo die Sabbati ſit & nomen & obſervantia conſtituta, tamen nos in octava die, quæ & ipſa prima eſt, perfecti ſabbati feſtivitate lætamur, *S. Hilar. Prolog. in Pſal.* Quid eſt ſecunda ſabbati niſi Dominica dies quæ Sabbatum ſequebatur? Dies autem abbati erat dierum ordine poſterior, ſanctificatione legis anterior. Sed ubi finis legis advenit, & reſurrectione ſua octavam ſanctificavit, cœpit eadem prima eſſe quæ octava eſt, & octava quæ prima, habens ex numeri ordine prærogativam, & ex reſurrectione Domini ſanctitatem, *S. Ambroſ. Enar. in Pſalm.* 47. Dicat aliquis, Si dies obſervari non licet, & menſes & tempora & annos, nos quoque ſimile crimen incurrimus, quartam Sabbati obſervantes, & paraſceven, & diem Dominicam, *S. Hieron. in Epiſt ad Gal. cap.* 4. *verſ.* 10. *And S.* Auguſtine *in anſwer to the ſame objection*, Nam nos quoque & Dominicum diem & Paſcha ſolenniter celebramus & quaſlibet alias Chriſtianas dierum feſtivitates, *Contra Adimantum cap.* 16. Dies Dominicus non Judæis ſed Chriſtianis reſurrectione Domini declaratus eſt, & ex illo habere cœpit feſtivitatem ſuam, *S. Aug. Epiſt.* 119. Hæc tamen ſeptima erit Sabbatum noſtrum, cujus finis non erit veſpera ſed Dominicus dies velut octavus æternus, qui Chriſti reſurrectione ſacratus eſt, æternam non ſolum ſpiritus verum etiam corporis requiem præfigurans, *Idem de Civitate Dei l.* 22. *c.* 30. Dominicum diem Apoſtoli & Apoſtolici viri ideo religioſa ſolennitate habendum ſanxerunt, quia in eodem Redemptor noſter à mortuis reſurrexit. Quique ideo Dominicus appellatur ut in eo à terrenis operibus vel mundi illecebris abſtinentes tantum divinis cultibus ſerviamus, dantes ſcilicet diei huic honorem & reverentiam propter ſpem reſurrectionis noſtræ quam habemus in illa. Nam ſicut ipſe Dominus Ieſus Chriſtus & Salvator reſurrexit à mortuis, ita & nos reſurrecturos in noviſſimo die ſperamus, *Autor. Serm. de Tempore*, *Serm.* 251. *& paulo poſt*, Sancti Doctores Eccleſiæ decreverunt omnem gloriam Judaici Sabbatiſmi in illam transferre, ut quod ipſi in figura, nos celebraremus in veritate. Περιέχει οὖν ἡ παραινεσις τὸ παθος, τὸ σάββατον τὴν ταφὴν, ἡ Κυριακὴ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, Author Clem. Conſtitut. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 13.

This day thus conſecrated by the Reſurrection of Chriſt was left as the perpetuall badge and cognizance of his Church. As God ſpake by *Moſes* to the *Iſraelites*, *Verily my Sabbath ye ſhall keep, for it is a ſigne between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth ſanctifie you*; 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 Ex. 31. 13.

this day as a ſigne between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worſhip the ſame God *Jehovah*, who did not onely create heaven and earth in the beginning, but alſo raiſed his eternall Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the *Jews* doe ſtill retain the celebration of the ſeventh day of the week, becauſe they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought then that of *Egypt*: as the *Mahometans* religiouſly obſerve the ſixt day of the week in memory of *Mahomets* flight from *Mecca*, whom they eſteem a greater Prophet then our Saviour: as theſe are known and diſtinguiſhed in the world by theſe ſeverall celebrations of diſtinct dayes in the worſhip of God; ſo all which profeſſe the Chriſtian Religion are known publickly to belong unto 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.

† Quid hac die felicius, in qua Dominus Judæis mortuus eſt, nobis reſurrexit? in qua Synagogæ cultus occubuit, & eſt ortus Eccleſiæ; in qua nos homines fecit ſecum ſurgere & vivere & ſedere in cœleſtibus, & impletum eſt illud quod ipſe dixit in Evangelio, Cum autem exaltatus fuero à terra omnia traham ad me. Hæc eſt dies quam fecit Dominus, exultemus & lætemur in ea. Omnes dies quidem fecit Dominus, ſed cæteri dies poſſunt eſſe Judæorum, poſſunt eſſe hæreticorum, poſſunt eſſe Gentilium; Dies Dominica, dies reſurrectionis, dies Chriſtianorum, dies noſtra eſt, *Explan. in Pſalm.* 117. *ſub nomine* Hieron.

That Chriſt did thus riſe from the dead, is a moſt neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian faith, which all are obliged to believe and profeſſe, to the meditation whereof the
2 Tim. 2. 8. Apoſtle hath given a particular injunction, *Remember that Jeſus Chriſt of the ſeed of David was raiſed from the dead.* Firſt, becauſe without it our faith is vain, and by virtue of it, ſtrong. By this we are aſſured that he which
2 Cor. 13. 4. dyed was the Lord of life, and though he were *crucified through weakneſſe, yet he liveth by the power of God.* By
Rom. 1. 4. this reſurrection from the dead, he *was declared to be the Son of God*, and upon the morning of the third day did

thoſe

thoſe words of the Father manifeſt a moſt important truth, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* In his death he aſſured us of his humanity, by his reſurrection he demonſtrated his divinity. Act. 13. 33.

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 righteouſneſſe*: For he *was delivered for our offences, and was raiſed again for our juſtification.* By his death we know that he ſuffered for ſin, by his reſurrection we are aſſured that the † ſinnes for which he ſuffered were not his own: had no man bin a ſinner he had not dyed; had he bin a ſinner he had not riſen again: but dying for thoſe ſinnes which we committed, he roſe from the dead to ſhew that he had made full ſatisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtein remiſſion of our ſinnes and juſtification of our perſons. *a God ſending his own Son in the likeneſſe of ſinfull fleſh for ſin condemned ſin in the fleſh,* 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 any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that juſtifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Chriſt that dyed, yea rather that is riſen again.* Rom. 2. 24, 25. † S. Chryſoſtome *excellently upon that place,* Ὁρᾷ πῶς τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτῶν τῷ θανάτῳ, τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ποιεῖ. Διὰ τί γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη, φησίν; ἁμαρτίαν ἡμῶν ἀνελεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ ἡμῶν ἦν ἁμαρτωλός, πῶς ἀνίστη; εἰ δὲ ἀνίστη, εὐδήλον ὅτι ἁμαρτωλὸς οὐκ ἦν. εἰ δὲ ἁμαρτωλὸς οὐκ ἦν, πῶς ἐσταυρώθη; διὰ τοῦτο· εἰ δὲ ἐτέρους, πάντως ἀνίστη. a Rom 8. 3.

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 uncorruptible and undefiled.* By the Reſurrection of Chriſt his Father hath bin ſaid to have begotten him; and therefore by the ſame he hath begotten us, who are called brethren and co-heirs with Chriſt. *For if* 1 Pet. 1. 3.

Rom. 5. 10. *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.* 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

Col. 1. 18. *firſt born from the dead,* and we *the ſonnes of the Reſurrection.* The Spirit of Chriſt abiding in us maketh us the members of Chriſt, and by the ſame ſpirit we have a full

Rom. 8. 11. 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 mortall bodies by his ſpirit that dwelleth in us.* 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 Efficient cauſe, in regard our Saviour by and upon his reſurrection hath obtained power and right to raiſe

1 Cor. 15. 22. all the dead; *For as in Adam all dye, 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

Rom. 6. 5. conformity to the reſurrection of Chriſt; *For if we have bin planted together in the likeneſſe of his death, we ſhall be alſo in the likeneſſe of his reſurrection. He ſhall change our*

Philip. 3. 21. *vile bodies that they may be like unto his glorious body:* That

1 Cor. 15. 49. *as we have born the image of the earthey we may alſo bear the image of the heavenly.* This is the great hope of a Chriſtian, that Chriſt riſing from the dead hath obtain'd 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 paſſe before them, and the Lord on the head of them.*

Fourthly, it is neceſſary to profeſſe our faith in Chriſt riſen from the dead, that his Reſurrection may effectually work it's proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our bodies, ſo it is alſo to our ſouls.

Epheſ. 2. 5. *When we are dead in ſinnes, God quickneth us together with Chriſt.*

Christ. And, *as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newnesse of life.* Rom. 6. 4. To continue among the graves of sin while Christ is risen, is to incurre that reprehension of the Angel, *why seek ye the living among the dead?* To walk in any habituall 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.* Eph. 5. 14. There must be a spirituall 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.* Revelat. 20. 6.

Having thus explained the manner of Christs 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 his 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 eternall Son of God, who was crucified and dyed for our sinnes, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself by reuniting the same soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man: and this he did the 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 untill 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.

THis Article hath received no variation, but onely 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. It conteineth two diſtinct parts: one tranſient, the other permanent; one as the way, the other as the end; the firſt is Chriſts Aſcenſion, the ſecond is his Seſſion.

In the Aſcenſion of Chriſt theſe words of the Creed propound unto 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 onely in conjunction with this particular Action. Wherefore I conceive theſe three things neceſſary and ſufficient for the illuſtration of Chriſts Aſcenſion: Firſt, to ſhew 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.

That the promiſed *Meſsias* ſhould aſcend into heaven, hath bin repreſented typically, and declar'd prophetically. The High Prieſt under the law was an expreſſe type of the *Meſſias* and his Prieſtly office; the atonement which he made was the repreſentation of the propitiation in Chriſt for the ſinnes of the world: for the making this

† Aſcendit in cœlos, ſedet ad dextram Patris. Ruffinus *in Symb.* S. Aug. *in Enchirid.* Maximus Taurin. Chryſol. Author *Expoſ. Symb. ad Catech. ante os*, Venantius Fortunatus, *the* Lat. *and* Greek Mss. *ſet forth by the Archbiſhop of* Armagh. S. Auguſt. *de* Fide Symb. *hath it*, Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris; *to which was afterwards added* Omnipotentis. Sedet ad dextram Patris omnipotétis, *Euſeb. Gallican.* Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris omnipotentis, *Etherius Uxam. &* Author Sermonú de Tempore, *the* Greek *and* Lat. Mss. *in* Bennet *Colledge Library.*

this atonement, the High Prieſt was apppointed once every year to enter into the Holy of holies, and no oftner. 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 Ark, that he dye not.* None entred into that holy place but the High Prieſt alone; and he himſelf could enter thither but once in the year; and thereby ſhewed 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 eternall redemption for us.* The *Jews* did all † believe that the Tabernacle did ſignifie this world, and the Holy of holies the higheſt heavens; wherefore as the High Prieſt did ſlay the ſacrifice, and with the bloud thereof did paſſe through the reſt of the Tabernacle, and with that bloud enter into the Holy of holies; ſo was the *Meſſias* here to offer up himſelf, and being ſlain to paſſe through all the courts of this world below, and with his bloud to enter into the higheſt heavens the moſt glorious ſeat of the Majeſty of God. Thus Chriſts Aſcenſion was repreſented typically.

Lev. 16. 2.

Heb. 9. 11, 12.

† Εἴ τις τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τὸν νοήσειε τῶν πάντων κόσμον, καὶ τῆς ἱερέως ἔσω τὴν σκιὰν τά τε σκεύη οἷς ἐπὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν χρώμενος, τὴν τε νομοθέτου εὐσέβειαν θείαν ἂν δόξαι, καὶ ματαίως ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τῆς ἄλλων τὰς βλασφημίας ἀκούοντας. ἔκρινε γὰρ τούτων εἷς ὑπομίμησιν καὶ σκιᾶς πάντων τῶν ὅλων, εἰπὼν ἀφθόνως ἐθέλειν καὶ μετὰ σωφίσεως σκηνεῖν, εὐσεβῆ χαρακτῆρα. τὴν τε γὰρ σκιὰν τειάκοντα πηχῶν ὄσαν νέμας εἰς εἶναι, καὶ δύο μέρη πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, ὥσπερ βίβλον τινὰ καὶ κοινὸν τόπον, τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ὑποπτεύειν· καὶ γὰρ πᾶσιν ὄντων ἐπίβατα. τὴν δὲ τρίτην μοῖραν μόνῳ ἀφιέναι τῷ Θεῷ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώποις. Where it is to be obſerved, that the place which S. Paul calls the firſt tabernacle, Joſephus termes βίβλον τινὰ 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. 9. 1. Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ δικαιώματα λατρείας τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν. For ἅγιον κοσμικὸν, ſanctum ſeculare, or as the Syriack בית קודשא עלמיא domus 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.

The ſame Aſcenſion was alſo declar'd prophetically, as

we

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 properly to no other conquerour but the *Meſſias*, not to *Moſes*, not to *David*, not to *Joſuah*, 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 ſonnes of men. The Prophecy of *Micah* did foretell as much, even in the opinion and confeſſion of the * *Jewes* 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 paſſe before them, and the Lord on the head of them.* And thus Chriſts Aſcenſion was declar'd prophetically; which was our firſt Conſideration.

Pſal. 68. 18. *This place muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of the* Meſſias, *by reaſon of that* high place *to which no other conquerour aſcended. For that* למרום *in the language of the Prophet is attributed to God, as* Pſal. 7. 8. שובה למרום, return on high, *that is in the language of the* Chaldee *Paraphraſe*, לבי שכינתך חוב, return to the houſe of thy majeſty; *and* Pſalm 93. 4. אדיר במרום יהוה, the Lord on high is mighty, *Chald.* בשמי מרומא, in the upper heavens. Pſalm. 71. 19. *Thy righteouſneſſe, O Lord,* is עד מרום uſque ad excelſum; *the* Chald *again*, עד שמי מרומא. *In the ſame manner in this place*, עלית למרום, thou haſt aſcended on high, *the* Chaldee *Paraſh aſe tranſlateth* סלקתא לרקיע thou haſt aſcended the firmament: *and he addeth immediately* משה נביא 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.*

* *This breaker up is by the confeſſion of the* Jews *the title of the* Meſſias. *So the Authour of* Sepher Abchath Ruchal *in his deſcription of the coming of the* Meſſias *maketh uſe of this place. And the ſame appeareth further by that ſaying of* Moſes Hadarſhan *in* Bereſhit Rabba, נטיעה מלמטה זה אברהם נטיעה מלמעלה זה משיח שנ' עלה הפרץ לפניהם וגו׳: The plantation from below is Abram, the plantation from above is Meſsias, as it is written, *The breaker is come up before them*, &c. *So he on* Gen. 40. 9. *Again the ſame* Bereſhit Rabba *Gen.* 44. 18. אמירתי אנו שמחים כשיעמדו רגלי השכינה על הר הזתים when ſhall we rejoyce? when the feet of the Shecinah ſhall ſtand upon the mount of Olives; *and again*, אמירתי כשיעלו הגלויות מניהם והשכינה בראשם שנ׳ ויעבר מלכם לפניהם ויהוה בראשם, When? when the captives ſhall aſcend from Hell, and Shecinah in the head, as it is written (Mic. 2. 13.) *their King ſhall paſſe before them, and the Lord in the head of them.*

Secondly,

Secondly, whatsoever was thus represented and foretold of the promised *Messias*, was truly and really performed by our Jesus. That onely begotten and eternall Son of God, who by his divinity was present in the heavens while he was on earth, did by a locall translation of his humane 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 liv'd and dyed and rose again.

The Ascent of Christ into heaven was not metaphoricall or figurative, as if there were no more to be understood by it, but onely 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 hath 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 Ascension. For that was therefore onely true, because the Son of man, not yet conceived in the Virgins womb, was not in heaven, and after his conception by vertue of the hypostaticall 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 hypostaticall union, beside that glorious condition upon his Resurrection, there was yet another and that more proper Ascension: for after he had both those wayes ascended, it was still true that he had not yet ascended to his Father.

Joh. 20. 17.

Joh. 3. 13.

Now this kind of Ascension, by which Christ had not

yet aſcended when he ſpake to *Mary* after his reſurrection, was not long after to be performed; for at the ſame time he ſaid unto *Mary*, *Goe 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 locall 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, & 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 toward heaven as he went up.* This was a viſible departure, as it is deſcribed, a reall 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 locall aſcenſion.

Luc 24. 50, 51. Act. 1. 9, 10.

† Βλεπόντων μὲν οὐκ ἀνέβη, βλεπόντων δὲ ἐπήρθη· ἐπέδειξε γὰρ ταῦτα ἡ ὄψις τὸ πᾶν ἔργον, καὶ δι' ἑκάστου τὸ μὲν τέλος ἔδειξε, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν οὐκέτι· καὶ τῆς ἀναλήψεως τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἔδειξε, τὸ δὲ τέλος οὐκέτι. παρεῖλκε δὲ ἐκεῖνο τὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἰδεῖν, αὐτῇ τῇ ταῦτα φθεγγομένῃ παρεῖντος, καὶ τῇ μνήματος καὶ θανάτου ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε. ἀπὸ τοῦ μετὰ τοῦτο λόγῳ δεῖξαι ἔδει, S. Chryſ. *Hom.* 2. *in Act. Apoſt.*

Thus was Chriſts 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 *ſhewed 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

In heaven, being the session was not to be visible to the Apostles 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.

Beside the eye witnesse of the Apostles, there was added the testimony of the Angells; those blessed Spirits which ministred 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 testifie of his reception; For *behold two men stood by them in white apparell, 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 goe into heaven.* We must therefore acknowledge and confesse against all the wild * Heresies of old, that the eternall Son of God who dyed and rose again, did with the same body and soul, with which he dyed and rose, ascend up to heaven; which was the second Particular considerable in this Article.

† Ἐπεὶδὴ οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι μαρτυροῦντες τὸ ὑψωθῆναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παραγίνονται πάλιν οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰς τὸν ἀέρα τὸν ἀνώτατον ἢ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὅρα τί γίνεται· ὅτι μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦν ὃς ἐξ ὧν διελέγετο πρὸς αὐτοὺς (πόρρωθεν γὰρ αὐτοὶ λοιπὸν ἐθεάσαντο τὰς ὄψεις ἰδόντας γνῶναι) ὅτι ἡ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναλαμβάνεται, ἐδίδασκον οἱ ἄγγελοι, *S.* Chrys. *Hom.* 2. *in Acta Apost.* a Act. 1. 10, 11.

Thirdly,

* *The various Heresies in the Primitive times concerning the humanity of Christ ascended into heaven are briefly touched by* Tertullian; Ut & illi erubescant, qui adfirmant carnem in cœlis vacuam sensu ut vaginam exempto Christo sedere, aut quæ carnem & animam tantundem aut tantummodo animam, carnem vero non jam, *D. Carne Christi, cap.* 24. *Of which* Gregory Nazianzene, Εἰ τις ἀπιθάνως νῦν τὴν σάρκα λέγοι, ἢ γυμνὴν δὴ τὴν θεότητα σώματος, ἀνὰ μὲν μετὰ τοῦ περιλήμματος καὶ τοῦ ἡμῶν, μὴ ἴδοι τὴν δόξαν τῆς παρουσίας, *Epist.* 1. *ad* Cledonium. *The Apellitæ taught that Christ left his body dissolved in the air, and so ascend into heaven without it;* Hunc Apellem dicunt quidam etiam de Christo tum falsa sensisse, ut dicerent eum non quidem carnem duxisse de cœlo, sed ex elementis mundi accepisse, quæ mundo redidit, cum sine carne resurgens in cœlum ascendit, *S.* Aug. *Hæres.* 23. *It is opinion of* Apelles *is thus delivered by* Epiphanius *in his own words,* Ἐν τῷ ἐρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ὑγρᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ σωτήριον ἔσεσθαι τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων σῶμα ..... Ἔδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν παθεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι, καὶ ἐσωσεῖσθαι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τὴν σάρκα

κα τοῖς ἑαυτῆ μαθηταῖς, καὶ ἀναλύσας αὐτὴν τὴν ἀναβάσιν ἑαυτῆ ἀπεμέρισε πάλιν ἐνάρετον ψυχὴν σοιχεῖον τὸ ἴδιον ἀποδὺς, τὸ θερμὸν τῷ θερμῷ, τὸ ψυχρὸν τῷ ψυχρῷ, τὸ ξηρὸν τῷ ξηρῷ, τὸ ὑγρὸν τῷ ὑγρῷ· καὶ ὕπως διαλύσας ἀπ' αὐτῆς πάλιν τὸ ἄφθαρτον σῶμα ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν ἀέρινον, ὅθεν καὶ ἦκε. Hæres. 44. *Of which* Gregory Nazianzene *is to be understood in that Epistle before cited,* ἢ εἰς τὸν ἀέρα ἐλθὼν καὶ διῆλθεν, ὡς φωνῆς φύσις, καὶ ἀδιαμῆς ῥύσις, καὶ ἀσπαθῆς ῥόμβου· ἐκ ἴσα λέγω.

Thirdly, being the name of *heaven* admitteth divers acceptions in the ſacred Scriptures, it will be neceſſary to enquire what is the true Notion of it in this Article, and what was the proper termination of Chriſts Aſcenſion. In ſome ſenſe it might be truly ſaid Chriſt was in heaven before the cloud took him out of the Apoſtles ſight; for the clouds themſelves are call'd the clouds of heaven: but that heaven is the firſt; and our Saviour certainly aſcended at leaſt as far as S. *Paul* was caught up, that is, into the third heaven; For *we have a great High Prieſt that is paſſed* † *through the heavens.* And needs muſt he paſſe through the heavens, becauſe he was a *made higher then the heavens*; For b *he that deſcended is the ſame alſo that aſcended up far above all heavens.* 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 *entred into that within the vail,* there is his paſſage through the heavens *into the holy place, even into heaven it ſelf to appear in the preſence of God,* this is the heaven of heavens. For *thus* ſaid *the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footſtool*; 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 ye ſhall ſee the ſon of man aſcend up where he was before?* Had he bin there before in body it had bin no ſuch wonder that he ſhould have aſcended thither again: but that his body ſhould aſcend unto

Heb. 4. 14.
† *We read it indeed* into the heavens, *but the Originall impo ts as much as through,* διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, *Vulg.* qui penetravit cœlos.
a Heb. 7. 26.
b Eph. 4. 10.
Heb. 6. 19.
Heb. 9. 12, 24.

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 then all the reſt which are called heavens; whatſoever ſanctuary is holier then 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 ſplendor of his Deity he *was before* he took upon him our humanity.

As therefore when we ſay Chriſt aſcended, we underſtand a literall and locall aſcent, not of his Divinity, (which poſſeſſeth all places, and therefore being every where 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 expoſitions of the Apoſtles muſt underſtand thereby the heaven of heavens or the higheſt heaven, it followeth that we believe the body with the ſoul of Chriſt to have paſſed far aboveall thoſe celeſtiall bodies which we ſee, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the † Sun.

† *The* Seleucia*ni and* Hermia*ni taugh: that the body of Chriſt aſcended no further then the Sun, in which it was depoſited*; *of whom* Philaſtrius, *an out of him* S Auſtin *thus*, Negant Salvatorem in carne ſedere ad dextram Patris, ſed ea ſe exuiſſe perhibent, eamque in Sole poſuiſſe, accipientes occaſionem de Pſalmo, *In Sole poſuit Tabernaculum ſuum*, Hæreſ. 59. *The ſame opinion* Gregory Nazianzene *attributeth to the* Manicheans, Πῶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα νῶν, εἰ μὴ μετὰ τῶ προσλαβόντος; ἃ γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὰς Μανιχαίων λύρας πρὸ ἡλίου ἀναποτίθεται ἵνα τιμηθῇ διὰ τῆς ἀτιμίας, *Epiſt.* 1. *ad* Cledonium. *And* S. Auſtin *ſayes they taught the Sun to be Chriſt*, Manichæi Solem iſtum oculis carneis viſibilem expoſitum & publicum, non tantum hominibus ſed etiam pecoribus ad videndum, Chriſtum Dominum eſſe putarunt, *Tract.* 34. in Joh. *This opinion is more clearly ſet down, but without a name, in the* Catena Patrum *on the* 18. *Pſalm*, Οὐ γὰρ προσκυτέον τοῖς ἀπὸ Λιεσιχῶν φλυαρόφροις, οἳ φασιν ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν τῷ ἡλιακῷ σφαίρᾳ ἀπέθετο ὃ ἐφόρεσε σῶμα, φυλάττων μέχρι τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας. *This was the old Hereſie of* Hermogenes, *as is related by* Theodoret, Οὗτος (ὁ Ἑρμογένης) τῷ Κυρίῳ τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ εἶναν ἵστορεῖ, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καὶ τὰς δαίμονας εἰς τὴν ὕλην ἀναχωρῆσαι, *Hæret. Fab.* l. 1. c. 19.

It was neceſſary to profeſſe this Article of Chriſts Aſcenſion firſt for the confirmation and augmentation of our Faith. Our Faith is thereby confirm'd, 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*, a *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 the 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.

Heb. 11. 1.

† Magnarum hic vigor eſt mentium, & valde fidelium lumen eſt animarum, incunctanter credere quæ corporeo non videntur intuitu, & ibi figere deſiderium quo nequeas inferre conſpectum.

Hæc autem pietas unde in noſtris cordibus naſceretur, aut quomodo quiſquam juſtificaretur per fidem, ſi in iis tantum ſalus noſtra conſiſteret quæ obtutibus ſubjacerent? *Leo de Aſcen. Serm.* 2. Fides eorum qui Deum viſuri ſunt, quamdiu peregrinantur corda mundantur; quod non videt credit, nam ſi vides non eſt fides: credenti colligitur meritum, videnti redditur præmium. Eat ergo Dominus & paret locum; eat ne videatur, lateat ut credatur: tunc enim locus paratur, ſi ex fide vivatur: creditus deſideretur ut deſideratus habeatur: deſiderium dilectionis præparatio eſt manſionis, *S. Aug. Tract. 68. in Joh.* a Joh. 20. 29.

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. 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 exclu-

† Chriſti aſcenſio noſtra provectio eſt; & quo præceſſit gloria capitis, eo ſpes vocatur & corporis, *Leo de Aſcen. Serm.* 1.

ſion,

cluſion *There are many manſions in his Fathers houſe.* And when he ſpake of aſcending thither, he ſaid expreſly to his Diſciples, *I go to prepare a place for you, and will come again, and receive you unto my ſelf, that where I am, there ye may be alſo.* The † firſt fruits of our nature are aſcended, and the reſt is ſanctified. a *This is the new and living way which he conſecrated for us through the vail, that is to ſay, his fleſh.* And hence we b *have our hope as an anchor of the ſoul both ſure and ſtedfaſt, which entreth into that within the vail, whither the forerunner is for us entred.* For if Chriſt in his aſcenſion be the *forerunner*, then are there * ſome to follow after; and not onely ſo, but they which follow are to goe in the ſame way, and to attain unto the ſame place: and if this *forerunner* be *entred for us*, then we are they which are to follow and to overtake him

Joh. 14. 3.

† Διὰ τῦτο ἐφ' ὅτε ἔζην ὀφείλομεν ἐπεκδέχεσθαι τὸ μέρος τῶν ἀπαρχῶν τῆς μετέρας φύσεως, τυτέστι τὴν σάρκα, ὃν ἔφασκεν ὁ Χριστὸς αὐήσεσθαι, S. Chryſ. *Orat.* 1. *de aſcenſ.* Διὸ λοιπὸν χρησὰς ἔχομεν τὰς ἐλπίδας πρὸς τὴν μετέραν ἀπαρχὴν ἀφορῶντες, Ibid. *Orat.* 2. a Heb. 10. 20. b Heb 6. 19, 20. "There is a double notion of προδρόμου: to this purpoſe, one of a man ſent before to make preparations for others which follow; in which it is well obſerved by S. Chryſ. Ὁ μὲν προδρόμος τινῶν δὴ προδρόμος, ἄσπερ Ἰωάννης τῦ Χριστῦ. καὶ ὑκ εἶπεν ἁπλῶς εἰσῆλθεν· ἀλλ' ὅπερ πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν· ὡς καὶ ἡμᾶς ὁρμιλόντων καταλαβεῖν. Οὐ πολὺ γὰρ τῦ προδρόμου καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων ὀφείλει τὸ μέσον· ἐπεὶ ὑδ' ἂν εἷς πρόδρομος. τὸν γὰρ πρόδρομον καὶ τὰς ἑπομένους ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ χρὴ εἶναι ὁδῷ καὶ μὴ ὁδεύειν, τὰς μὲν ὀπίσω καταλαμβάνειν, Hom. 11. *in Epiſt. ad* Hebræos. *Another notion there is among the Greeks of the fruit which is ripe and come to perfection before the reſt, as* Iſaiah 28. 4. Καὶ ἔσαι τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ὀπωρινὸν τὸ ἐλπίδος τὸ δόξης ἐπ' ἄκρυ τῦ ὄρυς ὡς προδρόμος σύκυ, כַּבְכּוֹרָה, tanquam primitiæ, o fructus primogeniti, ficus præcox. *Heſychius*, Πρόδρομα, τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄξονι ξύλα. ἢ τὰ προακμάζοντα σῦκα. lege Πρόδρομα, *for they indeed are properly* τὰ προακμάζοντα σῦκα, præcoces ficus: *For ſo* Theophraſtus *ſpeaking particularly* περὶ ζυκῆς, *has theſe words*, ὑπολιπομένης γὰρ πλείω τῆς τοιαύτης ὑγρότητος, ὅταν ἀλῇ ὀπτηθῇ μᾶλλον καὶ ὑγρὸς καὶ θερμὸς, ἐξεκαλέσατο πρὸ βλάστησιν· ὅπερ ἔοικε συμβαίνειν φανερὸν, ὅτι ὀλίγα τύτων μένει ὁ καρπὸς ἀνθοῦντα, ὅταν καὶ οἱ πρόδρομοι, De cauſis Plant. *l.* 5. *c.* 1. & paulo poſt, Πάλιν δὲ τὰς προδρόμους αἱ μὲ φέρυσιν, οἷ, ἥπερ Λακωνικὴ καὶ Λιβυκομηδία καὶ ἑτέρα πλείω, αἱ δ' ὀ φέρυσιν. *The firſt fruits of the early figs were called* πρόδρομοι, *and the tree which bare them* πρωτερικὴ. *Now as this early fruit doth ſoreun the latter fruit of the ſame tree, and comes to ripeneſſe and perfection in it's kind before the reſt; ſo our Saviour goes before thoſe men of the ſame nature with him, and they follow in their time to the maturity of the ſame perfection.*

there;

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 alſo hath he *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.

Eph 2. 6.

† Τῆς κεφαλῆς κατηζομένης τὸ σῶμα συγκάθηται· διὰ τοῦτο πάλιν, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, S. Chryſ. in locum.

Thirdly, the profeſſion of faith in Chriſt aſcended is neceſſary for the exaltation of our affections. *For where our treaſure is, there will our hearts be alſo. If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me*, ſaith our Saviour; and if thoſe words were true of his crucifixion, how powerfull 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*; 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 the earth.* Chriſt is aſcended into heaven to teach us, that we are ſtrangers and pilgrims here as all our fathers were, and that another countrey belongs unto us: from whence we *as ſtrangers and pilgrims* ſhould learn *to abſtain from fleſhly luſts*, and not *mind earthly things*, as knowing that we are *citizens of heaven, from whence we look for our Saviour, the Lord Jeſus*, yea *fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the houſhold of God*. We ſhould trample upon our

Mat. 6. 21.
Joh. 12. 32.
2 Kings 2. 2.
Col. 3. 1, 2, 3.
1 Pet. 2. 11.
Phil. 3. 19, 20.
Epheſ. 2. 19.

our ſinnes, and ſubdue the luſts of the fleſh, that our converſation may be correſpondent to our Saviours condition; that where the eyes of the Apoſtles were forced to leave him, thither our thoughts may follow him.

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 bin 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 certainty of this truth, ſaying, *If I goe not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will ſend him unto you.* 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 ſit upon them, it was firſt abſolutely neceſſary that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould ſo deſcend. Again, being it was impoſſible that the Spirit of God in that manner ſhould come down, untill 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 entred 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 confeſſe that Aſcenſion. Joh. 16. 7.

Upon theſe conſiderations we may eaſily conclude what every Chriſtian is obliged to confeſſe in thoſe words of our Creed, *He aſcended into heaven*: for thereby he is underſtood to expreſſe thus much, I am fully perſwaded, that the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, after he roſe from the dead, did with the ſame ſoul and body with

which he roſe, by a true and locall tranſlation convey himſelf from the earth on which he liv'd, through all the regions of the air, through all the celeſtiall Orbs, untill 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.*

AND SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY.

THis ſecond part of the Article conteineth 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.*

For the explication of Chriſts Seſſion, three things will be neceſſary; Firſt, to prove that the promiſed *Meſſias* was to ſit at the right hand of God; Secondly, to ſhew 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.

That the promiſed *Meſſias* was to ſit at the right hand of God, was both prety pified 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 then 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; onely in the throne will I be greater then thou. And Pharaoh took off the ring from his hand, and put it upon*

Gen. 41. 40, 42, 43.

upon Joſephs hand, and araied him in veſtures of fine linnen, and put a gold chain about his neck; And he made him to ride in the ſecond chariot which he had, and they cryed before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt. Thus *Joſeph* had the execution of all the Regall power committed unto him, all edicts and commands were given out by him, the managing of all affairs was through his hands, onely the Authority by which he mov'd remain'd in *Pharaoh* ſtill. This was a clear repreſentation of the Son of man, who by his ſitting on the right hand of God, obteined power to rule and govern all things both in heaven and earth (eſpecially as the *ruler of his houſe*, that is, the Church,) with expreſſe 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 reſerv'd, in whom the originall authority ſtill remains. And thus the Seſſion of the *Meſsias* was pretypified.

The ſame was alſo expreſly foretold not onely in the ſenſe but in the phraſe. *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord,* ſaith the Prophet *David, Sit thou at my right hand untill I make thine enemies thy footſtool.* The *Jews* have endeavoured to avoid this propheſie, but with no ſucceſſe: ſome make the perſon to whom God ſpeaks to be † *Ezechias*, ſome * *Abraham*, ſome *Zorobabel*, others '' *David*, Pſal. 110. 1.

† *This* Juſtine Martyr *teſtifieth of the* Jews *in his age*, Καὶ τοῦτον † ψεύδη μὸν ὅτι οἰς τὸν Ἐζεχίαν τὸν βασιλέα ἐξηγεῖσθε τολμᾶτε, ἐκ ἀγνοῶ, ἐπεῖπον. *Dialog. cum* Tryphone.

* *So* S. Chryſoſtome *ſpeaking of the* Jews, Τίνα οὖν ὀνῶσι τὸν λέγοντα ψαλμόν; Τὸν Θεόν· τὸν δὲ ἀκούοντα; † Ἀβραάμ· ἕτεροι δὲ † Ζοροβάβελ, ἄλλοι ἕτερον, *ad locum.* Ita Catena Græca, Οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι, τὸ γελοιότερον, εἰς τὸν Ἀβραὰμ (ἱερεῖς λέγουσι·) καὶ ὃς ὀκ ἀξιῶν τῆ Θεῷ. *And this Expoſition is now followed by* Solomon Jarchi *and* Lipmannus, Jarchi *acknowledging it to be ancient*, רבותינו דרשוהו באברהם אבינו ואני אפרשנו כדברוהם נאם יי לאברהם׃ '' *This is the expoſition of the late Rabbins, as of* Aben Ezra, *and* David Kimchi, *who attribute the ſubject of the Pſalm to* David: *And not onely they, but the ancient Rabbins ſince our Saviours time, as appeareth by the words of* S. Chryſoſtome, Καὶ τὰ ἐπιόντα δ' ἄλλοι ὅτι ἀδὴν περὶ τῦ Ζοροβάβελ ἐνταῦθα φέρη δὲ περὶ τῦ Δαβὶδ· ἡμεῖς δὲ αὐτῆ ἱερωσύνη τεθίμη).

others † the people of *Iſrael*; and becauſe the Propheſie cannot belong to him who made the Pſalm, therefore they which attribute the prediction to *Abraham*, tell us the Pſalm was pen'd 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 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 'twas 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 leſſe the people of *Iſrael* (to whom ſome of the *Jews* referr'd 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 Melchizedek*; but neither *Abraham*, nor *Ezechias*, nor any which the *Jews* have mention'd was ever any ∴ Prieſt of God. Again, our Saviour urg'd 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 'tis evident that the *Jews* of old, even the Phariſees, the moſt accurate and skilfull amongſt them, did interpret this Pſalm of the *Meſſias*; for if they had conceiv'd לדוד מזמור, *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 ſo, there is no title which ſhewes any Pſalm to be his.* "Τί οὖν, φησὶ, μοι, Ζοροβάβελ Κύριος τοῦ Δαβὶδ; καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι λόγον, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἀντὶ μυρίων πῶς Δαβὶδ κέκλη]ο S. Chryſ. ∴ *This is the Argument which the Fathers uſed againſt the Jews, as* Juſtine Martyr, *in oppoſition to their pretence of* Ezechias, Ἰσ]έον δὲ καὶ ὅτι οὗτος λέγουσιν Ἐζεχίαν, ὅτι ἐστὶν αἰώνιος ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς ἀν]ι]ε]ῖν τολμήσ]ε, *Dial. cum* Tryphone; *& ſo* S. Chryſ. *in the words before mentioned.*

* Τὸ which purpoſe ſaith S. Chryſoſtome, *concerning the* Jews *of his time*, Τί γὰρ φασιν ἄλλο, ἢ ὅτι ὁ παῖς τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ταῦτα λέγει περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ.

† *As for that objection which is made by* Aben-Ezra, *that it is not the Pſalm of* David, *but pen'd for and in the honour of* David, *becauſe the title is*

‖ *Zorobabel*

the propheſie belonged either to *Abraham*, or *David*, or any of the reſt ſince mentioned by the *Jews*, they might very well, and queſtionleſſe would have anſwered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the Son of *David*. It was therefore the generall opinion of the Church of the *Jewes* before our Saviour, and of divers † Rabbins ſince his death, that this prediction did concern the Kingdome of Chriſt. And thus the Seſſion of the *Meſsias* at the right hand of God was not onely repreſented typically, but foretold prophetically: which is our firſt Conſideration.

† *As in the* Midraſh Tillim, *Pſal.* 18. 36. אר יוחן בשר" חמא לעתיד הבה" מושיב מלך המשיח ליסיני שנ" נאם יי לאדני שב ליסיני :

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* (Pſal. 110. 1.) The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand.

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, [a]*He was received up into heaven, and ſate 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; [b]and *David is not aſcended into the heavens, but he ſaith himſelf, The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thy foes thy footſtool. Therefore let all the houſe of Iſrael know aſſuredly*, let all the blind and wilfull *Jews* be convinced of this truth, that God hath not ſet at his own right hand neither *Abraham* nor *David*, neither *Ezechias* nor *Zerubbabel*, but hath *made that ſame Jeſus whom they have crucified both Lord and Chriſt*.

a Mar. 16. 19.
b Act. 2. 34, 35, 36.

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 untill I make thine enemies thy footſtool.* But Chriſt was ſo aſſured of this honour, that before the Council of the Chief Prieſts and Elders of the people, when he foreſaw his death contrived,

Heb. 1. 13.

and his Croſſe prepared, even then he expreſs'd 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.

Luc. 22. 69.

1 Pet. 3. 22.

Our next enquiry 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 materiall or corporeall 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 onely to ſpeak by the mouthes 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 organicall parts which are moſt * active, and executive of our power; by thoſe the ſtrength of our body is expreſſed, and moſt of our naturall and artificiall actions are perform'd 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 generall cuſtome of the world the right hand is more uſed then the left, and by that generall uſe acquireth a greater firmitude and ſtrength, therefore the right hand of God ſignifieth the exceeding great and infinite power of God.

† Credimus etiam quod ſedet ad dextram Dei Patris. Nec ideo tamen quaſi humana forma circumſcriptum eſſe Deum Patrem arbitrandum eſt, ut de illo cogitantibus dextrum aut ſiniſtrum latus animo occurrat, *S. Aug De Fide & Symb.*

* Succedunt brachia & validi lacertorum thori, validæ ad operandum manus, & proceribus digitis habiles ad tenendum: Hinc aptior uſus operandi, hinc ſcribendi elegantia, & ille calamus ſcribæ velociter ſcribentis, quo divinæ voces exprimuntur oracula. Manus eſt quæ cibum ori miniſtrat; manus eſt quæ præclaris enitet factis, quæ concilatrix divinæ gratiæ ſacris infertur altaribus, per quam offerimus & ſumimus ſacramenta cœleſtia. Manus eſt quæ operatur pariter atq; diſpenſat divina myſteria, cujus vocabulo nõ dedignatus eſt ſe Dei Filius declarari, dicente David, *Dextra Domini exaltavit me.* Manus eſt quæ fecit omnia, ſicut dixit Deus omnipotens, *Nonne manus mea fecit hæc?* S. Ambroſ, *Hexam.* l. 6. c. 9.

Again,

Again, becauſe the moſt honourable place amongſt men is the right hand (as when *Bathſheba* went unto King *Solomon*, *he ſate down on his throne, and cauſed a ſeat to be ſet for the Kings mother, and ſhe ſate on his right hand*) therefore the right hand of God ſignifies the glorious majeſty of God. 1 Kings 2. 19.

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, therefore the right hand of God is the place of celeſtiall happineſſe and perfect felicity; according to that of the Pſalmiſt, *In thy preſence is fulneſſe of joy, at thy right hand pleaſures for evermore.*

Now as to the firſt acception 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 expreſly ſaid, *Hereafter ye ſhall ſee the Son of man ſitting on the right hand of power.* Mat. 27. 64. Mar. 14. 62. Luc. 22. 69.

As to the ſecond acception, Chriſt is ſaid to ſit on the *right hand* of God in regard of that honour, glory, and Majeſty which he hath obtained there; wherefore it is ſaid, *When he had by himſelf purged our ſinnes he ſate down on the right hand of the Majeſty on high*: and again, *We have an High Prieſt who is ſet on the right hand of the throne of the Majeſty in the heavens.* Heb. 1. 3. Heb. 8. 1.

In reference to the third acception 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 painfull and a ſhamefull death, he reſteth above in unſpeakable joy, and everlaſting † felicity.

† *Ad dextram* intelligendum eſt dictum eſſe in ſumma beatitudine, ubi juſtitia & pax & gaudium eſt, *S. Aug. de Fide & Symb.* Quid eſt Patris dextera, niſi illa æterna ineffabiliſque felicitas quo pervenit Filius hominis, etiam carnis immortalitate percepta? *Idem contra Serm. Arrii.* Beatus eſt & à beatitudine, quæ dextera Patris vocatur; ipſius beatitudinis nomen eſt dextera Patris, *De Symb. ad Catech.* Salus temporalis

As

lis & carnalis in ſiniſtra eſt, ſalus æterna cum Angelis in dextra eſt. Ideo ſum in ipſa immortalitate poſitus Chriſtus dicitur ſedere ad dextram Dei. Non nim Deus habet in ſeipſo dextram aut ſiniſtram; ſed dextera Dei dicitur felicitas la, quæ quoniam oſtendi non poteſt tale nomen accepit, S. Aug. *in Pſalm* 137.

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 generall term which ſignifies onely his being in heaven, without any expreſſion of the particular manner of his preſence. So S. *Paul*, *Who is even at the right hand of God*; and S. *Peter*, *Who is gone into heaven, and is at the right hand of God*. Beſide, we find him expreſs'd in another poſition then 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.* He appeared ſtanding unto *Stephen*, whom we expreſſe ſitting in our Creed; but this is rather a difference of the occaſion, then 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: and he is often expreſſed *ſitting*, not for any poſitionall variation, but for the variety of his effects and operation.

Rom. 8. 34.
1 Pet. 3. 22.

† Ἕστηκε τὸ σύστημα κεφαλῆς φορτικὸν αὐτοῖς ἦν, τέως τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν ἀθλητῶν κρατοῦντος καὶ λόγον ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ, S. Chryſ. *Hom.* 18. *in Acta.*

Si major gratia & manifeſtatior intelligentia in Novo eſt quam in Veteri Teſtamento, quare Eſaias Propheta ſedentem in throno Majeſtatis vidit Deum Sabaoth, in Novo autem Stephanus primus Martyr ſtantem evidiſſe ait Jeſum à dextris Dei? Quid eſt iſtud, ut hic ſubjectus videatur poſt triumphos, & illic quaſi dominus antequam vinceret? Prout cauſa erat feciſſe, ita & Dominus ſe oſtendit. Prophetæ enim viſus eſt quaſi rex corripiens plebem, & hoc ſe oſtendit quod erat, hoc eſt, ſedentem, in pace enim erat cauſa divinitatis ejus. Stephano autem ut ſtans appareret fecit calumnia Judæorum. In Stephano autem Salvatoris cauſa vim patiebatur. Ideo ſedente Judice Deo ſtans apparuit, quaſi qui cauſam diceret; & quia bona cauſa ejus eſt, ad dextram Judicis erat; Omnis qui cauſam dicit, ſtet neceſſe eſt, S. Aug. *Quæſt. in Novum Teſt.* 88. Sedere judicantis eſt, ſtare vero pugnantis vel adjuvantis. Stephanus ergo in labore certaminis poſitus, ſtantem vidit quem adjutorem habuit. Sed hunc poſt aſcenſionem Marcus ſedere ſcribit, quia poſt aſcenſionis ſuæ gloriam Judæis in fine videbitur, Greg. *Homil.* 29. *in Evang.*

This

This phraſe then to *ſit*, preſcinding from the corporall poſture of Seſſion, may ſignifie no more then habitation, poſſeſſion, permanſion, and continuance; as the ſame word in the † *Hebrew*, and *Greek* languages often ſignifies. 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 habitation there; and ſo hath he ſeated himſelf, and * dwelleth in the higheſt heavens.

† ישב *which properly ſignifieth to ſit, is familiarly uſed for* permanſit *and* habitavit; *as* Jud. 5. 17. אשר ישב לחוף ימים, LXX Ασὴρ ὠκίσθη παρ' αἰγιαλὸν θαλάσσης, Aſher continued on the ſea ſhore, *Levit.* 8. 35. : וּפֶתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד תֵּשְׁבוּ יוֹמָם וְלַיְלָה שִׁבְעַת יָמִים Καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τῆς σκηνῆς τῆ μαρτυρίου καθήσεσθε ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας, ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα, *Therefore ſhall ye abide at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation, day and night, ſeven dayes. Upon which place S.* Auguſtine, Quid eſt quod dicit Moyſes ad Aaron & filios ejus cum ſanctificantur ad ineundum ſacerdotium? *Ad oſtium tabernaculi teſtimonii ſedebitis ſeptem dies, die & nocte, ne moriamini.* Numquid nam credibile eſt ſitu corporis uno loco ſedere præceptos per dies ſeptem die & nocte, unde ſe omnino non commoverent? Nec tamen hic tanquam allegorice aliquid ſignificatum, quod non fieret, cogendi ſumus accipere, ſed potius agnoſcere locutionem Scripturarum, ubi Seſſionem pro habitatione & commoratione poſuit. Non enim quia dictum eſt de Semei quod *ſederet in Hieruſalem annos tres*, ideo putandum eſt per totum illud tempus in ſella ſediſſe & non ſurrexiſſe. Hinc & ſedes dicuntur, ubi habent commorationem quorum ſedes ſunt; habitatio quippe hoc nomen accepit, *Quæſt. ſuper Levit.* 24. * *Sedet ad dextram Patris.* Credite, Sedere intelligite habitare: quomodo dicimus de quocunq; homine, in iſta patria ſedit per tres annos. Dicit illud & Scriptura ſediſſe quendam in civitate tantum tempus. Numquid ſedit, & nunquam ſurrexit? Ideo hominum habitationes ſedes dicuntur. Ubi habitantur ſedes, numquid ſemper ſedetur, non ſurgitur, non ambulatur? Et tamen ſedes vocantur. Sic ergo credite habitare Chriſtum in dextera Dei Patris ubi eſt, *Author lib. de Symb. ad Catech.*

Again, the Notion of *ſitting* implieth reſt, quietneſſe and indiſturbance; according to that promiſe in the Prophet, *They ſhall ſit every man under his fig-tree, and none ſhall make them afraid.* So Chriſt is aſcended into heaven, where reſting from all paines and ſorrows, he is ſeated, free from all diſturbance and oppoſition; God having placed him at his right hand, untill he hath made his enemies his footſtool. Micah 4. 4.

† Ipſum verbum *ſedere* regni ſignificat poteſtatem, S. Hiero. *Com. ad* Eph. c. 1. v. 19. Heb. 12. 2. Pſal 110. 1. 1 Cor. 15. 25.

Thirdly, this *ſitting* implyeth yet more then quietneſſe or continuance, even † dominion, ſoveraignty, and Majeſty; as when *Solomon* ſate in the throne of his Father, he raigned over *Iſrael* after the death of his Father. And thus Chriſt *is ſet down at the right hand of the throne of God*. And S. *Paul* did well interpret thoſe words of the Prophet, *Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy footſtool*, ſaying, *He muſt raign till he hath put all enemies under his feet*.

Prov. 20 8. Iſa. 16. 5.

Fourthly, this *ſitting* doth yet more properly and particularly imply the right of Judicature, and ſo eſpecially expreſſeth *a King that ſitteth in the throne of Judgement*; 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 judgement, and haſting righteouſneſſe*. 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 ſignifie any peculiar inclination or flexion, any determinate location or poſition of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happineſſe of condition, regall and judiciary power; as in other * Authors ſuch ſignifications are uſuall.

* *Sedere* quod dicitur Deus, non membrorum poſitionē ſed judiciariam ſignificat poteſtatem, qua illa Majeſtas nunquam caret, ſemper digna dignis tribuendo; quamvis in extremo judicio multo manifeſtius inter homines Unigeniti Dei Filii Judicis vivorum & mortuorum claritas indubitata effulgebit, S. Aug. *de Fide & Symb. c.* 7. Hoc quod dicitur Filius ſedere ad dextram Patris, demonſtratur quod ipſe homo, quem ſuſcepit Chriſtus, poteſtatem acceperit Judicantis, *Author. l.* 3. *d. Symb. ad Catechum.* † *Moſt anciently* ſedere *did ſignifie no more then* eſſe, *to be in any place*; as Servius *noteth on that place of* Virgil Æneid. 9. Luco tum forte parentis Philumni Turnus ſacrata valle ſedebat. Sedebat, ut Aſper dicit, erat. Quæ clauſula antiqua eſt, & de uſu remota. *And then he goes on to ſhew that* ſedere *is taken for that which men are wont to do ſitting*. Secundum Plautum autem *ſedere* eſt conſilium capere, qui inducit in Moſtellaria ſervum dicentem, *Sine jacta aram ſedeam & dabo malum conſilium*. Sed ſecundum Augures *Sedere* eſt augurium captare: Namque poſt deſignatas cœli partes à ſedentibus captabantur auguria. Quod & ſupra ipſe oſtendit latenter, inducens Picum ſolum ſedentem, ut, *Parvaque ſedebat Succinctus trabea*, quod eſt augurum, cum alios ſtantes induxerit. Ergo *Sedebat*, aut erat, aut conſilia capiebat, aut augurabatur.

The

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 Mediators solemn entry upon his Regall 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 wisdome and strength and honour and glory and blessing.* Rev. 5. 12. Wherefore Christ after his death and resurrection saith, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* Mat 28. 18. For *because he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Crosse, 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.* Phil. 2. 8, 9, 10 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 onely 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.*

There was an expresse promise made by God to *David, Thine house and thy Kingdome shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* 2 Sam 7. 16. This promise strictly and literally taken was but conditionall: and the condition of the promise is elsewhere express'd, *Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne.* Psal. 132. 12. *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 the Kingdome of *David* was intercepted, nor was his family continued in the throne: part of the Kingdome was first rent from his posterity, next the regality it self; and when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but onely ceased

ſed in the obligation of a promiſe, becauſe the condition was not perform'd. 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 lineall ſucceſſion eſtabliſhed to perpetuity.

But yet in a larger and a better ſenſe, after theſe interciſions, the throne of *David* was continued. When they had ſinn'd and loſt their right unto the crown, the kingdome was to be given unto him who never ſinn'd, and conſequently could never loſe it; and he being of the ſeed of *David*, in him the throne of *David* was without interception or ſucceſſion continued. Of him did the Angel *Gabriel* ſpeak at his conception, T*he Lord God ſhall give unto*
Luc. 1. 32, 33. *him the throne of his father David, and he ſhall reign over the houſe of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdome 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 kingdome of *David* was a type, reſemblance and repreſentation of it; inſomuch that Chriſt himſelf in reſpect of this kingdome is † often called D*avid*, as
† Jer. 30. 9. Ezech. 37. 24, 25. Hoſ. 3. 5. particularly in that promiſe, *I will ſet up one ſhepherd over them, and he ſhall feed them, even my ſervant* David; *he*
Ezech. 34. 23, 24. *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 onely firſt deſigned but alſo
1 Sam. 16. 13. anointed King over *Iſrael*, and yet had no poſſeſſion of the Crown; Seven yeares he continued anointed by *Samuel*,
2 Sam. 2. 4. and had no ſhare in the dominion; ſeven yeares after he continued anointed in *Hebron* onely King over the tribe of *Judah*; at laſt he was received by all the Tribes, and ſo obteined full and abſolute regall power over all *Iſrael*, and ſeated himſelf in the royall city of *Jeruſalem*: So Chriſt was born King of the *Jews*, and the conjunction of his humane nature with his divine in the union of his perſon was a ſufficient unction to his Regall Office, yet as

the

the Son of man he exerciſed no ſuch dominion, profeſſing that his *Kingdome 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 S. *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.* Act. 2. 36.

The immediate effect of this Regall 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 hence forth expecting till his enemies be made his footſtool.* Heb. 10. 12. 13. This was the ancient cuſtome of the Orientall conquerors, to tread upon the necks of their ſubdued enemies; as when *Joſuah* had the five Kings as his priſoners, he *ſaid unto the men of war which went with him, Come neer, put your feet upon the necks of them.* Joſ. 10. 24. Thus to ſignifie the abſolute and totall conqueſt of Chriſt, and the dreadfull Majeſty of his throne, all his enemies are ſuppoſed to lye down before him, and he to ſet his feet upon them.

The Enemies of Chriſt are of two kinds, either Temporall or Spirituall; The Temporall enemies I call ſuch as viſibly and actually oppoſe him, and his Apoſtles, and all thoſe which profeſſe 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 deſpightfully uſed his diſciples; who tryed all wayes and means imaginable to hinder the propagation, and diſhonour the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. A part of his Regall Office was to ſubdue theſe enemies, and he ſet 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* Mat. 16. 28.

taſt of death till they ſee the ſon of man coming in his Kingdome. For within few yeares 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 crucifie the Lord of life. The *Romans* themſelves were the next enemies, who firſt complied with the *Jews* in Chriſts 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 were, when *Rome* the regnant City, the head of that vaſt Empire, was taken and lack'd; 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 Spirituall Enemies of this King are of another nature; ſuch as by an inviſible way make oppoſition to Chriſts dominion, as Sin, Satan, Death. Every one of theſe hath a Kingdome of it's own, ſet up and oppoſed to the Kingdome of Chriſt. The Apoſtle hath taught us, that
Rom. 5. 21. *ſin hath raigned unto death*; and hath commanded us not to *let it reign in our mortall bodies, that we ſhould obey it in the luſts thereof.* There is therefore a Dominion and Kingdome of Sin ſet up againſt the throne of the immaculate Lamb. Satan would have bin like the moſt high, and being caſt down from heaven, hath erected his throne be-
Joh. 12. 13. low; he is *the Prince of this world*: *the ſpirit which now*
Eph. 2. 2, 6, 12. *worketh in the children of diſobedience is the Prince of the power of the air*; and thus *the rulers of the darkneſſe of this world* oppoſe themſelves to *the true light of the world.* Death alſo hath it's dominion, and, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks,
Rom. 5. 14, 17. *reigned from Adam to Moſes*; even *by one offence death reigned*

reigned by one, and ſo ſet up a ruling and a regall power againſt *the Prince of life*. Act. 3. 15.

For the deſtruction of theſe powers was Chriſt exalted to the right hand of God, and by his Regall office doth he ſubdue and deſtroy them all. And yet this deſtruction is not ſo univerſall, but that ſin, Satan and Death ſhall ſtill continue. 'Tis true he ſhall *put down all rule and all authority and power*, but this amounts not ſo much to a totall deſtruction, as to an abſolute ſubjection: for as he is *able*, ſo will he *ſubdue all things unto himſelf*. The principall end of the Regall office of the Mediator is the effectuall redemption and actuall 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 any thing 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 ſpirituall enemies ſo far as they make this oppoſition; and further then they doe oppoſe they are not deſtroyed by him, but ſubdued to him: whatſoever hindreth and obſtructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdome, for the demonſtration of Gods mercy is aboliſhed; but whatſoever may be yet ſubſervient to the demonſtration of his juſtice is continued. 1 Cor. 15. 24. Phil. 3. 21.

Chriſt then as King deſtroyeth the power of ſin in all thoſe which belong unto his Kingdome, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, deſtroying the dominion thereof by his actuall grace, and taking away the ſpot thereof by grace habituall. But in the reprobate and damned ſoules the ſpot of ſin remaineth in its perfect die, the dominion of ſin continueth in it's abſolute power, the guilt of ſin abideth in a perpetuall obligation to eternall pains: but all this in ſubjection to his throne, the glory of which con-

consisteth as well in punishing Rebellion as rewarding loyalty.

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 actuall destruction of these powers of darkness hath reference onely 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 internall opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned soules are continued slaves unto the powers of hell; and he which sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the Devil and his Angells, 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.

Heb. 2. 14.
Ephes. 6. 11.
2 Tim. 2. 26.
1 Joh 3. 8.
1 Timoth. 3. 6.

Thirdly, Christ sitting on the throne of God at last destroyeth death it self: For *the last enemy which shall be destroyed is death.* But this destruction reacheth no further then 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 kingdome. He *will ransome them from the power of the grave,* he *will redeem them from death. O death,* he *will be thy plagues; O grave,* he *will be thy destruction.* The trump shall sound, the graves shall open, the dead shall live, the bodies shall be fram'd again out of the dust, and the soules 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 compleatly happy both in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternall life. Thus he who sitteth at the right hand of God *hath abolished death,*

1 Cor. 15. 26.
Hos. 13. 14.
1 Cor. 15. 54.

and

and brought life and immortality to light. But to the Reprobate & damned persons death is not destroyed but improv'd. 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.

The Regall power of Christ, as a branch of the Mediatorship, 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, untill 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 *sate down on 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 Regall power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be subdued.

1 Cor. 15. 25. Heb. 2. 8. Psal. 110. 1. Heb. 10, 12, 13.

When all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his Kingdome, 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 fulfill'd, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As therefore there shall no longer continue any act of the Propheticall part to instruct us, nor any act of the Priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no further act of this Regall power of the Mediator necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatificall vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actuall defence and pro-

tection. As therefore the generall 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 Mediatorſhip, as ſuch, muſt alſo ceaſe, becauſe that unity is in all parts compleat. *Then* cometh *the end, when he ſhall have delivered up the Kingdome 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.*

Gal. 3. 20.

1 Cor. 15. 24, 28.

Videamus an traditio regni defectio ſit intelligenda regnandi, ut quod tradidit Filius Patri tradendo non teneat, S. Hilar. l. 11.

Now though the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt be then reſigned, becauſe the end thereof will then be performed; though the Regall Office as part of that Mediatorſhip be alſo reſigned with the whole; yet we muſt not think that Chriſt ſhall ceaſe to be a King, or looſe any of the power and honour 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 kingdomes of this world are become the kingdomes of the Lord, and of his Chriſt, and he ſhall reign for ever and ever*, not onely to the modificated eternity of his Mediatorſhip, ſo long as there ſhall be need of Regall power to ſubdue the enemies of Gods elect; but alſo to the complete eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future is coeternall to his Divinity.

2 Tim. 2. 12.

Rev. 11. 15.

† Οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. *we find not theſe words in the Nicene Creed, as it was in it ſelf before the additions at Conſtantinople. But no long after, S. Cyril expounds them in his Catechiſm, and Epiphanius in Ancorato repeating two ſeverall*

Leaſt we ſhould imagine that Chriſt ſhould ever ceaſe to be King, or ſo interpret this Article, as if he were after the day of judgement to be removed from the right hand of God, the Ancient Fathers added thoſe words to the *Nicene* Creed, † *whoſe kingdome ſhall have none end*, againſt the Hereſie which then aroſe denying the eternity of the Kingdome of Chriſt.

The

Nerall Creeds, a ſhorter and a longer, §. 120, and 121. hath theſe words in both. After this they were added expreſly in the Conſtantinopolitan Creed. And the reaſon of their inſertion without queſtion was that which S. Cyril inſinuateth in his explication, that is, the Hereſie which was then newly begun. Καὶ ποτέ τινες ἀκούσας λέγοντος, ὅτι τέλος ἔχει ἡ Χριστοῦ βασιλεία, μίσησον τὴν ἀθεσίαν, τῶν δράκοντος δεῦρο· ἄμυνε κεφαλὴν προφάσεως περὶ τὴν Γαϊανῶν ἀναφυεῖσα ἐτόλμησε λέγειν, ὅτι μὴ τὸ τέλος τῆς κόσμου ὁ Χριστὸς ἐβασίλευσε· καὶ ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὁ Λόγος ὁ παρὰ Πατρὸς ἐξηλθὼν, εἰς ὃν εἰς Πατέρα πάλιν ἀναλυθεὶς ἀνάπαυσις, Catech 15. This was the particular Hereſie of Marcellus Biſhop of Ancyra, followed by Photinus born in the ſame place, and therefore termed by S. Cyril περὶ τὴν Γαϊανῶν ἀναφυεῖσα. It conſiſted of two parts; firſt, that the Kingdome 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 onely ceaſe to reign, but alſo ceaſe to exiſt. Which is yet more plainly expreſſed by Euſebius in his ſecond book againſt Marcellus, Καὶ πάλιν τοῦτον ἀνδρὸς παυδήσεως μετὰ τὸν τῆς κρίσεως καιρὸν, τοῦ μὲν Λόγου ἑνωμένου τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς μηδὲν ἕτερον εἶναι πλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τῆς δὲ σαρκὸς ἐρήμου καταλειφθείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου· ὡς μήτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ποτε ὑφεστάναι, μήτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὃν ἀνείληφε. This Hereſie of Marcellus S. Baſil properly calls an impiety εἰς τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Epiſt. 78. and again Epiſt. 52. εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ὕπαρξιν τῆς τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεότητος· which he there more fully expreſſeth, Ὃς (Μάρκελλος) Λόγον μὲ ἐρρῆξε τὸν Μονογενῆ λέγουσι, καὶ χρόνων καὶ αἰῶνας προϋφεστῶτα, πάλιν ἐς τὸν ὅσον ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐπεισαρέλθοντα, ἕως πρὸ τῆς ἑξακοσιοστῆς, ἕως τότε μετὰ τὴν ἐπιφοίτησιν ὑφεστάναι. This exiſtence of the Word and the Kingdome of the Son that Hereſie made coetvall; 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 judgement. Which is manifeſtly delivered by the Eaſtern Biſhops in that Profeſſion of Faith which they ſent to thoſe in Italy, Ἀλλ' ἐκ τότε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἡμετέραν οἰκονομίαν ἀνείληφε, περὶ τετρακοσίων ὅλων ἐτῶν. Ἐκ τότε γὰρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρχὴν βασιλείας ἐσχηκέναι λέγουσι, καὶ τέλος ἕξειν αὐτὴν μετὰ τὴν ζωοποίησιν καὶ κρίσιν. Τοιαῦτα δέ εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Φωτεινοῦ τοῦ Ἀγκυρογλαβοῦς, οἳ τὴν προαιώνιον ὕπαρξίν τε καὶ θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀτελεύτητον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν ἀθετοῦσιν, ἴσασι δοκεῖν τὴν μοναρχίαν, Socrat. l. 2. c. 19. But although Marcellus did thus teach the Kingdome of Chriſt not to be eternall, yet his Hereſie did not ſo much conſiſt in the denyall of this eternity, as of the ſubſiſtence and perſon of our Saviour: for otherwiſe he did truly teach that Chriſt was an eternall King; As appeareth out of his own words in his book againſt Aſterius the Arian, cited by Euſebius, Οὐκοῦν ὅδε τινα δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἰκονομία τὸ καὶ βασιλεύειν, ἄλλον δὲ ἕτερον βάλλεται ἢ τοῦτο τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ῥηθέν, ἕως ἂν θῇ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· ἀκουσὼν ἐπιδὼν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν, οὐκέτι χρήζει τῆς ἐν μέσῳ ταύτης βασιλείας παύσων καὶ δόλῳ βασιλεύων ὑπάρχων. And therefore he made the ſame confeſſion with the Catholicks when he delivered an account of his Faith to Julius Biſhop of Rome, Πιστεύω δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς θείας γραφῆς, ὅτι εἷς Θεὸς, καὶ ὁ τούτου μονογενὴς υἱὸς Λόγος ὁ ἀεὶ συνυπάρχων τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ μηδεπώποτε ἀρχὴν τῆ

τῦ δὲ ἰσχυὸς, ἀμυδρῶς ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχων, ἢ κλιθεὶς, ἢ ποιηθεὶς, ἀεὶ ὢν, ἀεὶ συμβασιλεύων τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, ἔτης βασιλείας, καὶ τῆν τῦ Δεσπότε ὑπηκοΐαν, ἀκέστας τῦ Θ, Epiph. *Hær.* 72. §. 2.

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, then 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 freedome; if unwillingly, then is our averseness everlasting misery. † Enemies we all have bin, under his feet we all shall be, either adopted or subdued. A * double Kingdome 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 from the first, and happy are we if by our obedience we shew our selves to have an interest in the second; for then that Kingdome is not onely Christ's but ours.

† Inimicus eras, eris sub pedibus ejus aut adoptatus aut victus, *S. Augustin.*

* Βασιλείας τῦ Θεῦ δύο εἶδεν ἡ γραφὴ, τὴν μὲ κατ' οἰκείωσιν, τὴν δὲ κατὰ δημιεργίαν· βασιλεύει μὲν γὰρ ἁπάντων καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ἰουδαίων καὶ δαιμόνων καὶ τῶν ἀντιτεταγμένων κατὰ τὸν τῆς δημιεργίας λόγον· βασιλεύει δὲ καὶ πιστῶν καὶ ἐκόντων καὶ ὑποτεταγμένων κατὰ τὸν τῆς οἰκειότητος, S. Chrysost. *Hom.* 39. *in* 1. *ad* Corinth.

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 gratious 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 onely

Phil. 1. 22.

† *This is the exclamation of S.* Chrysostome *upon the words of S.* Paul, Βαβαὶ τῆς πάλιν καὶ τῆν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀνήγαγε; ὥσπερ διά τινος ἔλκων μηχανῆς, εἰς ὕψος αὐτὴν ἀνήγαγε μέγα καὶ αὐτὴν ὀνάδισεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον τὸν θρόνον· ἔνθα γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸ σῶμα.

Σῶμα· ὑλικὴ γὰρ μέσον διείργεται ἡ κεφαλὴ καὶ τὸ Σῶμα· εἰ δὲ διείργετο, οὐκ ἂν εἴη Σῶμα, οὐκ ἂν εἴη κεφαλή, Homil. 3. in Epistol. ad Ephes.

onely of dominion but of union, and therefore while we look upon him at the right hand of God we see our selves in heaven. This is the speciall promise which he hath made us since he set down there, a *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 rejoyce, yea rather how should we * fear and tremble at so great an honour!

a Rev. 3. 21.

* Ἐννοεῖ τὸν θρόνον τὸν βασιλικὸν, ἐνταῦθα τῆς τιμῆς τὴν ὑπερβολήν· τοῦτο καὶ γέεννης, εἰγε βουλοίμεθα, μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς φοβῆσαι δυνήσῃ. Εἰ δὲ μὴ γέεννα ἦν, τὸ τιμηθέντας τιμωρὰν ἀναξίως εὐσεβῆσαι καὶ καλῶς, τίνα οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι κόλασιν; τίνα τιμωρίαν; ὀνόμασον τίνα ἐγχύσῃ ἡ κεφαλὴ (τοῦτο μόνον καὶ ἀπόχρη πρὸς παῦσιν ὅτιοῦν) τίνα δὲ ἀξίαν ἰδίᾳ, Idem ibidem.

Thirdly, the belief of Christs 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 onely 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 dayly ministring and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices wh ch could never take away sinnes this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sinnes for ever, sate 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 vertue of it is perpetually advanced by his Session, which was founded on his Passion: For he is *entred into heaven it self, 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 any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that*

Heb. 7. 1.

Heb. 10. 11, 12.

Heb. 9. 24.

1 Joh. 2. 1.

Heb. 7. 25.

Rom. 8. 33, 34.

dyed, 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 ſate down on Gods right hand, to improve this acceptation continues his interceſſion; and having obteined 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.

† S. Auſtin diſcourſing upon that place of S. Paul, 1 Tim. 2. 1. *I exhort that firſt of all ſupplications, prayers and interceſſions be made for all men, obſerveth what is the nature of Interceſſion.* Pro interpellationibus autem quod noſtri, ſecundum codices credo veſtros *poſtulationes* poſuiſti. Hæc interim duo, id eſt, quod alii *poſtulationes*, alii *interpellationes* interpretati ſunt, unum verbum transferre voluerunt, quod Græcus habet ἐντεύξεις. Et profecto advertis: Sed noſti aliud eſſe interpellare, aliud poſtulare. Non enim ſolemus dicere, poſtulant interpellaturi, ſed interpellant poſtulaturi. Veruntamen ex vicinitate verbum uſurpatum, cui propinquitas ipſa impetrat intellectum, non eſt velut cenſoria notatione culpandum. Nam & de ipſo Domino Ieſu Chriſto dictum eſt quod interpellat pro nobis. Numquid interpellat, & non etiam poſtulat? Imo vero quia poſtulat pro eo poſitum eſt *interpellat*. Evidenter quippe alibi de eo dicitur, *Si quis peccaverit, Advocatum habemus ad Patrem, Ieſum Chriſtum juſtum, ipſe eſt exoratio pro peccatis noſtris.* Quanquam fortaſſis codices apud vos etiam in eo loco de Domino Ieſu Chriſto non habent *interpellat pro nobis*, ſed *poſtulat pro nobis*. In Græco enim, quo verbo hic poſitæ ſunt *interpellationes*, quas ipſe poſuiſti *poſtulationes*, ipſum & illic verbum eſt, ubi ſcriptum eſt, *interpellat pro nobis*. Cum igitur & qui precatur oret, & qui orat precetur, & qui interpellat Deum ad hoc interpellet ut oret & precetur, &c. Epiſt. 59. *ad* Paulinum, *Quæſt.* 5.

Having thus explicated the Seſſion of our Saviour, we are next to conſider the Deſcription of him at whoſe right hand he is ſet down; which ſeems to be delivered 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 adjoyning 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

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*. But becauſe there is a difference in the language of the *Greeks* between that word which is rendred † *Almighty* in the firſt Article, and that which is ſo rendred in the ſixth, becauſe that peculiarly ſignifieth authority of Dominion, this more properly power in operation; therefore we have reſerved this notion of Omnipotency now to be explained.

† *In the firſt Article it is* Παντοκράτωρ, *in the ſixt* παντοδύναμον. *See* page 87. *And this diſtinction is very materiall, and much obſerved by the* Grecks; *As* Dionyſius Areopagita (*whoſoere that is*) *in his book* de Divinis Nominibus *in the* 18. *Chapter, explicates the* δυναμωνυμίαν, *or* παντοδύναμον, *and in the* 10. *chapter* παντοκράτωρ, *as two diſtinct names with different notions of God. Of the* Παντοκράτωρ, *which we have already conſidered, he gives this account,* Τὸ δὲ παντοκρατορικὴν ἕξιν ἔχειν καὶ πάντων αὐτὸν ἔχειν, καὶ περιέχειν τὰ ὅλα, καὶ συνέχειν καὶ περιέχειν καὶ περιειληφέναι, καὶ ἀρρήκτως ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ πᾶν ἱστῆσι καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτῆς τὰ ὅλα καθάπερ ἐκ ῥίζης παντοκρατορικῆς πηγάζειν, καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὴν τὰ πάντα καθάπερ εἰς πυθμένα παντοκρατορικὸν ὑπερέχουσι καὶ συνέχειν αὐτὰ, ὡς πάντων ἕνεκεν τὰ σχεθησόμενα πάντα καὶ μίαν ὑποστάσει καὶ πάντα συνέχειν ἀσφαλιζόμενον καὶ ἀκινήτως αὐτὰ διακρατοῦντα ἑαυτῆς, ὡς ἐκ παντὸς ἑστὼς κινήσεως παντοπλόκος. *But of the* δυναμωνυμία *he gives another account, as we ſhall ſee hereafter.*

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 naturall force or activity, by which we are aſſured that God is able to act, work and produce true and reall effects, which do require a true and reall power to their production. The omnipotency or infinitie of this power conſiſteth in an ability to act, perform and produce, whatſoever can be acted or produced, without any poſſibility of impediment or reſiſtance. And ſuch an Omnipotency we aſcribe to God. Which is ſufficiently delivered in the Scriptures, firſt by the

Luc 1. 34. 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*; Mar. 10. 27. *for with God all things are poſſible.* Now he, to whom all things are poſſible, and to whom nothing is impoſſible, is truly and properly Omnipotent. Thus whatſoever doth not in it ſelf 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 it ſelf a repugnancy or contradiction.

This truth, though confeſſed by the heathens, hath yet been denyed by ſome of them; but with ſuch poor and inſufficient Arguments, that we ſhall need no more then an explication of the doctrine to refute their objections.

† *The Arguments which the Heat in uſed are briefly touch'd by* Plutarch, *but were more largely delivered by* Pliny. Ἀνυπόδω δ' (φησὶν) ζωὴ κεντιμάχῳ τῷ λέγοντι, Εἰ θεὸν εἶδα, Ἴδ' ὅτι μ' ῥᾳξαι δαίμονι πᾶν δυνατόν· (οὐ πάσῃ σε γέα) ἀδύνατόν θεὸς δυνατὸν πᾶν ποιεῖν. Ἐπεὶ τοίγε εἰ θεὸς δοι, ποιῆσαι τὴν χθόνα μὴ ἅπασαν, ἢ ὑγρὸν πῦρ ψυχρὸν, τὸ δὲ καθ' ἡδονὴν ὀρθὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον, Plutarch. *De Plac. Philoſ. l.* 1. *c.* 7. Imperfectæ vero in homine naturæ præcipua ſolatia ne Deum quidem poſſe omnia. Namque nec ſibi poteſt mortem conſciſcere, ſi velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vitæ pœnis, nec mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos, nec facere ut qui vixit non vixerit, qui honores geſſit non geſſerit; nullumque habere in præterita jus præterquam obli vionis: atque (ut facetis quoque argumentis ſocietas hæc cum Deo copuletur) ut bis dena viginti non ſint, ac multa ſimiliter efficere non poſſe: perquæ declaratur haud dubie naturæ potentia, idque eſſe quod Deum vocamus, Plin. *Nat. Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 7. *Add unto these that Objection of* Elymas *the Sorcerer, recorded by* Dionyſius, Καίτοι φησὶν Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος, Εἰ πανδυνάμως ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς πῶς λέγεταί τι μὴ δυνατὸς πρὸς τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς θεολόγους. Λοιδορεῖ) ὁ τῷ θείῳ Παύλῳ φήσαντι, μὴ δυνατὸς τὸν θεὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀρνήσασθαι, *De* Divinis Nominibus, *cap.* 8.

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 term'd *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

from the Principall 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 doe it:) and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their severall and various powers flow from the first of powers: and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend of any but an infinite essence, so all those powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite power.

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. a *The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannull it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?* b *He doeth 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?* According to the degrees of power in the Agent and the Resistant is an action perform'd or hindered; if there be more degrees of power in the Resistant then the Agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, but not wholly hinder'd or suppress'd. 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 above all opposition, to be infinite. As *Jehoshaphat* said, *In thine hand, O God, is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?* From hence there is no difficulty with God to perform any thing; no greater endeavour or activity to produce the greatest then the least of creatures; but an equall facility in reference unto all things; which cannot be † imagined but by an infinite excesse of power above all resistance.

† Ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ὄντων ὅλων συμπλοκὴ καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἓν πάντα τὰ ὄντα χορηγεῖ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὅτι μὴ τῶν ὄντων ὅλων ἀφῄρηται τῆς πρὸς τὸ ἓν συμπαθείας καὶ συμφωνίας καὶ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἀντιπαθείας καὶ ἀντιφωνίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸ ἕτερον ἑτερότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ταυτότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ διαφορότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ὁμοιότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀνομοιότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἰσότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀνισότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἐναντιότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιθέσεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιφάσεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιστροφῆς καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιμεταθέσεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιμεταβάσεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιμεταπτώσεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιμεταπλάσεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιμεταμορφώσεως καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑαυτὸ ἀντιμεταστοιχει

Thirdly, God is yet more properly called Omnipotent, becauſe his own active power extendeth it ſelf to † all things; neither is there any thing imaginably poſſible which he cannot doe. For it muſt be infinite activity which anſwereth to all poſſibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extenſively in reſpect of it's 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 Gods omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatſoever is ſimply and abſolutely poſſible, whatſoever is in it ſelf ſuch as that it may be; and ſo poſſible every thing is which doth not imply a contradiction. Again, whatſoever implyeth 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 implyeth 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.

† Quis eſt omnipotens niſi qui omnia poteſt? S. ug. *de Trin. l.* 4. *c.* 7.

Now an Action may imply a contradiction two wayes, 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 termes doth ſignifie a repugnancy and ſo deſtroyes it ſelf, as for the ſame thing to be and not to be, to have bin and not to have bin. And therefore it muſt be acknowledged that it is not

in

in the power of God † to make that not to have bin, which hath already bin: but that is no derogation to Gods power, becaule 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 apparance 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, ſpeak no repugnancy in terms; but yet by conſequence it leads to that which is repugnant in it ſelf; which is that the ſame body is but one body, and not but one. Being then a covert and conſequentiall contradiction is as much & 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.

† Τὸ γεγονὸς ἂν μὴ γενέσθαι, διὸ ὀρθῶς Ἀγάθων. Μόνῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ Θεῷ ἀδύνατα ποιεῖν ἅπαντα ἀδύνατα ἐστὶν ἃ πέπονθεν, Arist. Ethic Eudem. l. 5. c. 2. Quiſquis dicit, Si omnipotens eſt Deus, faciat ut quæ facta ſunt facta nō fuerint, non videt hoc ſe dicere, ſi omnipotēs eſt faciat ut ea quæ vera ſunt eo ipſo quo vera ſunt falſa ſint, S. Aug. contra Fauſtum l. 26. c. 5. It is granted therefore to be true, which Pliny objects, Deum non facere ut qui vixit non vixerit, qui honores geſſit, non geſſerit; ut this proves nothing against omnipotency be auſe it is no act of poſſibility. Had the act objected been feizable, and God had not the power to effect it, then had he wanted ſome power, & conſequently had not bin Omnipotent. But being it is not want of power in the Agent, but of poſſibility in the Object, it proves no deficiency in God.

That doth imply a Contradiction in reſpect of the Agent, which is repugnant to his eſſentiall perfection; for being every action floweth from the eſſence of the Agent, whatſoever is totally repugnant to that eſſence, muſt involve a contradiction as to that Agent. Thus we may ſay God cannot ſleep, God cannot want, God cannot † dye;

† Neq; enim & vitā Dei & præſcientiā Dei ſub neceſſitate ponimus ſi dicamus, Neceſſe eſt Deum ſemper vivere, & cuncta præſcire, ſicut nec poteſtas ejus minuitur, cum dicitur mori falliq; non poſſe. Sic enim hoc nō poteſt, ut potius ſi poſſet, minoris eſſet utiq; poteſtatis. Recte quippe Omnipotens dicitur qui tamē mori & falli non poteſt. Dicitur enim Omnipotens faciendo quod vult non patiendo quod non vult. Quod ſi ei accideret nequaquam eſſet Omnipotens. Unde propterea quædam non poteſt quia Omnipotens eſt, Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 5. c. 10. Nam ego dico quanta nō poſſit Non poteſt mori, nō poteſt peccare, non poteſt mentiri, nō poteſt falli, Tanta nō poteſt, quæ ſi poſſet non eſſet Omnipotens, Autor Serm. 119. de Temp.

he cannot ſleep whoſe being is ſpirituall; he cannot want, whoſe nature is alſufficient; he cannot dye, who is eſſentially and neceſſarily exiſtent. Nor can that be a diminution of his Own potency, the contrary whereof would be a proof of his impotency, a demonſtration of his infirmity. Thus it is *impoſsible for God to* † *lye*, to whom we ſay nothing is impoſſible; and, he who can doe all things, a *cannot deny himſelf*. Becauſe a lye is repugnant to the perfection of Veracity, which is eſſentiall unto God as neceſſarily following from his infinite knowledge,

Heb. 6 8. † Nunquid mentitur Deus? Sed non mentitur, quia *impoſsibile eſt mentiri Deum.*

Impoſſibile autem iſtud nunquidnam infirmitatis eſt? Non utiq; Nam quomodo omnia poteſt, ſi aliquid efficere non poteſt? Quid ergo ei impoſſibile? Illudutiq; quod naturæ ejus cõtrariũ eſt, non quod virtuti arduũ. *Impoſsibile*, inquit, *eſt ei mentiri*, & impoſſibile iſtud non infirmitatis eſt, ſed virtutis & majeſtatis; quia veritas non recipit mendacium, nec Dei virtus levitatis errorem, S. Amb. *Apol. in Num.* Si volunt invenire quod Omnipotens non poteſt habent proſsus, ego dicam, mentiri non poteſt. Credamus ergo quod poteſt non credendo quod non poteſt, S. Aug. *de Civ. D. l.* 22. *c.* 25.

2 Tim. 2. 13 *This was the Argument of* Elymas *the Sorcerer before mentioned, to which* Dionyſius *gives this anſwer,* Ἡ ἑαυτῆ ἔγκλησις ἀγνοίας ἐστὶν· ἢ γὰρ ἀλήθεια ὄν ἐστιν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἀληθείας ἔγκλησις τοῦ ὄντος ἔγκλησις. Εἰ τοίνυν ἡ ἀλήθεια ὄν ἐστιν, ἡ ἀρνησις τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ ὄντος ἔγκλησις, ὃν τῷ ὄντος ὁμιλεῖν ὁ Θεὸς οὐ δύναται· καὶ τὸ μὴ εἶναι κατέρχηται οὐδέν, *De Div. Nom.* cap 8. Jobius *gives this Solution to the ſame Objection,* Αὐτὰ μὴ δύναται τὸ θεῖον παῦται ἅπερ μήτε ὄντων ἐστὶ μήτε δυνατῶν ὅλως ὑφεστάναι, τῷ γὰρ ὑφεστῶτι τὸ ἀρνήσασθαι τὸ θεῖον ἑαυτὸν, ἢ ἡ βούλη, ἢ ἡ τῆς ἀγαθότητος ἔκπτωσις ἢ ἴδιον ἀλήθειαι· ψεῦδος γὰρ ἐστὶ; Παντοδύναμος ὑμνεῖται καὶ λέγεται ὡς τάτε ἀρέσαντα καὶ τὰ μὴ καὶ σωτήρια τῆς δημιουργημάτων πάντα δυνάμεως ὅτε βάλει, Jobius *de Verbo Incarn. l.* 3. *a.* ult Photium *in Biblioth.* Ὁ Ἀπόστολος ὅπου περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, Ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεόν. ἐκ ἀδυνατεῖν τινα κατηγορῶν τῆς παραταῦς δυνάμεως ἀπαιτίζειν φάμεν, ὅτι ἀνεπίληπτός ἐστι τῷ ψεύσει ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας πατήρ. Καὶ ἀπαχθὲς ἡ ταύτην ὀχυρῶν τὴν ἔννοιαν ἔχειν, Ἐὰν ἀρνησάσθαι τὸν ἑαυτὸν πρὸς μᾶλλον· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ὁ λύκος. Καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκ ἀδυνατείας ἐστὶν ἀπόδειξις, ἀλλ' ἀνυποβλήτου ἰσχύος, ὅτι ἐκ ἐξωρεῖ τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἑαυτὴν ἀρνήσασθαι, Isidor. Peleuſ *Epiſt.* 335 *l.* 3. Theodoret *upon this place of S.* Paul, *It is impoſsible for God to lye*, Οὐκ ἀδυνατεῖ τὸ ἀδύνατον, ἀλλὰ ἄγαν αὐτὸ δεικνὺς δυνατόν. Οὕτω γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς ὡς ἀδύνατον ἐστὶ ψεῦσθαι ἢ σκιὰ τοῦ ἡλιοῦ ποτέ. Τὸ δυνατὸν ἄρα (ita lege, non ἀδύνατον οὖν) τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ τῦ ἀδύνατα σημαίνει. *And upon this, He cannot deny himſelf*, πάλιν ἔντεῦθεν ἡ δυνατὴ τῆς ἀπείρου δυνάμεως ὑπάρχει δηλωτικόν, &c. Theodor. *Dialog.* 3.

and

and infinite ſanctity. We who are ignorant may be deceived, we who are ſinfull 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 all things and to be ignorant of any thing: ſo is it to know all things and to be deceived; as it is an evident contradiction, to be infinitely holy, and to be ſinfull, ſo is it to be infinitely holy and deceive. But it is impoſſible for any one to lye, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Therefore it is a manifeſt contradiction to ſay that God can lye, and conſequently it is no derogation from his Omnipotency, that he cannot. Whatſoever then God cannot doe, whatſoever is impoſſible to him, doth not any way prove that he is not Almighty, but onely ſhew that the reſt of his Attributes and perfections are as eſſentiall 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 ſheweth infinite ability: and by not being able to doe any thing repugnant to the ſame perfections, demonſtrateth himſelf ſubject to no infirmity or imbecillity. And in this manner we maintain Gods Omnipotency, with the beſt and eldeſt, againſt the worſt and the lateſt of the Heathen Authors.

† Theodoret having proved that there were many things which fell not under the power of God, at laſt thus concludes, Πολλὰ τοίνυν εὑρήκαμεν ἃ δύνατα ὄντα τῷ παντοδυνάμῳ Θεῷ. Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ δυνηθῆναι τιθέτων, ἀπείρου δυνάμεως καὶ ἀστενείας τεκμήριον· τὸ δὲ λέγε δυνηθῆναι, ἀδυναμίας ὑπάρδειν, ἢ δυνάμεως. Ὅτι τύτων ἕκαστον τὸ ἀπρεπὲς τοῦ Θεοῦ κηρύττει καὶ ἀνθρώπου τὸ, Dial. 3. And Origen contra Celſum l. 3. gives this for the Chriſtians generall rule, Δύναται καθ' ἡμᾶς, πάντα ὁ Θεὸς ἀφ' ὧν δυνάμεθα· ἢ τὰ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ, καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶ, καὶ τὰ σοφὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ὀρθῶς. * It was the conſtant opinion of the moſt antient Heathens, as appeareth by Homer, who expreſſeth it plainly, Odyſ. κ'.

——— Χλεπὸν δέ τ' ὀφύσσαι
Ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι, θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα δύανται.

And the ſame ſenſe is attributed to Linus in a Diſtich cited for his by Stobæus; but

may rather be thought to have bin mad, by ſome of the Pythagoreans. *For this was the plain Deſtinie of* Pythagoras, *who taught is Scholars to believe miracle, and to doubt of nothing ſaid to be done by the Gods, becauſe all things were poſſible to them;* Οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τὰ ἀδύνατα θεῶν (vel potius τοῖς θεοῖς) ἀλλ' ὑπολαμβάνειν τοὺς ζηλωτὰς, ὅτι πάντα δυνατὰ· καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτὴ ὅτι τῷ ἑπτὰ, ἃ ἐκεῖνοι φασὶ θεὸν εἶναι. Λίαν, ἐσὶ δ' οὗτοι ἴσως ἐκείνων. Ἐλπὶς χρὴ πάντ' ἐπεὶ ἄκρες ἐσὲ ἀγαθόν. Ῥᾴδια πάντα θεῷ τύχειν, καὶ ἀπίθανον οὐδέν, Jamb. *de Vita Pythag. cap.* 28. *So* Epicharmus *a diſciple of* Pythagoras, Ἀδύνατον οὐδὲν θεῷ. *So* Pater Omnipotens, *and* Jupite. Omnipotens, *familiar to* Virgil *and the Poets before and after him. Thoſe ſo over-weigh authority's* Plutarch, *and that of* Pliny, *with the addition of* Galen, *who purſcribe Opinion of the Philoſophers to the end of* Moſes *expreſſly, and to our Saviour obliquely,* Οὐδὲ γὰρ βουληθῆναι τοιαύτας γυναῖκας μόνον ἵνα ταύτας ἐξ ἐκείνων ἐξαφῆναι ἐδύνατο ἄνδρας πεῖσαι δυνατὸν αὐτῷ (*which ſeem to be oppoſed to thoſe words of our Saviour* God is able to raiſe children to Abraham out of theſe ſtones. Καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ καθ' ὃ τῆς Μωσέως δόξης ἦν ὑπερέχει καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ ἧς ἀγωνιᾷ παρ' Ἕλλησιν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ μεταχειρισαμένων τὰς περὶ φύσεως λόγους διαφέρει. Τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τὸ βεληθῆναι ὁ θεὸν κοσμῆσαι τὴν ὕλην, ἣ δ' εὐθὺς κεκόσμηται· πάντα γὰρ ἔξεσι τῷ θεῷ δυνατὰ νομίζει, κἂν εἰ τὴν τέφραν ἅπασαν ἢ βοῦν ἀθλον ποιεῖν· ἡμεῖς δ' οὐχ ὅτω γινώσκομεν, ἀλλ' ἔσι γάρ τινα λέγ' ἃ δυ ατὰ εἶναι καὶ τούτοις μηδ' ὅλως ὁ θεὸς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔσι δυνατὸν γενέσθαι τὸ βέλτιον ἀγένητον, *De Usu Partium*, lib. 11.

Thus God is Omnipotent, and God onely. For if the power of all 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. Again, we ſay that *God the Father* is *Almighty*; but then we cannot ſay that the Father onely is Almighty. For the reaſon why we ſay the Father is Almighty, is becauſe he is God; and therefore we cannot ſay that he † onely is Almighty becauſe it is not true that he onely 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

† Non ergo quiſpiam audebit quamlibet creaturam, ſive cœleſtem ſive terreſtrem dicere Omnipotentem, niſi ſolam Trinitatem, Patrem ſcilicet & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum. Non enim cum dicimus nos credere in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem ſicut hæretici Ariani negamus Filium Omnipotentem, aut Spiritum Sanctum, *Author lib. de Symbolo ad Catechum.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

tent

teat as the Father is. But we have already ſhew'd that the Son of God is truly God, and ſhall hereafter ſhew 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 ſhew that Chriſt, having aſcended into heaven, and being ſet down at *the right hand of God*, is inveſted with a greater power then he exerciſ'd before: and that power which was then actually conferr'd upon him, acknowledgeth no bounds or limits; but *all power* in the ultimate extent of it's 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*.

† *Nor is it unuſuall in other Authors to make uſe of the word* Omnipotens, *rather in relation to the preſent occaſion, then in reference to the perſon who is ſaid to be omnipotent; as is obſerved by* Servius *upon that verſe of* Virgil, *Æneid. 9.* Juppiter omnipotens audacibus annue cœptis. Hoc epitheton interdum ad gloriam numinis ponitur interdum ad cauſam dicentis. Namque hoc loco dicendo *Omnipotens* oſtendit eum etiam his qui per ſe minus valent præſtare poſſe virtutem.

It is neceſſary to profeſſe belief in God *Almighty*; Firſt, becauſe the acknowledgement of his Omnipotency begetteth that fear, reverence, and ſubmiſſion which is due unto his infinite Majeſty. *I will forewarn you*, ſaith our Saviour, *whom ye ſhall fear: Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to caſt into hell, yea, I ſay unto you, fear him.* Three times we are commanded to fear, and one onely reaſon rendred, but ſufficient for a thouſand Luc. 12. 5.

fears,

fears, the power of him who is able eternally to puniſh us. God gave a generall command to *Abraham*, and with it a powerfull perſwaſion to obedience, when he ſaid unto him, *I am the Almighty God, walk before me, and be thou perfect.* It was a rationall advice which the Apoſtle gives us, *Humble your ſelves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time.*

Gen 17. 1.

1 Pet. 5. 6.

Secondly, the belief of Gods Omnipotency is abſolutely neceſſary as the foundation of our Faith. All the miracles which have bin ſeen, were therefore wrought, that we might believe; and never miracle had bin ſeen, if God were not Omnipotent. The objects of our faith are beyond all naturall and finite 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 any thing? What can God propound unto us, which we cannot aſſent unto, if we can believe that he is Omnipotent?

† *This was the Argument which the Pythagoreans uſed, who believed many miraculous actions, which others look'd 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 ſhewed before.* Τῶν τοιούτων δ' (*ſaith* Jamblichus *having related ſeverall ſtrange actions either fabulous or miraculous,*) ἥδιστ' ἀκούοντων μυθικῶν ἀπομνημονεύουσιν ὡς μηδὲν ἀπιστοῦντες ὅτι ἂν εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἀνάγῃ. *And whe eas others look'd upon them a weak and ſimple people, for giving credit to ſuch fabulous relations,* πρὸς πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἠλιθίως αὐτοὺς εὐπίστους νομίζουσιν καὶ τὰς ἀπιστίας, Jamblich. *de Vita Pythag. cap.* 28.

Thirdly, it is not onely 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 faithfull, a *who ſtaggered not at the promiſe of God through unbelief, but was ſtrong in faith giving glory to God, and being fully perſwaded that what he had promiſed he was able alſo to perform.* The promiſes of God are therefore † firm and ſure, becauſe he is both willing and able to perform them.

a Rom. 4 20, 21.

† Nulla eſt in promiſſis Dei falſitas, quia nulla eſt in faciendis difficultas aut impoſſibilitas, *Fulgent.* l. 1. *ad Monim.*

them. We doubt or diſtruſt the promiſes of men, either becauſe we may fear they intend not to doe what they have promiſed, or cannot doe 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 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 perſwaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him againſt that day.* 2 Tim. 1. 12. I am aſſured that if I be a ſheep and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of darkneſſe 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 then all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Fathers hand.* Joh. 10. 29.

Laſtly, the belief of Gods 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 acknowledgement, *For thine is the Kingdome, the Power, and the Glory.* Mat. 6. 13. Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midſt of all our temptations, then that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, *who is able to doe exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.* Eph. 3. 20.

After this Explication of our Saviour's Seſſion, we may conclude what every Chriſtian ought, and may be ſuppos'd, 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 happineſſe; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetuall 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 doe 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.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE VII.

From †Thence Shall He Come To Judge The Quick And The Dead.

† *Or, from whence; the* Latines *sometimes* inde, *sometimes* unde. *And the* Greek *is* ὅθεν, unde, *both in the ancient MS. in Sir* Robert Cottons *Library, and in the Creed of* Marcellus. Κατ' ἐκεῖθεν ἐρχόμενον, *in the later MS. in* Bennet *College Library. Others without* inde *or* unde, *only* venturus, *as the* Nicene *Creed,* ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι, *others* πάλιν ἐρχόμενον or ἥξοντα πάλιν; *and* Fortunatus *leaving out* inde venturus, *hath only* judicaturus vivos & mortuos.

THis Article conteineth 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, whither dead before, or then alive; for *from thence ſhall he come to judge the quick and the dead.*

For the illuſtration of the firſt Particular two things will be neceſſary, and no more; firſt, to ſhew that the promiſed *Meſſias* was to come again after he once was come: ſecondly, to declare how our Jeſus (whom we have already prov'd once to have come as the true *Meſſias*) did promiſe and aſſure us of a ſecond coming.

That the *Meſſias* was to come again, was not onely 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 were 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 errour; that the *Meſſias* is twice to come, once in all humility,

mility, to suffer and dye, as they conceive their son of *Joseph*; and again in all glory, to govern and judge, as they expect the son of *David*. Particularly, *Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied* of this Advent, *saying, behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Angells*. 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 dayes, and they brought him before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdome that all people, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not passe away, and his kingdome that which shall not be destroyed.* This Son of man the † *Jews* themselves confesse to be the promised *Messias*, and they take the words to signifie 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 sinnes, then the *Messias* should come in humility, according to the description in *Zachary*, *a lowly and riding upon an asse*; 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

Jude 14.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

† R. Saadias Gaon *ad locū*, זהו משיח צדקנו כתוב נאם ויי לאדני שב לימיני:

* In Bereshit Rabba, *speaking of the Genealogy concluding* (1 Chron. 3. 24.) *with* Anani *the youngest of the seven sonnes of* Elioenai, *the Author asks this question*, ומי הוא ענני וזה משיח שנ׳ חזה הייתי בחזון *and answers it thus, and who is this* Anani? *and answers it thus*, לילי׳ וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא: *This is the* Messias, *as it is written*, Dan. 7. 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*, אמר רב ישועה כי ור׳ אנש הוא מלך המשיח, *and* Aben Ezra *ibidem*, כבר אנש המשית ונכין הדבר: *So the Author of* Tzetor Hammor, וסוד אדם הוא סוד המשיח כאומרו כבר אנש אתי: *The mystery of man is the mystery of the* Messias, *according to that of* Daniel, *he came as the Son of man. This place is mention'd for one of the* כתובין *which speak of the* Messiah, *in the* Midrash Tillim, *Psal.* 2. *And the* Midrash *upon the* 21. Psal. *v.* 7. אך ברכיה בשם ר׳ שמואל כתוב אחד אומ׳ עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש: *speaking of the* Messias. *Indeed the* Jews *do so generally interpret this place of* Daniel *of the* Messias, *that they make it an Argument to prove that the* Messias *is not yet come, because no man hath yet come with the clouds of heaven.*

* *This Interpretation is delivered*

in

in libro *Sanhedrim*, אר׳ אלכסנדרי כתיב על ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא וכתיב עני ורוכב על חמור זכו עמהם ענני שמיא לא זכו עני ורוכב על חמור: Idem etiam legitur in Bereshit Rabba *R. Moseh Hadarshan*, Gen. 49. 11. *Thus they make the coming of Christ to depend upon their merit or demerit; whereas the promises of the Messias are absolute and irrespective, depending only on the goodnesse of God, not to be evacuated or altered by the wickednesse of man. Nay the unworthinesse of the Jews which Christ found when he came in humility, is one speciall cause why he should come again in glory.*

these two descriptions are two severall predictions, & therefore must be both fulfill'd. From whence it followeth, that, being Christ is already come *lowly and sitting upon an ass*, therefore hereafter 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 propheticall; then must there be a double advent of the same *Messias*, and so his second coming was foretold.

That our Jesus, whom we have already proved to have come once into the world as the true *Messias*, shall come the second time, we are most assured. We have the testimony of the Angells, *This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him goe into heaven.* Act. 1. 11. We have the promise of Christ himself to his Apostles, *If I goe to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto my self: ye have heard how I said unto you, I goe away and come again unto you.* Joh. 14. 3, 28. He it is which from the beginning was to *come*: that expresse prophesie so represented him, *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah untill Shiloh come*; Gen. 49. 19. 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.* Heb. 10. 37. Our Jesus then *shall come*, and not ὁ ἐρχόμενος, that is, he *was* known

by that vulgar appellation ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *he which did once come into the world to make that notion good, is still to be known by the same appellation, and therfore*

will come again. This was it which made the Apostles ask that Question, Matth. 24. 3. *When shall these things be, and what shall be the signe of thy coming, and of the end of the world?*

onely 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 Kingdome.* 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.* Those clouds were anciently expounded by the † *Jews* of the glorious attendance of the Angels, waiting upon the Son of man: and in the same manner, with the same attendance doe we expect the coming of our Jesus, even as he himself hath taught us to expect him, saying, a *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his Angels.* And thus our Jesus as the true *Messias shall come* again,

Mat. 16. 28.

Revelat. 1. 7.

† As R. Saadias Gaon *upon that place of* Daniel 7. 13.

עם ענני השמים הם מלאכי צבא השמים זו היא רוב הגרולה שיתן הבורא למשיח: *The clouds of heaven they are the Angels of the host of heaven; this is the great magnificence and power which God shall give unto the Messias. From hence is that exposition in* Midrash Tillim, *Psal.* 21. 7. אר׳ ברכיה בשם ר׳ שמואל כתוב אחד אומ׳ וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוא וקדמוהי הקריבוהי וכתיב אחר, אמר והקרבתיו וגש אלי הא׳ כיצד המלאכין מכנסין אותו עד מחיצתן: Rabbi Barachia *said in the name of* Rabbi Samuel, *One Scripture saith* (Dan. 7. 13.) *And behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes, and they brought him neer before him. And another Scripture saith,* (Jerem. 30. 21.) *and I will cause him to draw neer and he shall approach unto me. Behold in what manner? The Angels shall bring him into the midst of them.*

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 hereafter come to judge the quick and the dead. For *him must the heaven*

ven receive till the time of the reſtitution of all things; and when that time is fulfill'd, 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 joyned 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 fulneſſe 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 ſhall he come to judge.*

Act. 3. 21. 1 Theſ. 4. 16. 2 Theſſ. 1. 7. Mat. 26. 64.

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 Judgement to come, that any one *ſhall come to judge.* Secondly, in caſe we be aſſured that there ſhall be a Judgement, 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 enquiry in what this judgement ſhall conſiſt, how this action ſhall be performed: and more

more then this cannot be necessary to make us understand, that *he shall come to judge.*

That there is a Judgement to come after this life, will appear demonstrable, whither we consider our selves who are to undergoe it, or God who is to execute it. If we doe 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 judgement hereafter is to passe upon us. There is in the soul of every man a Conscience, and whersoever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to doe, and the subsequent or reflexive conscience warns us 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 onely prove that there is a judgement in this life, and every man his own Judge. But being it doth not onely allow and approve our good actions, but also doth create a complacency, apology, and confidence in us; being it doth not onely disprove and condemn our evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us, and breed a fearfull expectation and terrour in us; and all this prescinding from all relation to any thing either to be enjoyed or suffered in this life: it followeth, that this conscience is not so much a judge as a witnesse, bound over to give testimony, for or against us at some judgement after this life to passe upon us. For all men are *a Law unto themselves*, and have *the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witnesse, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.*

Rom. 2. 15.

Again, if we consider the God who made us and hath full dominion over us, whither we look upon him in himself, or in his word, we cannot but expect a judgement from him. First, if we contemplate God in himself, we must acknowledge him to be the judge of all mankind, *so*

that

that a man shall say; verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth. Now the same God who is our Judge, is, by an attribute, necessary, and inseparable, Just; and this Justice is so essentiall to his Godhead, that we may as well deny him to be God, as to be Just. It was a rationall expostulation which *Abraham* made, *shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* we may therefore 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 righteousnesse. For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lye under the disposition of providence, they shew no sign of an universall 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 then that in this life, rewards are not correspondent to the vertues, punishments not proportionable to the sinnes of men. Which consideration will inforce 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 judgement 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 God is that Judge, and all must confesse 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 judgement yet to come, in which God will shew a perfect demonstration of his justice; and to which every man shall in his own bosome carry an undeniable witnesse of all his actions. Psal. 58. 11. Gen. 18. 25.

From hence the Heathen, having alwayes had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man,

and of the exactneſſe of the juſtice of God, have from thence concluded that there is a Judgement to come. Inſomuch that when S. *Paul reaſoned of righteouſneſſe and temperance & judgement to come, Felix trembled.* The diſcourſe of righteouſneſſe and temperance touched him who was highly and notoriouſly guilty of the breach of both, and a preconception which he had of judgement after death now heightned by the Apoſtles particular deſcription, created an horrour 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 the which he will judge the world in righteouſneſſe by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given aſſurance unto all men, in that he hath rais'd him from the dead*, found *ſome* which *mocked when they heard of the reſurrection of the dead*; but againſt the day of judgement none replyed. That was a† principle of their own, that was confeſs'd by all who either believ'd themſelves, or a God, a conſcience, or a Deity.

25.

Act. 17. 31.

† *This principle of a Judgement 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.* Ἐπεὶ πλὴν ὑμῖν ὁ περὶ τῆ ἀληθοῦς θεοσεβείας πρόκειται λόγος, ἧς ὑδὲν, οἶμαι, πρωτιμότερον τῆς ἀκριδώσεως βιοῦ τοῦτο μεμόσοις δεῖ νενόμικαι διὰ τὸ μέγεθος μετὰ τὸ τελευτὴν τὸν τῦ βίν ἐπὶ τὸν κρίσιν ἧκειν· ἃ μόνον οἱ ἡμέτεροι χρὴ θεὸν κηρύσσειν πρέσβεις προφῆτάς τε καὶ νομοθέτας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν νομοθέτης δεῖ σοφοὶ, ἃ ποιητὰς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλόσοφοι οἱ τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ θείαν ἀπαγγελόμενοι παρ' ὑμῖν οἰκῆται γενῶν. *Ad* Græcos *Cohort.* 1. Tertullian *ſhewes the ſame not onely from the writings, but the conſtant converſation and language even of the Gentiles.* Anima licet corporis carcere preſſa, licet inſtitutionibus pravis circumſcripta, licet libidinibus & concupiſcentiis evigorata, licet falſis Diis exancillata, cum tamen reſipiſcit ut ex crapula, ut ex ſomno, ut ex aliqua valetudine, & ſanitatem ſuam patitur & Deum nominat, hoc ſolo, quia proprie verus hic unus Deus bonus & magnus. Et quod Deus dederit omnium vox eſt. Judicem quoque conteſtatur illum, Deus videt, &, Deo commendo, &, Deus mihi reddet. O teſtimonium animæ naturaliter Chriſtianæ! *Apolog adv. Gentes.* *Indeed the Ancient Gentiles have expreſſed this judgement to come very exactly.* As Philemon *cited by* Juſtin Martyr *De Monarch. Dei*, Ἔστι δίκης ἀρδαλμὸς ὃς λαμπρὸν ὁρᾷ. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δίκαιος κρίσιν ἔξεσιν ἦν, Ἅρπαζ' ἁπάντων, κλέπτ', ἀποστέρει, κλέπ. Μηδὲν πλανηθῇς, ἔστι κρίσις. Ἡ γὰρ ποινὴ

θεοῦ θεὸς ὁ πάντων Δεσπότης, Οὗ τύπους φοβεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' αὐ ὀνομάσαι μ' ἰγώ. *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 Præpar. Evangel. lib.* 11. *cap.* 38. *& lib.* 12. *cap.* 6. Theodor. *Serm. de Fine & Judicio. Where after the citation of several all places he concludes,* Οὕτως ἀκριβῶς ἐπίσταντο ὁ Πλάτων τὰ ὄντα ἡ Δυσχρήσεια.

But yet, beside the consideration of the eternall power of conscience in our selves, beside the intuition of that essentiall Attribute, the Justice, of God, which are sufficient arguments to move all men, we have yet a more neer and enforcing perswasion grounded upon the expresse determination of the will of God. For the determinate counsell of the will of the Almighty actually to judge the world in righteousnesse is clearly revealed in his word. *It is appointed unto men once to dye, but after this the Judgement.* Heb. 9. 27. There is a death appointed to follow this life, and a judgement 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 unto angry *Cain, If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lyeth at the door*; which by the most ancient † interpretation signifieth a reservation of his sin unto the Judgement of the world to come. Gen. 4. 7.

† *So the* Targum *of* Jonathan *renders it,*

הלא אם תיטיב עובדך ישתבק לך חובך ואין לא תיטיב עובדך בעלמא הדן ליום דינא רבא חטאך נטיר: If thou makest thy works good, shall not thy sin be forgiven thee? And if thou makest not thy works good in this world, thy sin is kept unto the day of the great judgement. *And the* Jerusalem Targum *yet more expressly,* הלא אין תיטיב עובדך בעלמא הדין שתתבק לך לעלמא דאתי ואין לא תיטיב עובדך בעלמא הדין ליום דינא רבא חטאך נטיר: If thou makest thy works good in this world, shall it not be remitted and forgiven unto thee in the world to come? And if thou makest not thy works good in this world, thy sin shall be reserved unto the day of the great judgement. *In the same manner the* Chaldee *Paraphrase of* Onkelos, : ליום דינא חטאך נטיר

Before the Floud *Enoch* propheſied of a Judgement to come, *saying Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of* Jude 4.

his Saints to execute judgement upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodlily committed, and of all their hard ſpeeches which ungodly ſinners have ſpoken againſt him. His words might have an aime at the waters which were to overflow the world; but the ultimate intention look'd through that fire which ſhall conſume the world preſerv'd from water. The teſtimonies which follow in the Law and the Prophets, the predictions of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, are ſo many & ſo known, that both the number and the plainneſſe will excuſe the proſecution. The throne hath bin already ſeen, the Judge hath appeared ſitting on it, the books have bin already open'd, the dead ſmall and great have bin ſeen ſtanding before him: there is nothing more certain in the word of God, no doctrine more clear and fundamentall, then that *of eternall Judgement.* I ſhall therefore briefly conclude the firſt conſideration from the internall teſtimony of the conſcience of man, from the eſſentiall attribute, the juſtice, of God, 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 Iudgement to come, there *ſhall* ſome perſon *come to judge.*

Heb. 6. 2.

Our ſecond conſideration followeth; ſeeing we are ſo well aſſured that there ſhall be a judgement, 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 Iudiciary 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 tryed are ſubject to his dominion; *God* therefore is *the Judge of all.* He *ſhall bring every work into judgement with every ſecret thing, whether it be good or whether it*

Heb. 12. 23.
Eccleſ. 12. 14.

be

be evil; and so the last day, that *day of wrath* is *the revelation of the righteous judgement of God.* Now if God, as God, be the Iudge 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 autocratoricall power, dominion, and authority. Rom. 2. 5.

† Πάντες πίνω ὁτὶ τῷ κρίσει τότι ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ πάντων παρὼν, συναγωζομένῳ Χριστῷ, καὶ συμπαρόντῳ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, S. Cyril Catech. 15.

But notwithstanding in that particular day of the generall judgement to come, the execution of this Iudiciary 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 the which he will judge the world in righteousnesse by that man whom he hath ordained.* It is God who iudgeth, it is Christ by whom he iudgeth. *For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement to the Son.* There is therefore an originall, supreme, autocratoricall 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 expressely, from the Holy Ghost concomitantly. For *the Father hath given him authority to execute judgement, 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 onely judge) but because of the three persons which are God, he onely is † also the Son of man, and therefore for his affinity with Act. 17. 31. Joh. 5. 22. Joh. 5. 27.

† *This Explication I thought necessary to insert, because it seems to me the onely way to end that controversie which is raised upon the interpretation of those words of S.* John *which we ordinarily read thus,* 27. Καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί. 28. Μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. *By which distinction those words* because he is the Son of man *have reference to the precedent sentence. But as lately they have*

bin otherwise distinguished, Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν κρίνειν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί· μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. So the old Syriack Translation, vers. 27. ואשלטה דנהוא דברה הוא דין דאנשא לא תתמרמרון בהדא: עבד אנש הוא and then vers. 28 And S. Chrysostome is so earnest for this reading, that he chargeth the former distinction upon Paulus Samosatenus, as invented by him in favour of his Heresie, that Christ was nothing else but purely man. Ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί· μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεὺς οὐχ ὅτι φησίν, ἀλλὰ πῶς; Ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίνειν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν· ἀλλ' ἐδείκνυτο ἀκολουθίαν ἔχει τοῦτο λεγόμενον (so he argues against that reading) ὃ γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἔλαβε κρίσιν ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ὄντα τί ὀνίνησι πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι κριτάς) ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις ἀσθενὴς ἐστὶν υἱὸς διὰ τοῦτο κριτὴς ὄντι. Οὕτως οὖν ἀναγνωστέον, Ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὄντι μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο. Euthymius followeth the distinction of S. Chrysostome, and Theophylact makes the same argument, Χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεὺς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λογματίζων τὸν Κύριον οὕτως ἀναγίνωσκε τοῦτο τὸ ῥητόν. Καὶ ἔξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίνειν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί· ὁπωσοῦν δὲ σίζων ἀπ' ἀνάγκης ἀρχῆς ἀνεγίνωσκε τὸ, Μὴ θαυμάζητε τοῦτο. Ἀνάγκη δὲ ἁπλῶς ἐστὶ τὸ οὕτως ἀναγινώσκειν, τὸν γὰρ κρίνειν τὸν υἱὸν ὁ Πατὴρ ἔδωκεν, οὐχ ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι Θεός. But though this division of the words be both by S. Chrysostome and Theophylact charged upon Paulus Samosatenus the Heretick, yet we find no other distinction in the ancient Copies; nor did the Ancient Latine Fathers any otherwise read it then that Paulus did. We must then acknowledge no other coherence then the ordinary, that God gave his Son power to judge because he was the Son of man. Nor need we to avoid the Argument of S. Chrysostome, change the ὅτι into καθότι, the quia into quatenus, for it is not rendred as the absolute reason in it self, but in relation unto God, or the persons of the Trinity; the Father shall not judge, nor the Holy Ghost, because those two persons are onely God, but all judgement is committed to God the Son because he is the Son of man.

with their nature, for his sense of their infirmities, for his appearance to their eyes, most fit to represent the greatest mildnesse and sweetnesse of equity in the severity of that just and irrespective judgement.

Nor was this a reason onely in respect of us who are to be judged, but in regard of him also who is to judge; for we must not look onely upon his being the Son of man, but also upon what he did and suffer'd 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 sinnes of all the world could cause; and therefore in regard

gard 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 onely God, and never took upon him either the nature of men or Angels, *judgeth no man*; (and the same reason reacheth also to the Holy Ghost) *but hath committed all judgement to the Son*; and the reason why he hath committed it to him, is *because he is*, not onely the *Son of God*, and so truly God, but also *the Son of man*, and so truly man; because *he is* that *Son of man*, who suffered so much for the sonnes of men. Jo. 5. 22, 25. 27.

From whence at last it clearly appeareth not onely 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 condemn'd to dye, and dyed 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 Tribunall and receive that sentence, *let him be crucified*; which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, Christ himself did shew at the same

† Veniet Christus ut judex qui stetit sub judice: veniet in ea forma in qua judicatus est, ut videant in quem pupugerunt, & cognoscant Judæi quem negaverunt, convincat eos homo ille susceptus & ab eis crucifixus, *Luther lib. de symb. ad Catech. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. Veniet ergo, fratres mei, veniet ille: qui prius venit occultus, veniet in potestate manifestus. Ille qui judicatus est veniet judicaturus. Ille qui stetit ante hominem judicaturus est omnem hominem, *Idem lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. Judex hic erit si ius hominis; forma illa hic judicabit quæ judicata est. Audite & intelligite, jam hoc Propheta dixerat, *Videbunt quem unxerunt.* Ipsam formam videbunt quam lancea percusserunt. Sedebit Judex qui stetit sub judice. Damnabit veros reos qui factus est falsus reus. Ipse veniet, forma illa veniet, S. Aug. *de Verbis Dom. Serm.* 64.

time

time when he ſtood before the judgement ſeat, ſaying, Mat. 26. 64. *Neverthelesse 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 our ſelves which are to be judged, whom can we deſire to appear before, rather then him who is of the ſame nature with us? If the children of *Iſrael* could not bear the preſence of God as a Law-giver, 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 wiſdome and goodneſſe of God, that making a generall Judgement, he will make a viſible Judge, which all may ſee who ſhall be judged. *Without holineſſe no man ſhall ever ſee God*; and therefore if God, as onely God, ſhould pronounce ſentence upon all men, the ungodly † ſhould never ſee their Judge. 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 onely ſhall ſee him who by that viſion ſhall enjoy him.

† Cum boni & mali viſuri ſunt Judicem vivorum & mortuorum, proculdubio eum videre non poterunt mali, niſi ſecundum formam qua filius hominis eſt; ſed tamen in claritate in qua judicabit, non in humilitate in qua judicatus eſt. Cæterum illam Dei formam in qua æqualis eſt Patri proculdubio impii non videbunt. Non enim ſunt mundi corde, *Beati enim mundi corde quoniam ipſi videbunt Deum*, S. Aug. *de Trin. l.* 1. *c.* 13. Hoc rectum erat ut judicandi viderent Judicem. Judicandi autem erant boni & mali. *Beati enim mundo corde quoniam ipſi Deum videbunt.* Reſtabat ut in judicio forma ſervi & bonis & malis oſtenderetur, forma Dei ſolis bonis ſervaretur, *Idem De Verbis Dom. Serm.* 64. *Et poteſtatem dedit ei judicium facere quia filius hominis eſt.* Puto nihil eſſe manifeſtius. Nam quia Filius Dei eſt æqualis Patri, non accepit hanc poteſtatem judicii faciendi, ſed habet illam cum Patre in occulto. Accepit autem illam ut boni & mali eum videant judicantem, quia filius hominis eſt. Viſio quippe Filii hominis exhibebitur & malis. Nam viſio formæ Dei non niſi mundis corde, quia *ipſi Deum videbunt*, id eſt, ſolis piis exhibebitur, quorum dilectioni hoc ipſum promittit quia ſeipſum oſtendit illis, *Idem rurſus de Trin. l.* 1. *c.* 13.

Chriſt

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.* 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 goe into heaven.* 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 locall translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will *judge the world in righteousnesse 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.* 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 dyed and rose and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* It appeareth therefore by Gods determination, by Christs Resurrection and Ascention, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed Judge.

Mat. 16. 27.

Act. 10. 11.

Act. 17. 31.

Rom. 14. 9.

This Office and dignity of the Son of man was often declared by severall figurative and parabolicall descriptions. *John* the Baptist representeth him *that cometh after* him by this delineation of an husbandman, *Whose fanne is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floore, and gather his wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaffe with unquenchable fire.* The Son of man describes himself as an housholder, saying to the reapers in the time of harvest, *Gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundels*

Mat. 3. 12. Ἀνωτέρω μὲν τὴν κόλασιν ἔφησε, δηλῶν ἅμα καὶ τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀνάκρισιν, καὶ τὴν παιδείαν ἀδύνατον οὖσαν, S. Chrys. in loc.

Mat. 13. 30, 39. Πάλιν ἀναμιμνήσκει αὐτοὺς τῆς Ἰωάννου ῥημάτων τῆς κειτὴν αὐτὸν εἰσαγόντων, S. Chryſ. *ad locũ.*

bundels 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 *a caſting a net into the ſea, and gathering of every kind; which, when it was full,* he *drew to the ſhore and ſate down and gathered the good into veſſels, but caſt the bad away.* He is the Bridegroom who took the wiſe virgins *b with him to the marriage,* and *ſhut the door* upon the fooliſh. He is the man who travailing into a far countrey, delivered the talents to his ſervants, and *after a long time* cometh again, *and reckoneth with them,* exalting the *good and faithfull,* and caſting the *unprofitable ſervant into outer darkneſſe.* Laſtly, he is the Shepheard, and is ſo expreſly deſcribed in relation to this judgement. 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 Shepheard 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 faithfull, puniſhing the unprofitable; as a ſhepheard, 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 Iudge of all the ſons of men. And thus it appeareth that Chriſt is he who ſhall be the Iudge, which is the ſecond conſideration ſubſervient to the preſent Explication.

a Mat. 13. 47, 48.

b Mat. 25. 10.

Mat. 25. 19, 21, 30.

Mat. 25. 31, 32, 33.

Thirdly, it being thus reſolved that the Son of man ſhall be the Iudge, our next conſideration is, what may the nature

nature of this Judgement be; in what that Judiciall action doth consist; what he shall then doe, when *he shall come to judge*. The reality of this Act doth certainly consist in the finall determination, and actuall disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternall 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 formall judiciary processe. In which

† S. Austin speaking of the particulars foretold to be exhibited at the day of Judgement, concludes them in this manner, Quæ omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est; sed quibus modis & quo ordine veniant magis tunc docebit rerum experientia quam nunc valet consequi ad perfectum hominum intelligentia, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 2. cap. 30.

first there is described a throne, a tribunall, a judgement-seat; for *in the regeneration the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*: and that this throne is a seat not onely of Majesty but also of judicature, appeareth by the following words spoken to the Apostles, *ye also shall sit upon the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel*. As in that vision in the *Revelation*, *I saw thrones and they sate upon them, and judgement was given unto them*. And *I saw a great white throne, and him that sate on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away*. This throne of Christ is expressly called his judgement seat, when the Apostle tells us, *we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ*, and *we must all appear before the judgement 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 personall 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 *judgement 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, & they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from*

Mat. 19. 28.
Rev. 20. 4, 11.
Rom. 14. 10.
2 Cor. 5. 10.
Rev. 20. 12.
Mat. 25. 32.
Mat. 24. 31.

one end of heaven to the other. For the *coming of our Lord*
2 Theſſ. 2. 1. *Jeſus Chriſt* is *our gathering together unto him.* Thirdly, when thoſe which are to be judged are brought before the judgement ſeat of Chriſt, all their actions ſhall appear; *he*
1 Cor. 4. 5. *will bring to light the hidden things of darkneſſe, and will*
Eccl. 12. 14. *make manifeſt the counſels of the hearts*: he will *bring every work into judgement with every ſecret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.* To this end in the viſion of *Daniel*, when *the Judgement was ſet, the books were*
Rev. 20. 12. *opened*; and in that of S. *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; the ſentence of abſolution, in theſe words expreſs'd, Mat. 24. 34. *Come ye bleſſed of my Father inherit the Kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world*; the ſentence of condemnation, in this manner, *Depart*
41. *from me, ye curſed, into everlaſting fire prepared for the devil and his Angels.* Laſtly, after the promulgation of the ſentence followeth the execution. As it is written,
46. *And theſe ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment, but the righteous into life eternall.* Thus appeareth Chriſt's majeſty by ſitting on the throne, his authority by conventing all before him, his knowledge and wiſdome by opening all ſecrets, revealing all actions, diſcerning all inclinations, his juſtice in condemning ſinners, his mercy in abſolving believers, his power in the execution of his ſentence. And thus the Son of man *ſhall come to judge*, which is the laſt particular ſubſervient to the third Conſideration of this Article.

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 it ſelf is delivered ſeverall times in the Scriptures,

and

and that upon the ſame occaſion; for Chriſt was *ordeined of God to be the judge of quick and dead*, & ſo his commiſſion extendeth to both: he *is ready to judge the quick and the dead*; his reſolution reacheth to each: and as he is ordeined and ready, ſo *ſhall he judge the quick and the dead*, 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 ſeverall notions, which makes the quick and the dead capable of ſeverall interpretations. Becauſe after death the ſoul doth live, and the body onely remaineth dead; therefore † ſome have underſtood the ſouls of men by *the quick*, 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 joyned 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 their 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 dye, 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.

Act. 10. 42.
1 Pet. 4. 5.
2 Tim. 4. 1.

† So Theophylact *teſt ſieth*, πνεῦς ἢ καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα ἐνόησαν, *Comment. in* 2 Timoth. 4. 1. *And ed* Iſidorus Peluſiota *giveth this as the firſt Interpretation*, Τὰ κεκοιμημένα ζῶντας καὶ νεκρὰς πῶτό ὅτι, τὰ μὲν ψυχῶν καὶ σώματος κεκοινωνηκότα, τὰ δὲ ἀμοιρήσαντα ἀμφοῖν, κοινὴν τὴν ὀνομασίαν ἐποιήσατο, ἅτε καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀμφοῖν ἐσομένην ὑφέξειν, Epiſt. 222. *lib.* 1.

Again, becauſe the Scripture often mentioneth a death in treſpaſſes and ſinnes, and a living unto righteouſneſſe, others have conceived by the *quick* to be underſtood

† *This is the ſecond expoſition delivered by* Iſidorus Peluſiota *to ſuch as are not ſatisfied with the firſt,* Εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀρκεῖ σοι τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ ζητεῖς, ἵνα καὶ ἀκριβῶς μάθῃς, ὅτι καὶ τοὺς ζῶντας τοὺς ἀμείνω βίον καὶ θεοφιλῆ μετιόντας, καὶ ἀποθανόντας αὐτοῖς ἀτυφότατος ἀμοιβὰς κεῖσθαι τοὺς νεκρωθέντας τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι καὶ τὸ δοθὲν αὐτοῖς τάλαντον ὡς ὁ τάφος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ κατακόπτοντας ῥᾳδυμίᾳ, καὶ ἀμύονας αὐτοὺς, Epiſt. 222. *lib.* 1.

ſtood the † juſt, 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 metaphoricall ſenſe, becauſe there is no adjunct giving any ſuch intimation, & becauſe the literall 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 corporeall death, [a] *Whether we live or dye*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *we are the Lords: for to this end Chriſt both dyed, and roſe, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.*

[a] Rom. 14. 9.

* *This is the third Expoſition of* Iſidorus Peluſiota, Εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀρκεῖ σοι, ἔτως, κρῖναι τὰς τότε ζῶντας καταλειφθέντας, καὶ τοὺς ἤδη πρὸ αὐτῆς κεκοιμημένους, Ibid. *Others of the Fathers give the ſecond and the third explication leaving it indifferent, and preferring neither; as S.* Chryſoſt. Ἦτοι ἀμφοτέρους λέγει καὶ δικαίους, ἤτοι καὶ τοὺς ἀναβάντας καὶ τοὺς νῦν ὄντας, ὅτι πολλοὶ καταλειφθήσονται ζῶντες, Com in 2. *Tim.* 4. 1. Duobus autem modis accipi poteſt quod vivos & mortuos judicabit; ſive ut vivos intelligamus quos hic nondum mortuos, ſed adhuc in iſta carne viventes inventurus eſt ejus adventus; mortuos autem qui de corpore priuſquam veniat exiere vel exituri ſunt: ſive vivos juſtos, mortuos autem injuſtos, quoniam juſti quoque judicabuntur, S. *Auguſt.* in Enchiridio, *c.* 54. Credimus etiam *ipſe venturum* convenientiſſimo tempore, & *judicaturum vivos & mortuos*, ſive iſtis nominibus juſtos & peccatores ſignificentur; ſive quos tunc ante mortem noſtram in terra inventurus eſt appellati ſunt vivi, mortui vero qui in ejus adventu reſurrecturi ſunt, *idq*

Thirdly therefore by * *the dead* are underſtood all thoſe who ever dyed before the time of Chriſts coming to judgement, and by *the quick* ſuch as ſhall be then alive: ſo that the quick and the dead literally taken are conſidered in relation to the time of Chriſts coming; at which time there ſhall

de Fide & Symb. cap. 8. *Inde venturus judicare vivos & mortuos.* Vivos qui ſuperfuerint, mortuos qui præceſſerint. Poteſt & ſic intelligi, vivos, juſtos; mortuos, injuſtos: utroſque enim judicat ſua cuique retribuens. Juſtis dicturus eſt in judicio, *Venite benedicti, &c.* Siniſtris quid? *Ite in ignem, &c.* Sic judicabuntur à Chriſto vivi & mortui. *Author lib.* 1. *de Symb. ad Catechum.* Duobus modis hæc ſententia accipitur. Vivi & mortui in animo, item vivi & mortui in corpore. In corpore ſecundum priorem, judicabit vivos in anima credentes, & mortuos in anima fidem nullam habentes: ſecundum poſteriorem judicabit vivos in carne, quos præſentes invenerit ejus adventus; judicabit & mortuos in carne, quos reſuſcitaturus eſt Deus excelſus, *Author lib.* 4. *de Symb. ad Catech.* cap. 7. *But although theſe two Expoſitions were thus indifferently propounded, yet the former ought by no means ſo to be received as any way to evacuate or prejudice the later.* Quod autem dicimus in Symbolo, in adventu Domini *vivos ac mortuos* judicandos, non ſolum juſtos & peccatores ſignificari, ſicut Diodorus putat; ſed & vivos eos qui in carne inveniendi ſunt credimus, qui adhuc morituri creduntur, vel immutandi ſunt, ut alii volunt, ut ſuſcitati continuo, vel reformati, cum ante mortuis judicentur, Gennadius *de Dogmat. Eccleſiaſt.* cap. 8.

ſhall be a generation living upon the face of the earth, and before which time all the generations paſſed ſince the creation of the world ſhall be numbred among the dead. And this undoubtedly is the proper * and literall ſenſe of the Article, that Chriſt ſhall come to judge, not onely thoſe which ſhall be alive upon the earth at his appearing, but alſo all ſuch as have liv'd and died before. None ſhall be then judged while they are dead: whoſoever ſtand before the judgement 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 be raiſed from the dead.

* *This is the cleer interpretation of* Theodoret, *without the leaſt mention of any other,* Νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κρίτην τὸν Κύριον καλοῦσιν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀνίστησι καὶ κρίσεις τὸ κριτήριον ἄγει καὶ τοὺς καθ' ὃν τῆς ζωοποιΐας καιρὸν εὑρεθησομένους ἀθρόως ἀναιρήσει τὰς ἐνδυσίας. Πάντες γὰρ, φησὶν, οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, *Com. in* 2. *Tim.* 4. 1. Vivi agnoſcuntur qui in corpore erunt in adventu Domini, mortui qui ex hac luce migraverunt, *Author Exp. Symb. ſub nomine S.* Chryſ.

† *This is cleared by the Author of the Queſtions and Anſwers under the name of* Juſtin Martyr, Εἰ τὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως δόγμα πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὁ Θεὸς δεδόκηται, καὶ πάντες ὀφείλουσιν ἀναστῆναι τῇ κρίσει παρίστασθαι, μᾶλλον, πῶς πλησιάζοντες τὸ κρίνειν νεκροὺς καὶ ζῶντας τὸν Κύριον; πῶς δὲ νεκροὶ κελεύονται ἀναστῆναι, ὧν

ὧν τὰ μὲν σώματα ὑπομένειν ἔρριπται, αἱ δὲ ψυχαὶ τῶν σωμάτων κεχωρισμέναι εἰσίν; Resp. Οὐ πάντες, φησὶ, κοιμηθησόμεθα· καινοὶ οὖν ζῶντες μὲν, τῶν τότε ζώντων, νεκρῶν δὲ, τῶν ἀνίσταμένων ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Quæst. 109.

The onely doubt remaining in this interpretation is, whether those that shall be found alive when our Saviour cometh, shall still so continue till they come to judgement; or upon his first appearance they shall dye, and after death revive, and so together with all those which rise out of their graves, appear before the judgement seat. The consideration of our mortality, and the cause thereof, (that it is appointed for all men once to dye, in that death hath pass'd upon all) might perswade us that the last generation of mankind should tast of death as well as all the rest that went before it; and therefore it † hath bin thought, especially of late, that those whom Christ at his coming finds alive shall immediately dye; and after a sudden and universall expiration shall be restor'd to life again, and joyned with the rest whom the graves shall render, that all may be partakers of the resurrection. But the Apostles description of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea rather excludeth it. a *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 air, and so shall we be ever with the Lord.* 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.

† Omnium enim hominum erit resurrectio. Si omnium erit, ergo omnes moriuntur, ut mors ab Adam ducta omnibus filiis ejus dominetur, & maneat illud privilegium in Domino, *Non dabis Sanctum tuum videre corruptionem.* Hanc rationem maxima Patrum turba tradente suscepimus, *Genadius de Eccles. Dogmat.* cap. 7.

a 1 Thess. 4. 15, 16, 17.

‖ *This is the observation of* Epiphanius, *who from these words proves as much. For having repeated the text, he thus inferrs,* Ἀπὸ τῆς ζωντῶν καὶ νεκρῶν ἐκλογῆς ἐστὶν ἰδεῖν ἐλαχίστως. Διαιρῶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος Ἀπόστολος τοὺς δύο τρόπους τοῦ θανάτου εἰς μίαν ἐλπίδα ζωοποιήσεως, ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμεῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτῶν, ἵνα δείξῃ ὄντως τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα, καὶ οὐχ ἕτερον παρὰ τοῦτο, ὁ καὶ ἁρπαγὲν ἄνω τιθέμενον, Hæres. 64. §. 70.

The

The ſame is further confirmed by the ſame Apoſtle, ſaying, *Behold I ſhew you a myſtery we ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed.* Which being added to the former putteth 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 it ſelf, 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

1 Cor. 15. 51.

† Nam & in hoc ipſum mittimus, dominium noſtrum quod de cœlo eſt ſuperinduere ſiquidem exuti & non nudi inveniamur; id eſt, ante voluimus ſuperinduere virtutem cœleſtem æternitatis; quam carne exuamur. Hujus enim gratiæ privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini deprehendentur in carne, & propter duritias temporum Antichriſti merebuntur compendio mortis per demutationem expunctæ concurrere cum reſurgentibus, ſicut Theſſalonicenſibus ſcribit, Tertul. *de Reſur. Carn.* c. 41. Sancti qui die conſummationis atque judicii in corporibus reperiendi ſunt cum aliis ſanctis qui ex mortuis reſurrecturi ſunt, rapientur in nubibus obviam Chriſto in aera, & non guſtabunt mortem; eruntque ſemper cum Domino, graviſſima mortis neceſſitate calcata, unde ait Apoſtolus, *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur.* Theodorus Heracleotes *Com. ad loc. apud S.* Hieron. *Epiſt.* 152. Apollinarius licet aliis verbis eadem quæ Theodorus aſſeruit; quoſdam non eſſe morituros, ſed de præſenti vita rapiendos in futuram, ut mutatis glorificatiſque corporibus ſint cum Chriſto, *S.* Hieron. *ibid.* Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοῦτό ἐστιν· οὐ πάντες μὲν ἀποθανούμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα, καὶ οἱ μὴ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἅπαντες γὰρ κεκοίμηνται. Μὴ τί ὧν, ἵνα ἐπειδὴ ἀποθνήσκῃς, διὰ τοῦτο δόξῃς, φησὶν, ὡς οὐκ ἐσόμενός ποτε. Εἰ γὰρ τινές, εἶπεν, οἱ καὶ τοῦτο διαφέρονται, καὶ ὅμως οὐκ ἀρχῆς τοῦτο αὐτοῖς εἰς πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν ὠφελεῖν, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ ὀνεῖνα τὰ σώματα τὰ μὴ ἀποθνήσκοντα ἀλλαγῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν μεταπεσεῖν, *S.* Chryſ. *ad locum.* So S. Jerome *ſpeaking of that place* 1 Theſſ. 4. Hoc ex ipſius loci continentia ſciri poteſt, quod Sancti qui in adventu Salvatoris fuerint deprehenſi in corpore, in iiſdem corporibus occurrant ei, ita tamen ut in glorium & corruptivum & mortale gloria & incorruptione & immortalitate mutetur: ut qualia corpora mortuorum ſurrectura ſunt, in talem ſubſtantiam etiam vivorum corpora transformentur, *S.* Hieron. *Epiſt* 148. *ad* Marcellam. *And S.* Auſtin *in relation to the ſame place*, Revera quantum ad verba beati Apoſtoli pertinet, videtur aſſerere quoſdam in fine ſæculi, adveniente Domino, cum futura eſt reſurrectio mortuorum, non eſſe morituros, ſed vivos repertos in illam immortalitatem quæ Sanctis etiam cæteris datur, repente mutan-

dos & simul cum illis rapiendos, sicut dicit, in nubibus. Nec aliquid aliud mihi visum est quoties de his verbis volui cogitare, *S. Aug. ad tertiam Quæst. 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 & alii æque Catholici & eruditi viri, qui credunt animam in corpore manente immutandos ad incorruptionem & immortalitatem eos qui in adventu Domini vivi inveniendi sunt; & hoc eis reputari pro resurrectione ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem præsentis vitæ immutatione deponant, non morte. Quolibet quis acquiescat modo, non est hæreticus, nisi ex contentione hæreticus fiat, *De Eccles. Dogm. cap. 7.*

† *There have been observed three severall readings of that place*, 1 Cor. 15. 51. *one of the* Latine, *two of the* Greek. Illud autem breviter in fine commoneo; hoc, quod in Latinis codicibus legitur, *Omnes quidem resurgemus, non omnes autem immutabimur*, in Græcis voluminibus non haberi, sed vel, *Omnes dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*; vel, *Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*, S. Hieron. *Epist.* 152. *But there was not one of these three onely in the* Latine *Copies, that is the first, but one which was in the* Greek, *was also in the* Latine, *that is the second. For both those* S. Austin *takes notice of.* Nam & illud quod in plerisque codicibus legitur, *Omnes resurgemus*, unde fieri poterit, nisi omnes moriamur? Resurrectio quippe, nisi mors præcesserit, nulla est. Et quod nonnulli codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*, multo facilius & apertius id cogit intelligi, *Ad 3. Quæst. Dulcitii.* Sed aliud rursus occurrit quod idem dicit Apostolus cum de resurrectione corporum ad Corinthios loquereretur, *Omnes resurgemus*, vel, sicut alii codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*, Idem de Civit. Dei, *lib. 20. cap. 20. Two readings therefore were anciently in the* Latine, *two in the* Greek; *one of the* Greek *in the* Latine *and no more. First then that reading*, Omnes quidem resurgemus, *&c. which is at this day in the Vulgar* Latine, *was by the testimony of* S. Jerome *and* S. Austin *the ordinary reading in their times, and is also used by* Tertullian, Horum demutationem ad Corinthios dedit, dicens, *Omnes quidem resurgemus, non autem omnes demutabimur*, De Resur. Carnis, c. 24. *And although* S. Jerome *testifieth that it was not to be found in the* Greek *Copies, yet to the same purpose it is amongst the* Variæ Lectiones March. Velesi. Πάντες ἀναστησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα. *And in* codice Claromontano, *the* Greek *is erased in this place, but the* Latine *left is*, Omnes quidem resurgemus. *As for the second Reading*, Omnes dormiemus, *&c. this was anciently in the* Latine *Copies according to* S. Austin, *and also in the* Greek, *according to* S. Jerome. Didymus *did so read it, and contend for that reading*, Scio quod in nonnullis codicibus scriptum sit, *Non quidem omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*; Sed considerandum est an ei quod præmissum est, *Omnes immutabimur*, possit convenire quod sequitur, *Mortui surgent incorrupti*

rupti & nos immutabimur. Si enim omnes immutabuntur, & hoc commune cum cæteris eſt, ſuperfluum fuit dicere, *& nos immutabimur.* Quamobrem ita legendum eſt, *Omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*, Apud *S. Hieron.* Epiſt. 152. *Indeed* Acacius *Biſhop of* Cæſarea *doth not onely acknowledge this Reading, but ſayeth it was in moſt Copies.* Dicamus primum de eo, quod magis in plurimis codicibus invenitur. *Ecce myſterium dico vobis, Omnes quidem dormiemus, non omnes autem immutabimur* The Alexandrian MS *may confirm this lection, which reads it thus,* Οἱ μὲν πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δ' ἀλλαγησόμεθα, *for the firſt* οὐ *is not written in the line but above it. And the* Æthiopick *Verſion to the ſame purpoſe.* Omnes nos moriemur, ſed non omnes nos immutabimur. *The third Reading,* Non omnes dormiemus, &c. *though it were not anciently in the* Latine, *yet it was frequently found in the* Greek *Copies.* Acacius *teſtifieth thus much,* Tranſeamus ad ſecundam lectionem, quæ ita fertur in pleriſque codicibus, *Non quidem omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*, apud *Hieron.* ibid. *It was ſo anciently read in the time of* Origen, *as appeareth by the fragment taken by S.* Jerome *out of his* Ἐξηγητικὰ *upon the firſt Epiſtle to the* Theſſalonians, *which he mentioneth himſelf in his 2. book againſt* Celſus. *The ſame is acknowledged by* Theodorus Heracleotes, Apollinarius, Didymus, *S.* Chryſoſtome, Theodoret, Theophylact, *and* Oecumenius. *The ſame is confirmed by the ancient* Syriack *Tranſlation,* לא כלן נרקד כלן ירן נתחלף *as alſo by the* Arabick. *Being then of the three Readings but two were anciently found in the* Greek *Copies,* Quæritis quo ſenſu dictum ſit, & quo modo in prima ad Cor. Epiſtola Pauli ſit legendum, *Omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*; an juxta quædam exemplaria, *Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*; utrumque enim in Græcis codicibus invenitur, *S. Hieron.* ibid. *being of thoſe two but ones now to be found, and the* Greek *Fathers ſucceſſively have acknowledged no other, being that which is left agrees with the moſt ancient Tranſlations, we have no reaſon to doubt or queſtion it.*

Text. Wherefore being the place to the *Theſſalonians* ſufficiently proves it of it ſelf, being that to the *Corinthians*, as we read it, invincibly confirmeth the ſame truth, I conclude that the living when Chriſt ſhall come, are properly diſtinguiſhed from all thoſe which dye before his coming; becauſe death it ſelf hath paſſed upon the one, & onely a change different from death ſhall paſſe 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 tribunall seat, and so shall truly come to judge both *the quick and the dead.*

† *This was well observed by S. Austin*, Si autem in illis verbis Apostoli nullus alius sensus poterit reperiri, & hoc eum intelligi voluisse clarum erit, quod videntur ipsa verba clamare; id est, quod futuri sint in fine seculi, & secundo adventu Domini, qui non expolientur corpore, sed superinduantur immortalitate, ut absorbeatur mortale à vita: huic sententiæ proculdubio convenit quod in Regula Fidei confitemur, *venturum Dominum, judicaturum vivos & mortuos*, ut non hic intelligamus vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quamvis judicandi sint & justi & injusti, sed vivos, quos nondum exiisse, mortuos autem, quos jam exiisse de corporibus, adventus ejus inveniet, *ad 3. Quæst.* Dulcitii. *And* Origen *long before did make the same exposition of those words*, That he might be Lord both of the dead and living, *Rom.* 14. 9. Ὅρα γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ὅτι ἀπέθανεν Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα νεκρῶν κυριεύσῃ, καὶ ἀνέστη ἵνα μὴ μόνον νεκρῶν ἄρχῃ καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. Καὶ οἶδέ γε ὁ Ἀπόστολος νεκροὺς μὲν ὧν κυριεύει ὁ Χριστὸς, λέγων ὅτι κατηλεγμένους ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτῃ (σημαίνει γὰρ, καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι) ζῶντας δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡμᾶς λαγχανομένους, ἑτέρους ὄντας ἢ ἐγερθησομένων νεκρῶν, ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἴδιόν τι λέξις ὅπως, Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλαγησόμεθα ἐξῆς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι τῷ, Οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται πρῶτον. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς πρώτῃ ἐπίσης λέξει πως αὐτὴν διαφορὰν παρίστησι φησὶν, ἡμεῖς μὲ οἱ τῶν κοιμωμένων, ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ζῶντας λέγων, *&c.* l. 2. contra Celsum. *Which Exposition is far more proper then that of* Methodius, Ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σωμάτων παραλαμβάνον· ζώντων μὲ τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ δὲ θανάτου, νεκρῶν δὲ τῆς σωμάτων, Phot. *in Biblio. Cod.* 234. *and* Ruffinus, Quid autem dicitur *judicare* vivos & mortuos, nisi quod alii vivi alii mortui ad judicium veniant? sed animæ simul judicabuntur & corpora, in quibus vivos animas, corpora mortuos nominavit, *Expos. in Symb.*

To believe an universall Judgement 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 shipwrack. That which made the Prophet *David* confesse, his *feet were almost gone*, his *steps had well nigh slipt*, hath hurried multitudes of men to eternall perdition. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent

Psal. 73. 2.

miseries

miſeries of the righteous, the frequent perſecutions of virtue, and eminent rewards of vice, the ſweet and quiet departures often attending upon the moſt diſſolute, & horrid tortures putting a period to the moſt religious lives, have rais'd a ſtrong temptation of doubt & miſtruſt whether there be a God that judgeth the earth. Nor is there any thing in this life conſidered alone, which can give the leaſt rationall ſatisfaction to this temptation. Except there be a life to come after ſuch a death as we dayly ſee, except in that life there be rewards and puniſhments otherwiſe diſpenſed then here they are, how can we ground any acknowledgement 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 profeſſe, that a juſt and exact retribution is deferr'd, that a due and proportionate diſpenſation of rewards and puniſhments is reſerved to another world, and conſequently that there is an Univerſall Judgement to come.

Secondly, it is neceſſary to believe a Judgement to come, thereby effectually to provoke our ſelves to the breaking off our ſinnes 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 ſweetneſſe of our ſinnes, ſuch the connaturalneſſe 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 bitterneſſe to his own ſoul. But being once perſwaded of a judgement, and withall poſſeſſed with a ſenſe of our ſinnes, who will not tremble with *Felix*? who will not *flee from the wrath to come*? what muſt the *hardneſſe* be of that *impenitent heart* which *treaſureth up unto it ſelf wrath againſt the day of wrath and* Rom. 2. 5.

revelation of the righteous judgement of God? We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills, and the inclination of our own hearts: all externall rules and prescriptions are burthensome to us; and did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfie any other desires then 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 onely so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule of Gods revealed will, that *God shall judge the*
Rom. 2. 16. *secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospell:* There is in every man not onely a power to reflect, but a necessary reflexion upon his actions, not onely a voluntary remembrance, but also an irresistible judgement of his own conversation. Now if there were no other judge beside our own soules, we should be regardlesse of our own sentence, and wholly unconcern'd in our own condemnations. But if we were perswaded that these reflexions of conscience are to be so many witnesses before the tribunall 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 indeavour above
2 Pet. 3. 11. 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 godlinesse looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God.* Reason it self will tell us thus much; but if that doe not, or if we will not
Tit. 2. 11, 12, 13. hearken to our own voice; *the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, that denying ungodlinesse 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.*

Thirdly, it is necessary to professe faith in Christ as Judge

Judge of the quick and the dead, for the ſtrengthning our hope, for the augmenting our comfort, for the eſtabliſhing our aſſurance of eternall life. If we look upon the Judgement to come, onely 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 tribunall, or a happineſſe at the laſt day. We muſt confeſſe 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 judgement, as ſuch, there can be nothing but a fearfull expectation of eternall miſery, and an abſolute deſpair of everlaſting happineſſe. 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 mildneſſe and mercies of the Goſpell; and then we may look upon not onely the precepts but alſo the promiſes of God; whatſoever ſentence in the ſacred Scripture ſpeaketh any thing of hope, whatſoever text adminiſtreth 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 Judgement to come; becauſe by that Goſpel which contains them all we ſhall be judged. If we conſider whoſe Goſpell it is, and who ſhall judge us by it, *we are the members of his body, of his fleſh and of his bones*; for *which cauſe he is not aſhamed to call us brethren. As one of our brethren* he hath *redeemed us*, he hath laid down his life as a ranſome for us. He is our High Prieſt who made an atonement for our ſinnes, a *mercifull and faithfull High Prieſt in all things, being made like unto his brethren.* He which is Judge is alſo our Advocate; and who ſhall condemn us, if he ſhall paſſe the ſentence upon us, who maketh interceſſion for us? Well therefore

Eph. 5. 30. Heb. 2. 11. Lev. 25. 48. Heb. 2. 17.

may

Eph. 3. 12. may *we have boldneſſe and acceſſe 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*

Joh. 5. 24. *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.*

Having thus explained the nature of the judgement 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 perſwaded of this as of an infallible and neceſſary truth, that the eternall Son of God, in that humane nature, in which he dyed, 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 judgement 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 tormented with the Devil and his Angels, and pronouncing the ſentence of abſolution upon all the elect, ſhall tranſlate them into his glorious kingdome of which there ſhall be no end. And thus I believe in Jeſus Chriſt, *who ſhall judge the quick and the dead,*

ARTICLE

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 bin sufficient, but that so many particulars concerning the Son doe intervene. For as we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: so doe we make Confession of our faith, saying, *I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; and the Ancients, whose Creed was something shorter, made no repetition of the Act of faith, but onely 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*. Wherefore being this word, *I believe*, is taken here onely by way of resumption or repetition, and consequently must be of the same sense and importance of which it was in the beginning of the Creed, it may well receive the same explication 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

† *So the Ancient* Greek *MS.* εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον; *and* Marcellus, εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα; *as also* Arrius *and* Eunoius, *and the Council of* Nice. *Thus also the* Latines, Post hoc ponitur in ordine fidei, Et in Spiritum Sanctum, *Ruffinus in Symb.* Max. Taurin. Author *lib. de Symb. ad Catechum.* The MS. *in the* Oxford *Library*, Et in Spiritu Sancto. *Others inlead of the Conjunction made use of* Credo *by way of repetition.* Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, *Chrysol. Eusch.* Gallican. *Author* Serm. de Tempore, *Etherius Uxam. the* Greek *and* Latine *MS. in* Bennet *Colleage Library, and* Credo in Sancto Spiritu, *Venantius Fortunatus.*

* *As the Ancient* Saxon *Creed set forth by* Freherus.

** Gregory Nazianzene *disputing for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, proveth that he is no Creature, thus,* Ἀλλ' οὐ μὲ κλόνει, πῶς οὐκ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἐρῶ; ἢ ὃ οὐ πνεῦμα ἐρῶ; ἢ ὃ μὴ λατρεύω θεὸν εἶναι; ἢ ὃ μὴ λατρεύω θεὸν πνεῦμα εἶναι· ἢ μὲ μὴ μάχῃ ὅτι δεσπότου, τὸν δοῦλον πρόβαλλε; *Orat.* 37. Epiphanius *seems to speak thus much, shewing that though the Fathers of the* Nicene *Council had determined nothing particularly of the Holy Ghost, yet they sufficiently shew that he is God by those words,*

καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Εὐδὺς γὰρ ἡ ἔκθεσις ὁμολογεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀρνεῖται· Πιστεύομεν γὰρ εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα. Τὸ δὲ πιστεύομεν οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται ἀντὶ τοῦ πίστις εἰς τὸν Θεόν. Καὶ, εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς Θεὸν ἡ πίστις. Καὶ, εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς μίαν δοξολογίαν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἕνωσιν θεότητος καὶ μίαν ὁμοουσιότητα, εἰς θεία τέλεια, μίαν θεότητα, μίαν ὑσίαν, μίαν δοξολογίαν, μίαν κυριότητα, ἀπὸ τῶν πιστευομένων καὶ πιστευομένη; *Haref.* 74. Agnoscamus verbi ipsius privilegium. Credere illi quilibet potest hominum, credere vero in illum soli debere te Majestati noveris. Sed & hoc ipsum aliud est *Deum credere*, aliud est *credere in Deum*. Esse Deum & Diabolus credere dicitur, secundum Apostolum; nam & dæmones credunt & contremiscunt. In Deum vero credere, hoc est fideliter eum quærere, & tota in eum dilectione transire. Credo ergo in illum hoc est dicere, Confiteor illum, colo illum, adoro illum, totum me in jus ejus ac dominium trado, atque transfundo. In professionis hujus reverentia universa divino nomini debita continentur obsequia, Paschasius *in Præfat. Operis de Spiritu S.*

becaus̄e we *believe in the Holy Ghost*; yet being that language is not expresly 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 onely the expression of the Church conteined in the Creed, being in the same Creed many of the Ancients, without any reprehension, have used the same phrase in the following Articles expresly, and where the prepositiō 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 greater force in the prepositiō.

It will therefore be sufficient for the explication of this Article, if we can declare what is the full and proper object of our Faith conteined in it, what we are obliged to believe concerning *the Holy Ghost*. And as to this we shall discharge our undertaking, and satisfie 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 expres'd. The addition of holinesse though it denote the intrinsecall sanctity essentially belonging to that Spirit, yet notwithstanding

ſtanding it conteineth alſo a derivative notion, as ſignifiing an emanation of that holineſſe, 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 intrinſecall 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 then 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 *Sadduces* ſeemed to deny it, * who *ſaid that there is no reſurrection, neither angel, nor ſpirit*; though it hath † bin ordinarily concluded from thence that they rejected the Holy Ghoſt, yet it cannot be proved from thoſe words that they denyed the exiſtence of the Spirit of God, any more then that they denyed the exiſtence of God, who is a Spirit; nor did the Notion which the *Jews* had of the Spirit of God any way encline the *Sadduces*, who denyed the exiſtence of the angels and the ſoules of men, to reject it. The Reſurrection, Angel, and Spirit, which the *Sadduces* refuſed to acknowledge, were but two particulars, for it is expreſly added that the *Phariſees confeſſed both*; of which two, the Reſurrection was one, * Angels and Spirits were the other; wherefore that which the *Sadduces* disbelieved was the exiſtence of ſuch created ſpirituall natures, as the Angels and the ſoules of men are conceived to have. And as for thoſe diſciples at

Act. 23. 8.

† *As* Epiph. *Hæreſ.* 14. Πνεῦμα ἅγιον οὐκ ἦσαν. *And* Gregory Nazianzene, Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Σαδδυκαῖοι οὐκ ἐδέχοντο· τὸ θεῖον ἐνόμιζον (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀγγέλους, οὐδὲ ἀναστάσιν) οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν τὰς τοιαύτας περὶ αὐτῶν ὑπονοίας ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ διαπεφύσηκε.

Orat. 37. * Φαρισαῖοι δέ, φησὶν, ὁμολογοῦσι τὰ ἀμφότερα· καὶ μὴν, τεῖα ἐστὶ· πῶς ἂν λέγει ἀμφότερα; ἢ ὅτι πνεῦμα καὶ ἄγγελος ἓν ὄν, S. Chryſ. ad locum.

Act. 19. 2. *Epheſus*, who had *not ſo much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghoſt*; 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 baptiſme of *John*, it ſignifieth not that they never heard of the Spirit of God, but onely that they had not heard of the giving of it, which the Apoſtle mentioned.

Joh. 7. 39. As we read elſewhere, that *the Holy Ghoſt was not yet*; not denying the exiſtence, but the plentifull effuſion of it. Howſoever, the Apoſtle asked thoſe ignorant Diſciples, *Unto what then were ye baptized?* intimating that if they were baptized according to the rule of Chriſt, they could not be ignorant that there is an Holy Ghoſt; becauſe the Apoſtles were commanded to *Baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* It is therefore preſumed that every one who profeſſeth the name of Chriſt, from the firſt baptiſmal inſtitution acknowledgeth that there is an Holy Ghoſt; and the onely queſtion conſiſts in this, what that Holy Ghoſt is, in whoſe name we are baptized and in whom according to our baptiſme we profeſſe to believe.

† *To conclude the Nature of the Holy Ghoſt, which is not ſo immediately expreſſed in the Scriptures, it will be needfull ſo to place our aſſertions as they may ſecurre to all other miſconceptions.*

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 joyned with the Father and the Son in the form of Baptiſme, is a Perſon. That bleſſed Spirit is not onely an † energy or operation, not a quality or power, but of a ſpirituall and intellectuall ſubſiſtence. *Now the old Notions, and more they can not now have, were thus deliver'd by* Gregory Nazianzene, *that great Divine ſo much concern'd in this Subject.* Τῶν δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς σοφῶν οἱ μὲν οὐσίωσαν τοῦτο (τὸ πνεῦμα) ὑπέλαβον, οἱ δὲ κίνημα, οἱ δὲ θεὸν, οἱ δὲ ἀκριβέστερον οὐδέτερον τούτων, αἰδοῖ τῆς γραφῆς, ὡς φασιν, ἑκάτερον σαφῶς δυλωούσης, Orat. 37. *Theſe were the three particular and oppoſite Opinions, 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 ἅγιον ἢ ἐν ἄλλῳ ἢ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὑφεστηκότων πάντως ὑποδεέστερον, ἢ ἐν ὁτέρῳ θεωρυμένων, ὧν τὸ μὲν οὐσίαν κεκλῆσιν οἱ περὶ ταῦτα δεινοὶ, τὸ δὲ συμβεβηκός. *Either it is ſubſiſting in it ſelf, as a ſubſtance, or in another, as an accident. This was the firſt queſtion then, and ſtill is.*

† If

† If we conceived it as an operation onely, then muſt it onely 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 any thing operative in the world beſide, and conſequently if they be not ſanctified by that, they can be ſuſceptible of no holineſſe. 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 reall and admirable effects? If there were no other Argument but this, that we are aſſured by the Chriſtian faith, that there is an 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 boldneſſe to aſſert the Holy Ghoſt, in whoſe name we are baptized, to be nothing elſe but a quality.

† *This is the Argument of the ſame Father,* Εἰ δὲ οὐ συμβέβηκεν, ἐνέργειαν τοῦτο εἶναι Θεοῦ. Ἢ οὐσίαν ἕτερον, ἢ τίνα; τοῦτο γάρ πως μόλις ἔχει φεύγειν ζωὸν θεσιν, καὶ εἰ ἐνέργεια, ἐνεργήσει. ἀναλογόν ἐκ ἐνεργήσῃ, καὶ ὁμοῦ τῷ ἐνεργηθῆναι παύσεται· τοιοῦτον δὲ ἡ ἐνέργεια. Πῶς οὖν ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ τί δὲ λέγει, καὶ ἀφορίζει, καὶ λυπεῖ, καὶ παρεξύνεται, καὶ ὅσα κινημάτα σαφῶς δεῖται κινήσεως.

But we are not left to gueſſe at the nature of the Spirit of God; the word of God which came from that Spirit hath ſufficiently delivered him as a perſon. He is clearly oppoſed to thoſe evil Spirits, which are and muſt be acknowledged perſons, of a ſpirituall and intellectuall 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 goe 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; and goe out* 1 Sam. 16. 14. 2 Chron. 18. 20, 21.

and doe 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 whome the other cometh.

Again, the New Teſtament doth deſcribe the Holy Ghoſt by ſuch perſonall diſpoſitions, and with ſuch operations, as are as evident marks and ſignes 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 perſonall 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*; & 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 perſonall: for he *ſearcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God*, and ſo he knoweth all things, *even the things of God*; which can be no deſcription of the power of God; he *worketh all* the ſpirituall 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 ſonnes 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 goe with them doubting nothing, for I have ſent them*: 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.* We cannot better underſtand the Nature of the Holy Ghoſt then 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*

Eph. 4. 30.

Rom. 8. 26.

1 Cor. 2, 10, 11.

Act. 10. 19.

Act. 13. 2.

Joh. 14. 26.

ſend in my name, he ſhall teach you all things, he ſhall teſtifie of me, and ye alſo ſhall bear witneſſe. If I goe 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 ſhew you things to come; he ſhall glorifie me, for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you. 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. 15. 26, 27. 16. 7, 8, 13, 14.

† *The preſent Adverſaries to this truth are the Socinians, and their opinion was thus firſt delivered by Socinus,* Quod in teſtimoniis ſacris quæ adverſarii citant Spiritui S. actiones tribuuntur, & ea quæ perſonarum ſunt propria, ex hoc nihil concludi poteſt, cum aliis rebus quas perſonas non eſſe conſtat, ſimiliter in Scripturis ſacris actiones tribuantur, & ea quæ ſunt propria perſonarum. Cujus rei pleniſſimam fidem facere poteſt vel locus ille Pauli 1 *Cor.* 13. à *v.* 4. ad 8. ubi perpetuo de Charitate, tanquam de perſona aliqua loquitur, illi permulta tribuens, quæ revera non niſi in perſonam cadunt, *Fauſtus ocinus* contra *Wickum*, c. 10. a 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7.

The † Adverſaries to this truth acknowledging all theſe perſonall 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: as when the Apoſtle ſaith a *Charity ſuffereth long and is kind, charity envieth not, charity vaunteth not it ſelf, is not puffed up, doth not behave it ſelf unſeemly, ſeeketh not her own, is not eaſily provoked, thinketh none evil, rejoyceth not in iniquity but rejoyceth in the truth beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* All which perſonall actions, are attributed to charity which is no perſon, as in * other caſes it is uſuall, but belong-

* *So the* Racovian *Catechiſm doth enlarge this Anſwer, ſtating the queſtion thus,* Qui vero iis Scripturæ loci accipiendi ſunt in quibus Sp. S actiones perſonarum propriæ & ad Deum ipſum ſpectantes, attribuuntur? *And returning this ſolution,* Ad eum modum, quod in Scripturis rebus id attribuatur ſæpenumero, quod perſonarum eſt, neqitamen res illæ propterea perſonæ cenſentur, ut peccato, quod *deceperit*, & *occiderit*, Rom 7 11 & legi, quod *loquatur*, Rom 3.19. & Scripturæ quod *proſpiciat* & *prænunciet*, Gal. 3. 8. & Charitati quod ſit *longanimis*, &c. 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. Denique Spiritui, *i. e.* vento, quod ſpiret ubi velit; *Cap.* vi.

belonging to that perſon which is charitable; 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, perſonall actions are attributed to the Holy Ghoſt, which is no perſon, but onely 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 perſonall 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 & get thee down and goe with them doubting nothing; for I have ſent them*: we muſt underſtand that God the Father was the perſon which ſpake thoſe words, & 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 ſumme of their anſwer; and more then this I conceive cannot be ſaid in anſwer to that Argument which we urge from thoſe perſonall expreſſions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a perſon.

* Quod ſi quis dixerit ſatis conſtare Paulum eo in loco figurate loqui, & charitatis nomine eum intelligere qui charitate eſt præditus, quatenus ea eſt præditus: Reſpondebo, Cum Spiritus S. ſit Spiritus Dei, certumque ſit alioqui ſpiritũ alicujus perſonæ non poſſe eſſe perſonã ab ea cujus eſt Spiritus diſtinctam, non minus conſtare cum Spiritui S. ea tribuuntur, quæ perſonæ & ſimul ipſius Dei ſunt propria, nihil aliud intelligendum nomine Spiritus S. eſſe, quam ipſum Deum ſpiritu ſuo, id eſt, virtute atque efficacia ſua, agentem atque operantem. *F. Socinus ibid.* Quoniam vero Spiritus S. virtus Dei eſt, hinc fit ut ea quæ Dei ſunt, Spiritui S. attribuantur, & ſub nomine Spiritus S. ſæpe Deus ipſe intelligatur, quatenus ſuam virtutem Deus per Spiritum ſuum exerit, *Catech. Racov. ibid.*

But this Anſwer is moſt apparently inſufficient, as giving no ſatisfaction to the Argument. For if all the perſonall

ſonall 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 theſe actions be perſonall, 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 doe that, by the power within him, which is ſaid to be done by the Holy Ghoſt, then is that deſence not to be defended; then muſt the Holy Ghoſt be acknowledged a perſon. But I ſhall clearly prove, that there are ſeverall perſonall attributes given expreſly 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 doe; 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 perſonall action, and this action is attributed to the Spirit of God, *becauſe he maketh interceſſion for the Saints according to the will of God.* Rom. 8. 27. 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 perſonall action of interceſſion 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 perſonall 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 goe 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 expreſly to ſend, and that in the name of the Son (*whom the Father will ſend in my name*, ſaith our Savi-

our.) 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 perſonall 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 doe it. To ſpeak and hear are perſonall actions, and both together attributed 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 himſelf: but whatſoever he ſhall hear, that he ſhall ſpeak.* Now to ſpeak and not of himſelf cannot be attributed to God the Father, who doeth all things of himſelf; to ſpeak what he heareth, and that of the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorifie him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as Chriſt ſpeaketh of the Holy Ghoſt, *He ſhall glorifie me for he ſhall receive of mine, and ſhew it to you*, is by no means applicable to the Father; and conſequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghoſt is therefore ſaid to doe theſe perſonall 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 perſonall actions attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, is ſound and valid. From whence I conclude againſt the *Socinians* and the † *Jews*, that the Holy Ghoſt is not a quality, but a Perſon; which is our firſt Aſſertion.

† *The Opinion of the Jews was, that the Holy Ghoſt was nothing elſe but the* afflatus *or energy of God, and therefore they which denyed the ſubſtantiality of the Spirit were look'd upon as ſymbolizing with the Jews in this particular.* Lactantius in libris ſuis, & maxime in Epiſtolis ad Demetrianum Spiritus S. omnino negat ſubſtantiam; & errore Judaico dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel ad Filium, & ſanctificationem utriuſque Perſonæ ſub ejus nomine demonſtrari, S. Hieron. *Epiſt.* 55. Moſes Maimonides *ſufficiently declareth the opinion of the* Jews, *who delivering the ſeverall ſignifications of* רוח, *in keeth the fifth and ſixth to be theſe.* Quinto ſignificat Influentiam illam intellectualem divinam à Deo Prophetis inſtillatam, cujus virtute prophetant. Sexto ſignificat Propoſitum, & Voluntatem. *And then concludes,* Vox hæc רוח quando Deo attribuitur, ubiq; ſumitur partim in quinta, partim in ſexta ſignificatione, quatenus voluntatem ſignificat, *More Nevochim*, p. 1. c. 40.

Our

Our second Assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we professe 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 Ghost 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.* That this Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost I find denyed by none. That the same spirit is in God, appeareth by the Apostles discourse, and is granted by the † *Socinians*: 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; inas-

1 Corinth. 2. 11.

† *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, &c. as they say, there can be but one, therefore the Holy Ghost is not a Person. Deinde idem (*sc. Sp. S.* non esse personam) ex eo patet, quod non sit extra Deum natura sed in ipso Deo, Nisi enim natura Deo inesset, non potuisset Paulus Spiritum Dei cum spiritu hominis qui homini inest natura conferre, idque eo in loco, 1 Cor. 2. 11. ubi ait, *Quis hominum novit quæ sunt hominis nisi spiritus hominis qui est in homine? ita quæ sunt Dei nemo novit nisi Spiritus Dei.* Quoniam vero Spiritus *S.* in Deo est, nec tamen in Spiritu *S.* reciproce dici potest esse Deum, hinc apparet Sp. S. non esse Personam. Præterea cum superius demonstratum sit unam tantum esse in Deitate personam, & Spiritus *S.* sit Dei virtus, ut verba Christi ad Apostolos indicant, *Luc.* 24. 49. efficitur Spiritum *S.* esse personam divinam. Denique si Spiritus *S.* esset persona, essentiam quoque divinam eum habere oporteret. Nam ea attribuuntur illi quæ propria sunt essentiæ divinæ: at superius docuimus substantiâ divinâ unâ esse numero, nec tribus personis esse posse communè. Quamobrè Sp. S. non esse Deitatis personâ planè est, *Catech. Racho. c. 6. To the same purpose doth* Socinus *argue against* Wiekus, *that the nature of the Spirit is the nature of God, & 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, & from this place have refer'd with them, that the same spirit is in God & of the divine nature, it followeth that he is no created Spirit, inasmuch as the divine nature cannot be created.*

much as that cannot be a created perſon which hath not a created nature, & that cannot 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 expreſſ'd, which muſt be acknowledged to be underſtood. 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 onely denyed to be in God, becauſe it is not ſaid ſo when it is implyed,) therefore he is no created Perſon.

Secondly, the Holy Ghoſt is ſuch a Perſon, 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 ſinnes and blaſphemies committed againſt God the Father or the Son of God; that this ſin hath an aggravation added unto it beyond other ſinnes and blaſphemies: but if the Holy Spirit were no perſon, the ſin could not be diſtinct from thoſe ſinnes 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 ſinnes 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

* Mat. 12. 31, 32. Quomodo audent inter omnia numerare Spiritum S. quando ipſe Dominus dixerit, *Qui blaſphemaverit in Filium hominis remittetur ei, qui autem blaſphemaverit in Spiritum S. nec hic nec in futurum remittetur ei.* Quomodo igitur inter creaturas audet quiſquã Spiritũ computare? Aut quis ſic ſe obligat, ut ſi creaturæ derogaverit, non putet ſibi hoc aliqua venia relaxandum? S. Ambroſe *De Spiritu S.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

to our purpoſe; but they doe not, cannot ſhew 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 the 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 it now put under the feet of the Son of man. Therefore the Spirit of God can be no created perſon. *All things were made by the Word, and without him was not any thing 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, *a created perſon, did alſo teach that he was made by the Son, as* Epiphanius *teſtifieth of the* Arians. Παυλὸς τοῦτο δῆλόν ὅτιν ὅτι ὁμολογῦσι πρὸ ἀγγέλους ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ ὅδ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημοῦσι καὶ τολμῶσι λέγειν κτιστὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ, *Hær.* 69. § 52. Ariani ab Ario, in eo ſunt notiſſimi errore quo Patrem & Filium, & Spiritum S. nolunt eſſe unius ejuſdemque naturæ, ſed eſſe Filium creaturam, Sp. vero S. creaturam creaturæ, hoc eſt, ab ipſo Filio creatum volunt, *S.* Auguſt. *Hær.* 49. *Vide* Euſebius, Τὸ δὲ ἄδιάκριτον Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ὥτε Θεὸς, ὥτε υἱὸς, ἐπεὶ μὴ ὂν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁμοίως τῷ υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν ὑπόστασιν εἴληφεν, ὃν δέ τι τῆς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ γνωμένων πυγκάνει, ὅτι δ' πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ

Joh. 1. 3.

1 Cor. 15. 27.

Job 26. 13.

Thoſe which anciently did believe the Spirit of God to be

αὐτῷ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν, *De Eccl. Theolog.* lib. 3. cap. 6. Ὁ δὲ μόνος καὶ παρεικὼς θεότητι τετιμημένος καὶ πιστικὸς αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ δημιουργητικὸς τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου φύσεως πάντων, δεχθεὶς τε καὶ ἀποστάντων, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ παρακλήτου Πνεύματος ὑπουργίας· πάντα γὰρ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν, ibid. *Where it is worth our Observation, that* Eusebius *citing the place of* S. John, *to prove that the Holy Ghost was made by the Son, leaves out those words twice together by which the Catholicks used to refute that hereſie of the* Arians, *viz.* δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. *All things which were made were made by the Son, but the Holy Ghoſt was not amongſt them all* ἐγένετο, *which were made, and therefore was not made by the Son.* Τὸ Ἅγιον γὰρ Πνεῦμα κτίσμα φασὶν εἶναι, διὰ τὸ, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὰ πάντα γεγονέναι, ὡς ἔπεσιν ἡ γραφή, ἀσυνέτως τινὰς διαπαίζοντες, ἃ μηδὲ ὑπὸ ῥητοῦ τὸ κτλὸν εἰρημένον κεκτῆσθαι τὴν κακὴν αὐτῶν ὑπόνοιαν παρορμωμένους· ὑφ' οὗ τὸ θεῖον Εὐαγγέλιον περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔφη, μηδὲ περὶ πάντων τῶν κεκτισμένων, ὅτι οὐ τι κτίσμα διὰ τοῦ Λόγου γεγένηται, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου· τὸ γὰρ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν, παρεκτεθειμένης τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ἔχει, ὃ γέγονεν, ἵνα ὅτω γένηται, ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν, Epiphan. *Hæreſ.* 69. §. 56.

phets, 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 giveth all ſpirituall gifts, ***dividing to every man ſeverally as he will***; ſo that in this kingdome of Chriſt all things are done ***by the power of the Spirit of God.***

1 Cor. 12. 11.

Rom. 15. 19.

Fourthly, He, by whoſe operation Chriſt was conceived in the 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 bin the cauſe of his conception, he had bin 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, 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;

Luc. 1. 35.

ſon; which is our ſecond Aſſertion againſt the ancient, but newly revived Hereſie of the † *Arians* and *Macedonians*.

† *This expreſſe notion of the Spirit of God, that he was a perſon, as a miniſtring 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* Anomeans *or pure* Arrians, *ſuch as were* Actius, Eunomius, *&* Eudoxius, *and the* Homeouſians, *or* Semiarians, *ſuch as* Euſebius, *and* Macedonius; *they both alike denied the Divinity, and aſſerted the creation of the Holy Ghoſt. The Opinion of the* Anomeans *is clear out of the words of* Eunomius, *who very ſubtilly delivered it as if it had bin the opinion of the Ancients,* Τὴν δὲ ἁγίαν ὁν ἅπασι φυλάττοντας διδασκαλίαν, παρ' ὧν τέλεον αὐτὸ ἀξιώματι καὶ τάξει μαθόντες, πρίν τι καὶ τῇ φύσει πεπιστεύκαμεν. *The confeſſion of the Ancients was that the Holy Ghoſt was the third perſon of 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,* Τρίτον τάξει καὶ φύσει, παραδείγματι μὲν τῆς Πατρὸς, ἐνεργείᾳ δὲ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς· τρίτη χώρα τιμωμένων, ὡς πρῶτον καὶ μεῖζον ἁπάντων, καὶ μόνον πιστὸν τῷ μονογενεῖ πίνημα; Θεότητος καὶ δημιουργικῆς δυνάμεως ἀπολειπόμενον. *And again,* Εἰ μὲ κτίσμα ἐστὶν, ὡσαύτως γέννημα ἢ ἀγέννητον· εἰς δὲ ἀνάρχως θεὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος· ἔστι μὲν γέννημα, λείπεται οὖν κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα αὐτὸ ὀνομάζειν, apud *S. Baſil. adverſ. Eunom.* lib. 3. So Gregory Nyſſen *repeats the words of the ſame* Eunomius, Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Παράκλητον, ὁμοούσιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς, *and declares that their ordinary language was* αὐτὸ τὸ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος κτίσμα κτίσματος καὶ ἕτερον ἕργον ὀνομάζουσιν, *Orat.* 1. *contra* Eunomium. *Beſide theſe, the* Semiarians *and ſome of thoſe which were Orthodox as to the Divinity of the Son, were of the ſame Hereſie as to the nature of the Holy Ghoſt, and therefore were called* Πνευματομάχοι *(as* Epiphanius *derives them in the deſcription of that Hereſie,* ἀπὸ Ἡμιαρείων καὶ ἀπὸ Ὀρθοδόξων *) and afterward* Macedoniani. Macedoniani ſunt à Macedonio Conſtantinopolitanæ Eccleſiæ Epiſcopo, quos & Πνευματομάχους Græci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu S. litigent. Nam de Patre & Filio recte ſentiunt, quod unius ſit ejuſdemque ſubſtantiæ vel eſſentiæ, ſed de Spiritu S. hoc noluntce edere, creaturam eum eſſe dicentes, *S. Auguſt.* Hæreſ. 52. *This Hereſie was firſt condemned by the Council of* Alexandria, Ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι θεολογήσαντες τῇ ὁμουσίῳ τελέως συναυξανόμενοι, Socrat. *l.* 3. *c.* 7. *Afterward by the Council held in* Illyricum Ἡμεῖς δὲ φρονοῦμεν ὡς καὶ αἱ Σωίεδοι, ἑνὶ ἢ τρισὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἡ κατὰ Γαλατίαν, μίαν εἶδος καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν οὐσίαν, τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὁμοτίμους, τυπίσιν ὁμοτίμοις τριάσι καταστάσει, *apud* Theodoret. *Hiſt. Eccl.* l. 4. c. 8. *The Synod held at* Rome *with the* Gallican *Biſhops under* Damaſus. Ὥστε τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἑνὸς θεότητος, καὶ ἀρχῆς, καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ ἑνὸς χαρακτῆρος πιστεύειν καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς καταστάσεως καὶ ἁγιότητος, τὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, *Apud* Theodoret. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 22. *Another Synod held under the ſame* Damaſus *at* Rome, Εἴ τις εἶπει τὸ Πνεῦμα

Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον πτίσμα, ἢ διὰ τῆς ὑιῆς γεγονὸς, ἀναθεματίζω, apud Theodor. l. 5. c. 10. *After and upon these particular Synods this Heresie was fully condemned in the second Generall Councel held at* Constantinople, *in which these words were added to the* Nicene *Creed,* Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ συν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ὑιῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν Προφητῶν. *And in the first Canon, mentioning the Heresies condemned expresly by the Council; they name ἰδικῶς τὴν τῶν Εὐνομιανῶν, εἴτουν Ἀνομοίων, καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἀρειανῶν, εἴτουν Εὐδοξιανῶν, καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἡμιαρειανῶν, ἤγουν Πνευματομάχων. *And thus the Heresie of* Macedonius, *who made the Holy Ghost a created Person, was condemned by the second Generall councel,* ὡς ἐκ οὖν ὁ ἱεροφάντης χορὸς Μακεδονίου τινὰ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ὄρον ἄρπαγμα πάλαι ποτὲ ὄντα, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ζωαρχικὸν ἐυσεβῶς Πνεῦμα, ἐυθυμίας ἐδικῶς δοῦναι· ὡς δ' Ἀρείῳ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ παλαιὰ ἐξεπαπάτησε Πνεύματι, εἰς δύλας καὶ ὑπηρέτας τὴν δεσποτικὴν καὶ ὑπερκειμένην αὐτῶν συνέπαθε χειρότητα, Photius *Epist.* 1.

Our 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 professe 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 eternall God. And there is this great felicity in the laying of this third Assertion, that it is not proved onely by the two precedent 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 eternall & omnipotent power of God; he which denies the second, asserts that he is a Person, of an intellectuall nature subsisting; but whatsoever is a Person subsisting of eternall and omnipotent power, must be acknowledged to be God. Whether therefore we look upon the truth of our Assertions, or whether we consider the happinesse 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

ſure us of the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt, to make us undoubtingly 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 vail off, untill he came out.* Exod. 34. 34. 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 vail is upon their heart. Nevertheleſſe when it ſhall turn to the Lord, the vail ſhall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit.* 2 Cor. 3. 17. The Spirit is here ſo plainly ſaid to be the Lord, that is, *Jehovah* the one Eternall 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 denyals muſt ſeem very ſtrange to any perſon which conſidereth the force and plainneſſe of the Apoſtles diſcourſe. But indeed they are ſo ready to deny any thing, 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 Apoſtles 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 call'd the Spirit of the Lord. Nay were it not that the coherence of the diſcourſe did ſatisfie us; yet the objection ought not at all to move us; for the name of Spirit in thoſe places mentioned by them to ſignifie *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 the place either of an entire ſubject or a prædicate in a propoſition except by way of 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 eternall 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 alwayes, unleſſe 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

† *The places alleadged by them are theſe,* Πρὸς τὰ παλαιὰ βιβλία ὁ Πνεῦμα ἐστὶ γράμμα, Roman 2. 29. Ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος, καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος, Rom. 7. 6. Ἅτις καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ Αἴγυπτος, Rev. 11. 8. *One of theſe places ſpeaks onely adverbially; the other two have* Πνεῦμα *in obliquo; and one of thoſe two have it* cum adjuncto, *both of them* cum oppoſito, *none of them* cum articulo, *none of them are in* loco ſubjecti *or* prædicati; *and therefore how any of theſe can ſhew, that* τὸ Πνεῦμα *in this place by us urged, inveſted with an Article, ſtanding in the place either of a compleat ſubject or a compleat Prædicate, with nothing adjoyned, nothing oppoſed unto it, muſt be taken in the ſame ſenſe with them, I cannot imagine. In the ſixth verſe of this Chapter indeed it is the ſubject of a Propoſition, and inveſted with an article; but that is an Article of oppoſition.* Τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, *and this not. Howſoever, in that ſenſe objected it neither agrees with the words before it nor with thoſe which follow it.* * *The words in* Exodus *were theſe* 34. 34. Ἡνίκα δὲ ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωϋσῆς ἔναντι Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, ἀφεῖλετο τὸ κάλυμμα; *which are thus made uſe of by the Apoſtle;* ἡνίκα δὲ ἂν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς Κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. Κύριος *then, is here uſed by Saint Paul citing ſome place out of the Old Covenant, and the words which follow,* Ὁ δὲ Κύριος *ſignifie the ſame* Κύριος, *as appeareth by the Conjunction* Δὲ: *and if ſo, then according to the Doctrine of our Adverſaries it cannot ſignifie Chriſt. For that Lord of whome* 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 cantradiction.*

there

there 'tis used, framing an Argument and urging it from thence; and if he did not, † that rule is not so universall and infallible, but that *the Lord* in the language of the same Apostle may not signifie the second, but the first or third person of the Trinity. If then *the Lord* be the eternall 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 eternall God, and so termed in the Scriptures.

† *For though Christ be most frequently called* our Lord, *yet being God the Father of Christ is our Lord, being* ὁ Κύριος *it is often by S.* 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 universall. For I desire to know by what means they can be assured, that the Apostle doth by the title* ὁ Κύριος *intend Christ and not the most High God the Father, in these following places,* 1 Cor. 3. 5. 4. 19. 7. 10, 12. 16. 7. 1 Thess. 4. 6. 5. 27. 2 Thess. 3. 1, 5, 16. 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18. 2. 7. *And beside I ask, how the pretence of this generall rule can be properly objected by those who knew that they to whom they doe object this Rule, have contended that this title is elsewhere attributed to the Holy Ghost. As the Author of the book* de Spiritu S. *under the name of* S. Basil, *upon that place,* 2 Thess. 3. 5. Ὁ δὲ Κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *thus disputes,* Τίς ὁ κατευθύνων Κύριος εἰς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπην, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκ μέρους τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπομονήν; ἀποκρινάσθωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα καταδυκνύοντες. Εἶτα γὰρ περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ λέγων, πάντως ἂν εἴρητο, ὁ δὲ Κύριος ὑμᾶς κατευθύναι εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην· εἴτε περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, περιττὸν ἂν, εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὑπομονήν· ζητείτω δὲ οὐ τί ὄζιν ἄνθρωπον ὁ τὴν περιουσίαν τοῦ Κυρίου τιμᾶσθαι ἄξιον. *And upon the like place,* 1 Thess. 3. 12, 13. Ποῖον Κύριον εὐχῆς ὑπερβαλεῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν ὃν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἀμέμπτους τὰς καρδίας ἐκφαίνομένας ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ καὶ ἐν θεοπαλονίκῃ πίστεως σπείρας; Ἀποκρινάσθωσαν ἡμῖν οἱ μᾶλλον τῆς λειτουργικῶν πνευμάτων τῆς πρὸς διακονίαν ἀποσταλέντων (*the newly-revived opinion clearly*) τὸ Πνεῦμα τιθέντες· ἀνὴ ἔχων, *De Spiritu Sancto, cap.* 21.

Again, the same Scriptures doe clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term him plainly and expressly so. For when *Peter said*, Ananias, *Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lye 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 lyed unto men, but unto God.* To lye unto the Holy Ghost, is to lye unto God: to lye unto the Holy Ghost, is not to Act. 5. 3, 4.

lye unto men, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is not man; and conſequently not to lye unto any Angel, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is not an Angell, not to lye unto any creature, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt is no creature, but to lye 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 weakneſſe 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 Originall is † put in one caſe, and *God* in another, and the Apoſtle ſpeaking in one manner of the Spirit, and in another of God, cannot ſhew that the Spirit is God. To which it is eaſily anſwered, that the caſe or manner of the Apoſtles 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 lye unto him, or by a lye to endeavour to deceive him. The Act objected to *Ananias* was but one, which act of his the Apoſtles look'd upon as injurious not to themſelves but to the Holy Ghoſt; and therefore *Peter* ſhew'd 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 *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 *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 ſeverall things. And it is evident that in this place the tempting of the Spirit, was nothing elſe but lying to him. For *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 lyed. *Then Peter ſaid unto her*, *How*

† Ex his facile apparet haud quaquam ex eo loco concludi poſſe Spiritum S. eſſe Deum, cum alio modo de Spiritu S loquatur Petrus, alio de Deo. Illic dicit *mentiri* ſeu *fallere*, ac *ludificari Spiritum S.* hic *mentiri Deo*, Crellius *de uno Deo Patre*, l. 1. ſect. 3. Argum. 1.

How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? 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 bely the Holy Ghoſt. This is not to expound S. *Peter*, but to bely *Ananias*, and make him guilty of that ſin which he was never yet accuſed of. It is moſt certain that he lyed, it is alſo certain that he to whom he lyed was the Holy Ghoſt, and therefore it might be well † tranſlated that he lyed to the Holy Ghoſt. Next becauſe they may very well be conſcious that this verball 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 juſtifie this negation, is, becauſe there are ſeverall 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 alledge thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *He therefore that deſpiſeth*, ורחרגל ברוחא דקודשא, *the Vulgar* Latine *to the ſame purpoſe*, mentiri te Spiritui S. *And the Author of the Tractat* de temp. Barbarico, *under the name of* S. Auſtin, mentiri te apud Spiritum S. *cap.* 3. *Now* ψεύσασθαι εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα *is the ſame with* τῷ πνεύματι, *as* Μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἷς τὸν ἀδελφόν, Lye not one to another. *If we read it* εἰς πνεῦμα *then, it is rightly tranſlated. Again, if we read it* τὸ πνεῦμα, *it has in this caſe the ſenſe of* τῷ πνεύματι. *As* Pſal. 66. 2. יכחשו לך איביך, LXX. ψεύσονται σοι οἱ ἐχθροί σου, *of the ſame ſenſe with that* Pſalm. 18. 61. משנאי יהוה יכחשו לו, LXX. Οἱ ἐχθροὶ Κυρίου ἐψεύσαντο αὐτῷ. *So* Deutero. 33. 26. ויכחשו איביך לך, LXX. Καὶ ψεύσονται σοι οἱ ἐχθροί σου. *And* Iſa. 57. 11. כי תכזבי, ἢ ἐψεύσω μοι; 2 King. 4. 16. אל תכזב בשפחתך, μὴ διαψεύσῃ τὴν δούλην σου. *If therefore we read it* ψεύσασθαι τὸ πνεῦμα, *it is rightly tranſlated to lye unto the Holy Ghoſt; and ſo agreeth with that which followeth to tempt the Holy Ghoſt, as* Pſalm. 78. 36. τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτῶν ἐψεύσαντο αὐτῷ, *and verſe* 41. ἐπέστρεψαν καὶ ἐπείρασαν τὸν Θεόν. *Therefore whatſoever diffs are layd upon the phraſe, or difference of expreſſion, are either falſe or frivolous.*

† *Our Tranſlation is here accuſed without reaſon. For though the Originall be* ψεύσασθαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, *yet ſome Copies have it* εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, *and the* Syriack *did ſo read and interpret it*

1 Thess. 4. 8. *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; & 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 founds our reason, that is, no opposition. For there are three particulars in that Scripture which we produce for our Assertion; first, that they lyed to the Holy Ghost; secondly, that, in doing so, they lyed not unto men; and thirdly, that by the same act they lyed 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 bin said, you lyed not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God. And indeed if the Apostles would have aggravated the sin of *Ananias* with the full propriety and iniquity, in their sense, he must have said, thou hast not lyed 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 sinfulnesse it, *thou hast not lyed unto men, but unto God*: it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lyed is God.

Mat. 10. 40. Luc. 10. 16.

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 replyed differently

1 Cor. 6. 19.

accor-

according to the diverſity of our Adverſaries; as it is not probable that the denyers of ſo great a truth ſhould agree. The firſt tells 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 poſſeſſe our bodies by a divine right. 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 onely thoſe words of the Apoſtle, a *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.* We doe certainly know that we are the temple of God; and we alſo know that the Spirit of God dwelleth therefore 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 onely becauſe we know the Spirit of God is God; for if the Spirit were any other Perſon not divine, or any thing 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 onely this, that being the Holy Ghoſt who poſſeſſeth us, is a Perſon, we muſt ſhew that our bodies are his by the higheſt intereſt, and primarily dedicated to his honour: which he therefore conceives we cannot ſhew, 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

† Si quis ex eo quod corpus noſtrum Spiritus S. templū ſit, concludere velit eum eſſe Deum, illi demonſtrandum eſt ita corpus noſtrum Spiritus S. templum dici, ut intelligatur eum eſſe perſonam cujus honori corpus noſtrum ſit dedicatum, à qua corpus noſtrum eo jure quod divini numinis proprium eſt, poſſideatur, & principaliter incolatur, *Cellius* de uno Deo Patre, *lib.* 1. *Sect.* 3.

a 1 Cor. 3. 16.

cauſe 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, as our Adverſary doth, that *we ought with our body to glorifie, 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 glorifie him, I ſhall rather take leave to ſuſpect that of blaſphemy, then 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 wit, by inhabitation*; this is ſo far from breeding in me the leaſt thought of diminution, that by this onely 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: 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.

2 Cor. 6. 16.

Fourthly, He, to whom the divine attributes doe 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 doe 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

ſaries 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 doe firmly believe that the true and living God can be but one, that the infinity of the divine eſſence is incapable of multiplicity, being we have already ſhewn that the Father is originally that one God, which is denyed by none; and have alſo proved that the onely Son is the ſame God, receiving by an eternall 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 ſhew 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

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 doe as certainly diſtinguiſh them in their perſons, as they doe 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.

Joh. 15. 26.

Secondly, though we have formerly proved that the Son of God is properly and truly God, though we now have alſo 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 glorifie 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 expreſly ſaid, *He ſhall glorifie 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 Sons 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 goe away; for if I goe 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.

Joh. 16. 15.

Thirdly,

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*, 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 accesse by one Spirit unto the Father*, and consequently assureth us that the Spirit, *by whom*, is not the Father, *to whom*, nor the Son, *through whom*, we have that accesse. 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.* 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 severall times in a word, as, *The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name; the Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father*, and when that Comforter is come, *Goe teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* I conclude therefore against the old † *Sabellian* Heresie, 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.

Mat. 3. 16.

Eph. 2. 18.

Joh. 14. 26. 15. 26.

Mat. 28. 19.

† *This Heresie 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 where the three persons were distinguished, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, 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, & virtus altissimi altissimus est. *After* Praxeas *followed* Noetus, μονοπάτως τὸν αὐτὸν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα

Our

μα ἄγνοιαν ἀνθ', Epiph. Hær. 57. Noetiani à quodam Noëto, qui docebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem & Spiritum S. S. Aug. Hær. 36. Suddenly after Noëtus arose Sabellius. Ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τότε, φησὶ, τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Σαβελλιανοὺς, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱὸν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἅτε τὸ μιᾷ ὑποστάσει βεβιωκότας, Epiph. Hær. 62. From him afterwards were all which held the same opinion called Sabellians. Sabellians ab illo Noeto quem supra memoravimus defluxisse dicuntur. Nam & discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas hæreses Epiphanius computet nescio, cum sicut potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius ille famosior, & ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen acceperit. Noetiani enim difficillime ab aliquo sciuntur, Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum, S. Aug. Hær. 41.

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 he is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor lesse then 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 extemall, but internall 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 were 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

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.* 1 Joh. 5. 7. 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 baptismall 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 eternall 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 conteined virtually in the Scriptures. First, it is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our 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 testifie of me.* Joh. 15. 26. And this is also evident from what hath bin 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 Fa-

ther hath bin already shewn 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 conteined 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

Matth. 10. 20. 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

1 Co. 2. 11, 12. 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*

Galat. 4. 6. *sonnes God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our*

Rom. 8. 9. *hearts.* The Spirit of Christ. *Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his:* even the Spirit of

1 Pet. 1. 11. Christ which was in the Prophets. The Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the Apostle speaks, *I know that this shall turn*

Phil. 1. 19. *to my salvation through your 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 proceeded 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 having by the

Joh. 14. 26. originall 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

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 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 doe they alſo virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son.

From whence it came to paſſe in the Primitive times † that the *Latine* Fathers taught expreſly 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 us'd to prove that truth.

† *This is not the late but ancient opinion of the* Latine *Church, as will appear by theſe teſtimonies,*

Loqui de eo (Sp. S.) non neceſſe eſt, quia de Patre & Filio auctoribus confitendus eſt, S. Hilar. *de Trinit. l.* 2. Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit à Patre & Filio, non ſeparatur à Patre, non ſeparatur à Filio, *S.* Ambroſ. *de Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 10. Spiritus autem Sanctus vere Spiritus eſt procedens quidem à Patre & Filio: ſed non eſt ipſe Filius, quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroq; *Id. de Symb.* c. 3. Et in ſervos cœleſtia dona profudit, Spiritum ab Unigena Sanctum & Patre procedentem, Paulinus *in Nat.* 9. 2. *Felicit.* Non poſſumus dicere quod Spiritus S. & à Filio non procedat, neque enim fruſtra Spiritus & Patris & Filii ſpiritus dicitur, *S.* Auguſt. *de Trinit.* lib. 4. Firmiſſime tene & nullatenus dubites, eundem Spiritum S. qui Patris & Filii unus eſt Spiritus, de Patre & Filio procedere, Fulgent. *de Fide ad Petrum.* Qui noſter Dominus, qui tuus unicus Spirat de patrio corde Paracletus. *Prud. Hymn.* 5. *Cathem.* Tanquam idem Deus nunc Pater, nunc Filius, nunc Spiritus S. nominetur, nec alius eſt qui genuit, alius qui genitus eſt, alius qui de utroque proceſſit. Leo *ſpeaking of the* Sabellian *Hereſie*, *Epiſt.* 93. *cap.* 1. Audi manifeſtius proprium Patris eſſe genuiſſe, & proprium Filii natum fuiſſe: proprium vero Sp. S procedere de Patre Filioq; *Vigilius contra Eut. l.* 1. *By which teſtimonies and the like of the Latine Fathers we may well gueſſe in which Church the Creed commonly attributed to* Athanaſius *firſt was framed; for as it is confeſſed to be written firſt in* Latine, *ſo it is moſt probable that it was compoſed by ſome member of the* Latine *Church, by that expreſſion in it*, Spiritus S. à Patre & Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, ſed procedens.

And

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; yet they acknowledged under another Scripture expreſſion the ſame thing which the *Latines* 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 *receiveth of the Son*. The interpretation of which words according to the *Latines* inferred a proceſſion, and that which the *Greeks* did underſtand thereby, was the ſame which the *Latines* 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

† *The Ancient Greek Fathers ſpeaking of this proceſſion, mention the Father onely, and never, I think, expreſſe the Son, as ſticking conſtantly in this to the language of the Scriptures.*

* *As to the Scriptures ſpeak, in relation to the Father.*

Thus Gregory Nazianzene diſtinguiſheth the three Perſons, Ἐπὶ μὲν ἡμιτέρων ὄρων ἰσάζουσι, τὸ ἀγέννητον καὶ γεννητὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, Orat. de Filio. *And the three properties attributed to the three Perſons are theſe, ἀγεννησία to the Father, γέννησις to the Son, and ἐκπόρευσις to the Holy Ghoſt. But this word ἐκπόρευσις, or the verb ἐκπορεύεσθαι was not uſed by the Greeks in reference to the Son, but onely, as the Scriptures ſpeak, in relation to the Father.* * As Epiphanius, Καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ βλασφημῶσι, καὶ τολμῶσι λέγειν κτίσμα εἶναι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον, Hær. 69. §. 52. Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, οὐκ ἀνόμοιον Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄν, ἀπὸ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον, Idem Ancor. cap. 6. Ἀεὶ γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ συνῆν Πατρὶ, ἀγέννητον, ἄκτιστον, ἀκατάληπτον Υἱοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὂν, καὶ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον, Id. Hær. 62. §. 4. Ad Filio accipit quia ab eo mittitur, ſic à Patre procedit: & interrogo utrum id ipſum ſit à Filio accipere quod à Patre procedere. Quod ſi nihil differre credetur inter accipere à Filio, & a Patre procedere, certe id ipſum atque unum eſſe exiſtimabitur, à Filio accipere, quod ſit accipere à Patre. Ipſe enim Dominus ait, *Quoniam de meo accipiet, & annuntiabit vobis*, S. Hil. l. 8. de Trin. So S. Cyril, Ἐκ τοῦ (τὸ Πνεῦμα) ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐστι τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ πρέπον ὁμοφυῶς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοῦ πως ὑφ' ἁγίων γεγονέναι λόγον ὑπάρχειν τὸ λαλεῖσθαι, διὰ τοῦτο φησιν, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, &c. in Joan. l. 11. De Filio ergo accipit, & omnia quæ habet Pater Filii ſunt, quæ Spiritus S. accipit, quia non de ſolo Filio, ſed ſimul de utroque procedit, *Fulg.* l. 7. contra *Fab.* apud *Theodulphum* de Sp. S.

being

being of the Father † and the Son, as receiving that infinite and eternall eſſence from them both.

† *That this was the ſenſe of the Greek Fathers anciently, who ſed thoſe two Scriptures of the Holy Ghoſt, appeareth by* Epiphanius, *who frequently declares ſo much. As in* Ancorato, Πνεῦμα γὰρ Θεοῦ καὶ Πνεῦμα Παρὸς καὶ Πνεῦμα Υἱοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ Παρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, τέτον τῇ ὀνομασίᾳ, cap. 8. *And ſpeaking of* Ananias *who lyed unto the Spirit,* Ἀλλ᾽ Θεὸς ἐκ Παρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ᾧ ἐψεύσαντο οἱ ἀπὸ τῦ πνεύματος νοσφισάμενοι, cap. 9. Οὐκ ἀμφότερον Παρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, ἀμφὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ὐσίας, ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς θεότητος, ἐκ Παρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ, Ὡς Παρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ ἐνυπόσατον ἀεὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, *Idem* Hæreſ. 62. §. *In theſe words is plainly contained this truth, that the Spirit is God of God the Father and of God the Son. And that they did conclude this truth from thoſe two Scriptures, he proceedeth from the Father, and receiveth of the Son, is alſo evident by theſe and the like paſſages,* Εἰ γὰρ Χριστὸς ἐκ τῦ Παρὸς πιστεύεται Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τῦ Χριστῦ, ἢ παρ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων, ὡς φησιν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὃ παρὰ τῦ Παρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ, ὃ ἐκ τῦ ἐμῦ λήψεται, Epiphan. *Ancor.* §. 67. Εἷς ἄρα τῦ Παρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ ἐκ τῦ ἐμῦ, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος, λήψεται. Οὐ γὰρ τέτοις ἤδεις ἦσαν τὸν Παρέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱὸς, ἤδε τὸν Υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ Παρὴρ, ὅπω τολμῶ λέγειν, ὅτι ἤδει τὸ Πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Παρὴρ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς, παρ᾽ ἧς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ παρ᾽ ἧς λαμβάνει, καὶ ἤδε τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸν Παρέρα, εἰ μὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ παρὰ τῦ Παρὸς καὶ ἐκ τῦ Υἱῦ, *Ibid.* 72. Non loquetur à ſemetipſo, hoc eſt non ſine me, & Patris arbitrio, qui inſeparabilis à mea & Patris eſt voluntate; quia non ex ſe ſed ex Patre & me eſt. hoc enim ipſum quod ſubſiſtit & loquitur à Patre & me illi eſt, *Didymus* de Sp. S. l. 2. & paulo poſt, *Ille me clarificabit*, id eſt Paracletus, *quia de meo accipiet.* Rurſum hoc *accipere* ut divinæ naturæ conveniat intelligendum ..... Spiritum S. à Filio accipere id quod ſuæ naturæ fuerat cognoſcendum eſt. Neque enim quid aliud eſt Filius exceptis his quæ ei dantur à Patre, neque alia ſubſtantia eſt Spiritus S. præter id quod datur ei à Filio.

This being thus the generall doctrine of the Eaſtern and the Weſtern Church, differing onely 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 *Latines*; denying that the Holy Ghoſt receiveth his eſſence from the Son, becauſe the Scripture ſaith, he proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit which is of God. But

† *S.* Cyril *having ſet forth Anathematiſms againſt the Hereſie of* Neſtorius, *in the ninth Anathematiſm, condemned all who did not ſpeak of the Holy Ghoſt as ἴδιον τῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα, To which* Theodoret *returned this anſwer,* Ἴδιον γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα ἴσμεν Υἱοῦ οὐκ ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ὁμοφυὲς καὶ ἐκ Παρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον ἔφη, Ὡμολογήσαμεν καὶ ὡς ἐυσεβῆ δεξόμεθα τὴν φωνὴν· εἰδ᾽ ὡς ἰδίᾳ ἢ ἀλλ᾽ ἰδίᾳ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον, ὡς βλάσφημον τῦτο καὶ

καὶ ὡς λυσιτελὲς ἀποῤῥίψομεν Πιστεύομεν δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ λέγοντι, Τὸ Πνεῦμα ὃ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ τῷ Θεοπάτορι Παύλῳ ὁμοίως φάσκοντι· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κύριου καὶ λέγομεν, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. Cyril *in his reply takes no great notice of this high charge of impiety and blaſphemy, and onely anſwers to the Argument ſo far as it concerned his expreſsion,* viz. *that the Spirit is* ἴδιον τοῦ Υἱοῦ Πνεῦμα, *but in this Anſwer makes uſe of that Scripture which he and others uſed to prove that the Spirit had his eſſence from the Son.* Ἐκπορεύεται δὲ καὶ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωνὴν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. *Although therefore S.* Cyril *doth not goe to maintain that which* Theodoret *denyed, and S.* Cyril *elſewhere teacheth,* viz. *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.*

But *Cyril* againſt whom he wrote, taking ſmall notice of this Objection: and the writings of *Theodoret* in which this was conteined being condemned; there was no ſenſible difference in the Church, for many years, concerning this particular. Afterwards divers of the *Greeks* expreſly denyed the proceſſion from the Son, and ſeverall diſputations did ariſe in the Weſtern Church, till at laſt the *Latines* put it into the * *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed, and being admoniſhed by the *Greeks* of that, as of an unlawfull addition, and *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 this,* I believe in the Holy Ghoſt, *framed this acceſſion againſt* Macedonius, εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον; *in which they ſpake moſt warily, uſing the words of the Scripture, and the language of the Church, which was ſo known and publick, that it is recorded even by* Lucian, *in his Dialogue call'd* Philopatris, Κεκ. Καὶ τίνα ἐπωμόσω μαι; Τεκ. Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεὸν, μίγαν, ἄμετρον, ἀκατάληπτον, ὃν Πατὴρ, πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἓν ἐκ τριῶν, καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς τρία. Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἐγὼ Θεόν. *This Creed being received by the whole Church of God, and it being added alſo by the next General Council at* Epheſus, *that it ſhould not be lawfull to make any addition to it. Notwithſtanding, the Queſtion being agitated in the Weſt,* Utrum Spiritus S. ſicut procedit à Patre, ita & procedat à Filio, *and it being concluded in the affirmative, they did not onely declare the doctrine to be true, but alſo added the ſame to the* Conſtantinopolitan *Creed, and ſang it publickly in their Liturgy.* Credimus & in Spiritum S. Dominum & vivificatorem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem. *This being firſt done in the* Spaniſh *and* French *Churches, and the matter being referred to* Leo *the third*

* *The ſecond Generall Council held at* Conſtantinople,

third Bishop of Rome, *he absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated. For in the Acts of the Synod held at* Aquisgranum *we find it so determined by the Pope upon the conference with the Legates.* Ergo, ut video, illud à vestra Paternitate decernitur, ut primo illud de quo quæstio agitur, de sæpe fato Symbolo tollatur, & tunc demum à quolibet licite ac libere sive cantando, sive tradendo discatur & doceat. *So one of the Legates: to which* Leo *answered thus,* Ita proculdubio à nostra parte decernitur: ita quoque ut à vestra assentiatur, à nobis omnibus modis suadetur. *Beside, least the* Roman *Church might be accused to joyn with the* Spanish *and* French *churches in this addition, the same Pope caused the Creed to be publickly set forth in the Church graven in silver plates, one in* Latine, *and another in* Greek, *in the same words which the Council of* Constantinople *had first penn'd it.* Hic pro amore & cautela orthodoxæ Fidei fecit in B. Petri Basilica scuta argentea duo scripta utraque Symbolo, unum quidem literis Græcis, & alium Latinis, sedentia dextra lævaque super ingressum Corporis. *Anastasius in vita Leonis* III. Leo tertius (Symboli) transcriptum in tabula argentea, post altare B. Pauli posita posteris reliquit, pro amore, ut ipse ait, & cautela Fidei Orthodoxæ. In quo quidem Symbolo in processione Spiritus S. solus commemoratur Pater his verbis, Et in Spiritum S Dominum vivificatorem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre & Filio coadorandum, & glorificandum, *P. Lombardus.* *These were taken out of the* Archiva *at* Rome, *saith* Photius, *and so pleaded by* Leo, *that they might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true Copies of that Creed not to be altered.* Ὁ Θεσπέσιος Λέων καὶ τὰς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ θησαυροφυλακίοις δὴ κατορυχείσας πλάκας καὶ παλαιοτάτων χρόνων ὑποτεθησαυρισμένας τῇ ἱερᾷ κειμηλίοις δύο ἀποδοὺς, αἳ γράμμασι καὶ ῥήμασιν ἑλληνικοῖς ἔλεγον τὴν ἱερὰν τῆς ἡμῶν πίστεως ἔκθεσιν, ταύτας καταναγνῶναι καὶ τετυπῶσθαι τῷ Ῥωμαϊκῷ πλήθει καὶ εἰς ὄψιν ἁπάντων ἐλθεῖν ἐδικαίωσε, καὶ πολλοὶ δὴ θεασάμενοι πλησιχωροῦσι καὶ ἀναγνωκόσιν ἐπὶ τῷ βίῳ ἔδραμον, Photius *apud* Nicetam *Thes. Orthod. Fid. t.* 21. *ut exscripsit Archiep.* Armachanus. Οὗτος ὁ Λέων καὶ τὸ θησαυροφυλάκιον τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ῥωμαίων ἀθοίξας ἀπλᾶς δύο τῆς ἱερᾶς κειμηλίοις ἀπὸ τῆς θησαυρισμένας ἐξήνεγκεν ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ γράμμασι καὶ ῥήμασιν ἐχούσας τὴν ἐυτυπῶσθαι τῆς πίστεως ἔκθεσιν, *Idem* apud Euthymium, Panopl. Dom. tit. 12. ab eodem Archiep. exscriptus. *This was the great and prudent care of* Leo *the third, that there should be no addition made to the ancient Creed authorized by a Generall Council, and received by the whole Church; and by this means he quieted all distempers for his time. But not long after, the following Popes, more in love with their own Authority, then desirous of the peace and Unity of the Church, neglected the tables of* Leo, *and admitted the additon* Filioque. *This was done first in the time and by the power of Pope* Nicolaus *the first, who by the activity of* Photius *was condemned for it.* Tunc inter alias accusationes hoc principaliter posuit (Photius ipsum (Nicolaum) fore excommunicatum quod apposuerat ad Symbolum Spiritum S. à Filio procedere. Similiter & depositum, quod ipse Nicolaus Papa incidisset in sententiam tertii Concilii, *Antonin.* Part 3. tit. 22. c. 13. *This was it which* Photius *complained of so highly in his Encyclick Epistle to the Arch episcopall Seats of the Eastern Church.* Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐχὶ μόνον εἰς ταῦτα πεφρονήμασιν ἐξηνέχθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερα κακῶν ἐστὶ κρείττω οἷς ταύτῃ ἀνέδραμον, πρὸς γάρ τοι τοῖς εἰρημένοις ἀτοπήμασι καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἅγιον σύμβολον ὃ

πᾶσι τοῖς ζωοδόκοις καὶ οἰκουμενικοῖς ψηφίσμασιν ἅμαχον ἔχει τὸν ἰσχύν, νόθοις λογισμοῖς καὶ παρεγγεγραμμένοις λόγοις καὶ θράσει ὑπερβολῇ κεκινηκέναι ἐπεχείρησαν (ὦ τῆς τοσαύτης μωρίας πράγματος) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλὰ γε καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι ὁμολογήσαντες, Phot. *Epiſt.* 2. §. 8. Hugo Etherianus *legit* ὁμολογήσαντες, *dum vertit*, fruſtra profitetur; *Thus far* Photius *againſt* Nicolaus *before he was depoſed. After he was reſtored again, in the time of* Pope John *the eighth in the eighth Generall Council, as the* Greeks *call it, it was declared that the Addition of* Filioque *made in the Creed ſhould be taken away.* Ἐξήνεγκε δὲ καὶ Σωσθένης αὖθις καὶ περὶ τῆς περιθέσεως τοῦ Συμβόλου, καὶ ἐκείνων ἄξιον ἵνα ἐξαιρεθῇ πάντῃ καὶ πάντως, *ſayes* 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, Ἔστιν οὖν τὸ μέγιστον ἐκεῖνο σφάλμα, καὶ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ τῶν Σολομῶντος ἀδύνατα πεταύρους ποιοῦν ζωωστῆρας, ἢ ἐν τῇ τῆς πίστεως Συμβόλῳ καινοτομία, ἣν ἐποιήσατο ἀλαζονεύσαντες τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι, Theophylactus *ad* Joan. *cap.* 3. Καὶ τοῖς Δυτικοῖς τοίνυν οὕτω περὶ τὸ δόγμα διαμαρτάνειν τὴν πρώτην πίστιν σημεῖον, ὅτι δὴ τὸ ἐν τῷ Συμβόλῳ τοῦ Υἱοῦ Πνεύματος προσθήκην, ἔνθα ὁ κίνδυνος μέγας, τοῦτο μὴ διορθώσεως ἀξιοῦμεν ὁ συγχωροῦν ἀσυγχώρητος, Ibid. *Thus did the Orientall Church accuſe the Occidentall for adding* Filioque *to the Creed, contrary to a Generall Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the leaſt pretence of the Authority of another Council; and ſo the Schiſm between the* Latine *and the* Greek *Church began and was continued, never to be ended untill 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 any thing; 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 much to be lamented, that the* Greeks *ſhould not acknowledge the truth which was acknowledged by their Anceſtors, in the ſubſtance of it; and that the* Latines *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.*

and refuſing to raſe 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 formall Creed without the conſent, and againſt the proteſtation, of the Oriental Church be not juſtifiable, yet that which was added is nevertheleſſe 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 be a Definition of that Council, but an addition or explication inſerted, and con-

condemn not thoſe who, out of a greater reſpect to ſuch Synodicall determinations, will admit of no ſuch inſertions, nor ſpeak any other language then 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; ſhewing him to be of an infinite and eternall 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 eſſentiall & originall holineſſe, as God, and ſo may be called *Holy* in himſelf, though other Spirits which are created, be either actually unholy, or of defectible ſanctity, 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 holineſſe*, becauſe, of the three Perſons in the bleſſed Trinity, it is his particular Office to ſanctifie, or make us holy. Rom. 1. 4.

Now when I ſpeak of the Office of the Holy Ghoſt, I doe not underſtand any Miniſteriall office or function, ſuch

as that of the created Angels is, who are *all miniſtring*
Heb. 1. 14. *Spirits ſent forth to miniſter for them who ſhall be heirs of ſalvation*; for I have already proved this Spirit to be a Perſon properly divine, and conſequently above all miniſtration. But I intend thereby whatſoever it 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*
Joh. 3. 16. *loved the world that he gave his onely begotten Son, and*
Ephes. 2. 18. *through that Son we have an acceſſe by one Spirit unto the Father.* 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 holineſſe it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, becauſe we are all impure, and unholy, and the purity and holineſſe 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 holineſſe 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 holineſſe and perfection muſt be ſupplyed by the Spirit of God. Wherefore being by nature we are totally voyd of all ſaving truth, and under an impoſſibility of knowing the will of God; being as *no man knoweth the things of a man*
1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. *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*, and revealeth

vealeth them unto the Sons of men; ſo that thereby the darkneſſe of their underſtanding is expell'd, and they are enlightned with the knowledge of their God. This work of the Spirit is double, either externall and generall, or internall and particular. The externall and generall 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 bin propounded as was ſufficient to inſtruct men unto eternall life. For there have bin *holy Prophets ever ſince the world began*; and *propheſie came not at any time by the will of man, but Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt.* When it pleaſed God *in the laſt dayes to ſpeak unto us by his Son*, even that Son ſent his Spirit into the Apoſtles, the *Spirit of truth*, that he might *guide* them *into all truth*, *teaching* them *all things*, *and bringing all things to their remembrance whatſoever* Chriſt *had ſaid unto them.* By this means it came to paſs that *all Scripture was given by inſpiration of God*, 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 of Faith generally to the Univerſall Church of God, which object is propounded externally by the Church to every particular believer, doth alſo illuminate the underſtandings of ſuch as believe that they may receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God not onely in the object but alſo in the act; Chriſt is not onely given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is *alſo given to 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 our ſelves, it is the gift of God.* As the en-

Luc. 1. 70. 2 Pet. 1. 21. Heb. 1. 2. Joh. 16. 13. Phil. 1. 29. Act. 16. 14. Heb. 4. 2. Epheſ. 2. 8.

creaſe

† *This is the ancient determination of the second Arausican Council, Si quis sicut augmentum, ita etiam initium Fidei, ipsumque credulitatis affectum quo in eum credimus qui justificat impium, & ad regenerationem baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratiæ donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritus S. corrigentis voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, & naturaliter nobis inesse dicit, Apostolicis dogmatibus adversarius approbatur, beato Paulo dicente, Confidimus quia qui cœpit in vobis bonum opus perficiet usque in diem Domini nostri Iesu Christi; & 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. Arausi. & Gennad. Eccl. Dogm. cap. 42.*

creaſe and perfection, ſo the originall, or † initiation of faith is from the Spirit of God, not onely by an externall propoſall in the word, but by an internall illumination in the ſoul; by which we are enclined to the obedience of faith, in aſſenting to thoſe truths, which unto a naturall and carnall man are fooliſhneſſe. And thus we affirm not onely 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.*

* *It was the known opinion of the* Pelagians *that it is in the power of man to believe the Goſpel without any internall operation of the grace of God, and* S. Auſtin *was once of that opinion*, Neque enim fidem putabam, *ſayes he*, Dei gratia præveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur quod poſceremus utiliter, niſi quia credere non poſſemus, ſi non præcederet præconium veritatis. Ut autem prædicato nobis Evangelio conſentiremus noſtrum eſſe proprium, & nobis ex nobis eſſe arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla Opuſcula mea ſatis indicant ante Epiſcopatum meum ſcripta, *D. Prædeſt. Sanct. l. 1. c. 3. But whatſoever he had ſo written before he was made a Biſhop, he recalled and reverſed in his Retractations*, l. 1. c. 23. *and diſputed earneſtly againſt it as a part of the* Pelagian *Hereſie. This, as the reſt of* Pelagianiſme *is renewed by the* Socinians, *who in the* Racovian *Catechiſme deliver it in this manner*, Nonne ad credendum Evangelio Spiritus S. interiore dono opus eſt? Nullo modo: neque enim in Scripturis legimus cuiquam id conferri donum, niſi credenti Evangelio.

The ſecond part of the Office of the Holy Ghoſt in the ſanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our naturall corruption conſiſting in an averſation 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*

Tit. 3. 5.

ing of the Holy Ghoſt. So that *except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghoſt, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God.* We are all at firſt defiled by the corruption of our nature and the pollution of our ſins; *but we are waſhed but we are ſanctified, but we are juſtified in the name of the Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God.* The ſecond part then of the Office of the Holy Ghoſt is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his ſoul. 1 Cor. 6. 11.

The third part of this Office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions & converſations, that we may actually doe and perform thoſe things which are acceptable and well pleaſing in the ſight of God. *If we live in the Spirit*, quickned by his Renovation, we *muſt alſo walk in the Spirit*, following his direction, led by his manuduction. And *if we walk in the Spirit, we ſhall not fulfill the luſts of the fleſh*; for we are not onely directed, but animated and acted in thoſe operations by the Spirit of God, *who giveth both to will and to doe*, and *as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, they are the ſons of God.* Moreover that this direction may prove more effectuall, we are alſo guided in our devotions by the ſame Spirit, according to the promiſe, *I will powre upon the houſe of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jeruſalem the Spirit of grace and of ſupplications.* Whereas then *this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us*; and whereas *we know not what we ſhould pray for as we ought, the Spirit it ſelf maketh interceſſion for us with groanings which cannot be uttered*, and *he that ſearcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, becauſe he maketh interceſſion for the Saints according to the will of God.* From which interceſſion eſpecially I conceive he hath the name of the *Paraclete* given him by Chriſt, who ſaid, *I will pray unto the Father, and he ſhall give you another Paraclete.* For *if any man ſinne we have a Paraclete* Gal. 5. 25. Gal. 5. 16. Rom. 8. 14. Zach. 12. 10. 1 Joh. 5. 14. Rom. 8. 26, 27. Joh. 14. 16. 1 Joh. 2. 1.

with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous saith S. John: Rom. 8. 34. who also maketh intercession for us, saith S. Paul; and we have another Paraclete, saith our Saviour; which also maketh intercession for us, saith S. Paul. A † Paraclete then in the notion of the Scriptures is an Intercessor.

† Παράκλητος is five times used in the Scriptures, and Fourthly, that by S. 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 wanst to it always Comforter, when to Christ we render it Advocate; of which diversity there can be no reason, because Christ who is a Paraclete said that he would send another Paraclete, and therefore the notion must be the same in both, ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, τηρήσει, ἄλλον ὡς ἐμέ. S. Chrys. If therefore in the language of S. John παράκλητος be a Comforter, then Christ is the Comforter, if παράκλητος be an Advocate, the Holy Ghost is the Advocate. The Vulgar Latine keeps the Greek word in the Gospels Paraclitus, but in the Epistle renders it advocatus. The Syriack keepeth the Originall altogether פרקליטא, as being of ordinary use in the writers of that and the Chaldee language, and therefore was not well translated Paracletus in the Gospells, and Advocatus in the Epistle, by Tremellius. That the Latines did use generally the word Paracletus for the Holy Ghost, as it is now in the Vulgar Latine, appeareth by the description of the Heresie of Montanus, which Tertullian calls novam prophetiam de Paracleto inundantem, de Resur. Carnis, cap. 63. & spiritalem rationem Paracleto autore, contra Marcio. l. 1. c. 29. And yet the ancientest Latine Translations rendred it advocatus even in the Gospels in reference to the Spirit. As we read it in Tertullian, Bene quod & Dominus usus hoc verbo in persona Paracleti, non divisionem significavit sed dispositionem. Rogabo enim, inquit, Patrem, & alium advocatum mittet vobis, Spiritum veritatis. Adv. Prax. cap. 9. So Novatianus, Ego rogabo Patrem, & alium advocatum dabit vobis, Nec non etiam subdidit illud quoque, Advocatus autem Spiritus S. quem missurus est Pater, ille vos docebit, de Trinit. cap. 28. Cum venerit Advocatus ille quem ego mittam, Apud S. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 8. Notwithstanding Consolator also is of good antiquity. As we read in the same S. Hilary, Sumus nunc quidem consolati, quia Dominus ait, Mittet vobis Pater & alium Consolatorem, Enar. in Psal. 125. And 'tis possible that some which used Advocatus might understand so much: for in the ancient Christian Latine, Advocare signifieth to comfort, and Advocatio consolation; as being the bare interpretations of παρακαλεῖν and παράκλησις. As Tertullian translates παρακαλέσω πάντας, Isa. 61. 2. Advocare languentes. Adv. Marc. l. 4. c. 14. So when we read, Væ vobis divitibus, quia habetis consolationem vestram. Tertullian read it, Væ vobis divitibus, quoniam recepistis advocationem vestram, Adv. Marcio. l. 4. c. 15. And speaking in his own language, Beati, inquit flentes atque lugentes. Quis talia sine patientia tolerat? Itaque talibus & advocatio & risus promittitur, De Patien. c. 11. And as S. Hilary read it, so did S. Austin expound it, Consolabuntur Spiritu S. qui maxime propterea Paracletus nominatur, id est, Consolator, De Serm. Dom. in Monte, l. 1. c. 4. Cum Christus

Chriſtus promiſerit ſuis miſſurum ſe Paracletum, id eſt Conſolatorem vel Advocatum, *contra Fauſtum l.* 13. *c.* 17. Conſolator ergo ille, vel Advocatus, utrumque enim interpretatur quod eſt Græce Paracletus, *Expoſ. in Joh. Tract.* 94. *Aquila* hoc reddit *ex ounded it*, ſo did the Arabick *Enſultor* 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 ros Dei, ut non comburamur, neque infructuoſi efficiamur, & ubi accuſatorem habemus, illic habeamus & Paracletum, *Iren. l.* 3. *c.* 19. Hic ipſe (Spiritus) & in Prophetis populum accuſavit, & in Apoſtolis advocationem gentibus præſtitit. Nam illi ut accuſarentur merebantur quia contemſerant legem, & qui ex Gentibus credunt ut patrocinio Spiritus adjuventur merentur, quia ad Evangelicam pervenire geſtiunt legem, *Novatianus de Trin.* cap. 29. *In this ſenſe it was, that when* Vetius *pleaded for the* Gallican *Martyrs before their perſecutors*, ἐξὸν ἀκυδῆναι ἀπολογούμενον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀδελφῶν, *and avouring to clear them from all impiety objected to them, he was called the* Παράκλητος *of the Chriſtians*, ἀνελήφθη γὰρ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν κλῆρον τῶν μαρτύρων, παράκλητος Χριστιανῶν χρηματίσας, Acta Martyrum Gal. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 1. *In the ſame Notion did the ancient Rabbins uſe the ſame word retained in their language*, פרקליט, *as appeareth by that in the* Pirke Avoth, *cap.* 4. העושה מצוה אחת קונה לו פרקליט אחד והעובר עבירה אחת קונה לו קט גור אחד. *He which keepeth one commandement gaineth one Advocate, and he which tranſgreſſeth once getteth one Accuſer. As therefore* קטיגור *is* κατήγορος, *ſo* פרקליט *is* σωτήρος, *or* patronus qui cauſam rei agit. *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* παράκλητοι *among the Greeks, who did not plead or maintain the cauſe, but did only aſſiſt with their preſence, intreating and interceding by way of petition to the Judges, ſuch as were the friends of the* reus, *called by him to his aſſiſtance, and interceding for him; in both which reſpects they were called* παράκλητοι. *As we read in* Iſæus, τοὺς φίλους παρεκαλέσατες, καὶ ῥήτορας παρασκευάσαι; *the* ῥήτορες *were to plead, the* φίλοι παράκλητοι *were to intercede. The action of theſe* Advocati *was called* παράκλησις, *and by the ancient Grammarians* παράκλησις *is interpreted* δέησις; *as* Harpocration, Τίθησι μόνοι σωτῆρίως καὶ αὐτὴν τῆς δεήσεως. Λυκοῦργος, ὁ τοῦ ῥήτορος, περὶ τῶν ἱερείας, περὶ τῶν, Εἰ δὲ ὑπὸ ἰδίᾳ τινὸς ἦν ὁ ἀγὼν, ἐδεόμην ἂν ὑμῶν μετ' εὐνοίας ἀκοῦσαί μου, μετ' ὀλίγον φησὶ, Νυνὶ δὲ αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς οἶμαι τοῦτο ποιήσειν καὶ χωρὶς παρακλήσεως τῆς ἐμῆς. *And that the action of the* παράκλητοι *was* δέησις, *entreaty, and petition, appears by thoſe words of* Demoſthenes, Αἱ δὲ τῶν παρακλήτων τάττων δεήσεις καὶ σπουδὰς ὑπὲρ ἰδίων πλεονεξιῶν ἕνεκα ἐλίνοντο, Orat. περὶ παραπρ. *Of theſe* παράκλητοι *is* Æſchines *to be underſtood*, Τὴν μὲν φιλανθρωπίαν ὁρᾶτε, καὶ τὴν παράταξιν ὅση γεγένηται, καὶ τὰς κατ' ἀγορὰν δεήσεις αἷς κέχρηται πάντες, Orat. Κατὰ Κτησ. *Thus I conceive the notion of* παράκλητος *common to the Son and to the Holy Ghoſt to conſiſt, eſpecially in the office of Interceſſion, which by Saint Paul is attributed to both.*

Fourthly, the Office of the ſame Spirit is to joyn us unto Chriſt, and make us members of that one body of which our Saviour is the head. *For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body.* And *as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, ſo alſo is Chriſt.* a *Hereby we know that God abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given us.* As we become ſpirituall men by the Spirit which is in us, as that union with the body and unto the head is a ſpirituall conjunction, ſo it proceedeth from the Spirit; and b *he that is joyned unto the Lord is one Spirit.*

1 Co. 12. 12, 13.

Dominus policitus eſt mittere ſe Paracletum qui nos aptaret Deo. Sicut enim de arido tritico maſſa una fieri non poteſt ſine humore neque unus panis; ita nec nos multi unum fieri in Chriſto Ieſu poteramus ſine aqua quæ de cœlo eſt, *Irenæus lib. 3. cap. 19.* a 1 Joh. 3. 24. b 1 Corinth. 6. 17.

Fiftly, it is the Office of the Holy Ghoſt to aſſure us of the adoption of Sons, to create in us a ſenſe of the paternall 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 it ſelf 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 *heires, heires of God, and joynt heires 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

Rom. 5. 5.

Rom. 8. 14.

Gal. 4. 6.

Rom. 8. 15, 16.

Rom. 8. 17.

2 Cor. 1. 22.

that we are ſealed with that holy Spirit of promiſe, which is the earneſt of our inheritance untill 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 any thing already due; yet is to be looked upon as an † earneſt, 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. Eph. 1. 14.

† *The word ἀῤῥαβὼν which the Apoſtle only uſeth in this particular, is of an Hebrew extraction,* עֵרָבוֹן *from* ערב *a word of promiſe and engagement in commerce, bargaines, and agreements; and being but in one particular affair uſed in the old Teſtament, is taken for a pledge, Gen. 38. 17, 18, 20. and tranſlated ἀῤῥαβὼν by the LXX as well as* משכנא *by the Chaldee; yet the Greek word otherwiſe, conſonantly enough to the etymation, ſignifieth rather an earneſt then a pledge, as the Greeks and Latines generally agree.* Heſych. Ἀῤῥαβὼν, προδομα. Etym. Ἀῤῥαβὼν, ἡ ὅση τῆς ὠνῆς παρὰ τῆ ωνουμένων διδομένη σφηκαταβολὴ ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας. *which words are extant alſo in* Suidas *but corruptly. To this purpoſe is cited that of* Menander, Μικρὸν ἀῤῥαβῶνά μ' ἔφησεν εὐθὺς καταβαλεῖν. *So the* Latines, Arrabo ſic dicta ut reliquum reddatur. Hoc verbum à Græco ἀῤῥαβὼν. Reliquum ex eo quod debitum relquit, *Varro de L. L. lib.* 4. Pignus Latinus Interpres pro arrabone poſuit. Non idipſum autem arrabo quod pignus ſonat. Arrabo enim futuræ emptionis quaſi quoddam teſtimonium & obligamentum datur. Pignus vero hoc eſt, ὑπόχειρον, pro mutua pecunia opponitur, ut cum illa redditta fuerit reddenti debitum pignus à creditore reddatur, *S. Hie on. ad* Epheſ. 1. 14 *To reaſon after this obſervation is* A. Gellius, *upon theſe words of* Q. Claudius, Cum tantus arrhabo penes Samnites Populi Romani eſſet. Arrabonem dixit ſexcentos obſides, & id maluit quam pignus dicere, quoniam vis hujus vocabuli in ea ſententia gravior acrior que eſt, *Noct. Att.* lib. 17. cap. 2. *The ſenſe and uſe of this word is evident in* Plautus, Eas quanti deſtinat? Talentis magnis totidem, quot ego & tu ſumus. Sed arrhaboni has dedit quadraginta minas, *Moſtell. act.* 1. *ſc.* 3. *The ſumme was* 120 l. *of which he gave* 40 l. *in part of payment, and this was the* arrhabo *So the* Greek *Fathers interpret S. Paul,* Διὰ μέντοι ἀῤῥαβῶνος ἠ ἔλατο τὴν δοθησομένην τὸ μίσθος· ὁ γὰρ ἀῤῥαβὼν μικρόν τι μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ παντός. Theodoret 2 *Cor.* 1. 22. Οὐκ Πνευμα δ' ἔσιν ἁπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἀῤῥαβῶνα αὐτόμασιν, ἵνα ἀπὸ τέτου μὴ ἀφὶ τῦ παντὸς θαῤῥῆς, *S.* Chryſoſt.

Sixthly, for the effecting of all theſe and the like particulars, it is the Office of the ſame Spirit to ſanctifie and ſet apart Perſons for the duty of the Miniſtry, order-

ning them to intercede between God and his people, to ſend up prayers to God for them, to bleſſe 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 miniſtry, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt.* The ſame Spirit which illuminated the Apoſtles, and endued them with power from above to perform perſonally their Apoſtolicall 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 their ſelves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made them overſeers to feed the Church of God.*

Eph. 4. 12.

Act. 20. 28.

By theſe and the like means doth the Spirit of God ſanctifie the Sons of men, and by virtue of this ſanctification, proceeding immediately from his Office, he is properly called the the Holy Spirit. And thus have I ſufficiently deſcribed the object of our faith conteined 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.

* *In reſpect of the nature of the Holy Ghoſt I have endeavoured the ſame which* Fauſtus Rhegienſis *did, of whom* Gennadius *relates thus much*; Fauſtus ex Abbate Lirinenſis Monaſterii apud regnum Galliæ Epiſcopus factus, vir in divinis Scripturis ſatis intentus, ex traditione Symboli occaſione accepta, compoſuit librum de Spiritu S. in quo oſtendit eum juxta fidem Patrum, & conſubſtantialem & coæternalem eſſe Patri & Filio, ac plenitudinem Trinitatis obtinentem.

The neceſsity of the belief of this Article appeareth firſt from the nature and condition of the Creed whereof it is an eſſentiall 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 Baptiſme, being we are baptized *in the name of the Father, and of the*

the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, we are obliged to profeſſe 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 alwayes included the Holy Ghoſt, and ſome * concluded with it.

* *I have formerly ſhewn at large how the Creed did firſt ariſe from the Baptiſmall Inſtitution*, pag. 56, 57, 58. *And therefore as the name of the holy Ghoſt is an eſſentiall part of that form, ſo muſt the belief in him be as eſſentiall to the Creed, which was at firſt nothing elſe but an explication of that Form. The firſt enlargement and explication we find in* Juſtine Martyr, *thus expreſſ'd*, Ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προκηρύξαντος τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πάντα ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται, Apolog. 2. *And the Rule of Faith delivered ſoon after by* Irenæus *is every conſonant unto it.* Εἷς ἐστὶν Θεὸς Πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἷς ἐστὶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐπὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας, καὶ εἷς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις, Adv. Hæreſ. lib. 1. cap. 2. *As that delivered ſoon after him by* Tertullian, Unum quidem Deum credimus, ſub hac tamen diſpenſatione (quam οἰκονομίαν dicimus) ut Unici Dei & Filius Sermo ipſius, qui ex ipſo proceſſerit, per quem omnia facta ſunt, & ſine quo factum eſt nihil. Hunc miſſum à Patre in Virginem, & ex ea natum Hominem & Deum, filium hominis & filium Dei, & cognominatum Ieſum Chriſtum; Hunc paſſum, hunc mortuum, & ſepultum ſecundum Scripturas, reſuſcitatum à Patre, & in cœlis reſumptum, ſedere ad dextram Patris venturum judicare vivos & mortuos. Qui exinde miſerit ſecundum promiſſionem ſuam à Patre Spiritum S. Paracletum, Sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem & Filium & Spiritum S. *Adv. Prax. c.* 2. *To which* Euſebius Cæſarienſis *gave in a Copy of the Creed by which he was catechiſed, baptiſed, and conſecrated, to the Council of* Nice, *it runs thus*, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα, &c; καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, &c πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, *and there concludes. In conformity whereunto the* Nicene Council, *altering ſome things and adding others, gainſt the* Arians, *concludeth in the ſame manner*, Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. *And the* Arian *Biſhops in the Synod at* Antioch *no long after*, Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἢ ὀφείλει προσδιδόναι, πιστεύομεν καὶ περὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου. *From whence it appeareth that the Profeſſion of Faith in the Father and Son, Holy Ghoſt was the united eſſentiall to the Creed, the reſt which followeth was looked upon as* παράδοσις.

Secondly, it is neceſſary to believe in the Holy Ghoſt, not onely for the acknowledgement of the eminency of his Perſon,

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
2 Cor. 13. 14. every Chriſtian, that: *the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghoſt*
Rom. 8. 9. *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 ca not be united to him: if he acknowledgeth him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his ſervant;
1 Cor. 12. 3. 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 profeſſe faith in the Holy
1 Theſſ. 4. 3. Ghoſt, that *the will of* God may be effectuall in us, *even*
2 Theſſ. 2. 13. *our ſanctification.* For if *God hath from the beginning choſen us to ſalvation through ſanctification of the Spirit*; if
1 Pet. 1. 2. we be *elected according to the foreknowledge of* God *the Father through ſanctification of the Spirit unto obedience*, if the office of the Spirit doth conſiſt in this, and he be therefore called Holy becauſe he is to ſanctifie us, how
Heb. 12. 14. ſhould we *follow peace with all men and holineſſe, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord*? how ſhould we en-
2 Cor. 12. 1. deavour to *cleanſe our ſelves from all filthineſſe of the fleſh*
1 Cor. 3 16, 17. *and ſpirit, perfecting holineſſe in the fear of God? The temple of God is holy, which temple we are, if the ſpirit of God dwelleth in us*; for the inhabitation of God is a conſecration; and that place muſt be a temple where his
1 Cor. 3. 16. 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

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 glorifie God in our body and in our spirit, which are Gods*. Thus is it 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*. 1 Cor. 6. 19, 20. 1 Thess. 3. 13.

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 kingdome of God is not meat and drink, but righteousnesse and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*. We read of the *Disciples* at first, that they *were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost*; 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*. These are *the rivers of living water flowing out of his belly that believeth*; this is *the oyl of gladnesse* wherewith the Son of God was *anointed above his fellows*, but yet with the same oyl 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*. Rom. 14. 17. Act. 13. 52. 1 Thess. 1. 6. Joh. 7. 38. Psal. 45. 7. Heb. 1. 9. 1 Joh. 2. 20, 27.

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*, so the Son sent the Apostles, saying, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you; and when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost*: and as the Son sent the Apostles, so did they send others by the virtue of the same Spirit, as S. *Paul* sent *Timothy* and *Titus*, and gave them power to send others, saying to Luc. 4. 18. Joh. 20, 21, 22.

1 Tim 5.22. Tit. 1.5. *Timothy, Lay hands ſuddenly on no man*, and to *Titus*, *For this cauſe left I thee in Crete that thou ſhouldſt ſet in order the things that are wanting, and ordein Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.* Thus by vertue of an Apoſtolicall Ordination there is for ever to be continued a Miniſteriall ſucceſſion. Thoſe which are thus ſeparated by Ordination to the work of the Lord, are to *feed the* 1 Pet. 5.2. *flock of God which is among them, taking the overſight thereof*; and thoſe which are committed to their care, are to *remember and obey them that have the rule over them*, Heb. 13.7, 17. *and ſubmit themſelves, for* that *they watch for their ſoules as they that muſt give account.*

Having thus at large aſſerted the verity conteined 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 profeſſe, 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 reall and perſonall ſubſiſtence, not a created but uncreated Perſon, and ſo the true and one eternall God; that though he be that God, yet is he 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 eternall Spirit to be not onely of perfect and indefectible holineſſe in himſelf, but alſo to be the immediate cauſe of all holineſſe in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inſpiring the bleſſed Apoſtles, and inabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetuall ſucceſſion to continue the edification of the Church, illuminating the underſtandings of particular perſons, rectifying their wills and

and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of Sonnes, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions, by all wayes and means purifying and sanctifying our soules and bodies, to a full and eternall acceptation in the sight of God. This is the eternall Spirit of God; in this manner is that Spirit holy; and thus *I believe in the Holy Ghost*.

ARTICLE IX.

THE HOLY CATHOLICK CHURCH, THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

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 then to believe † *the Holy Church*; and the *Greeks* having added by way of explication or determination, the word *Catholick*, it was at laſt received into the *Latine* Creed.

* *Although generally the Article of the* Holy Church *did immediately follow the Article of the Holy Ghoſt, as* Tertullian *well obſerves*, To

Cum ſub tribus & teſtatio fidei & ſponſio ſalutis pignerentur, neceſſario adjicitur Eccleſiæ mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id eſt Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Eccleſia quæ trium corpus eſt, *De Baptiſmo, c. 6. and the Author of the firſt book* de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, Sequitur poſt S. Trinitatis commendationem S. Eccleſia. *Yet notwithſtanding this order was not alwayes obſerved, but ſometimes this Article was reſerved to the end of the Creed.* As *firſt appeareth in that remarkable place of S.* Cyprian, Quodſi aliquis illud opponit ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Eccleſia teneat, eodem Symbolo quo & nos baptizare, eundem noſſe Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Chriſtum, eundem Spiritum S. ac propter hoc uſurpare eum poteſtatem baptizandi poſſe, quod videatur in Interrogatione baptiſmi à nobis non diſcrepare; ſciat quiſquis & hoc opponendum putat, primum non eſſe unam nobis & Schiſmaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remiſſionem Peccatorum & vitam æternam per ſanctam Eccleſiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, cum non habeant Eccleſiam. Tunc deinde voce ſua ipſi confitentur remiſſionem peccatorum non dari niſi per Sanctam Eccleſiam, *Epiſt. ad* Magnum. *Thus* Arius *and* Euzoius *in the words hereafter cited, place the Church in the concluſion of their Creed. And the Author of the ſecond book* De Symbolo ad Catechumenos, *placeth the Remiſſion of ſinnes after the Holy Ghoſt*, Noli injuriam facere ei qui te fecit, ut conſequaris ab illo quod in iſto *S.* Symbolo ſequitur, *Remiſſionem omnium peccatorum, and after he hath ſpoken of the Reſurrection and life everlaſting, proceedeth thus to ſpeak of the* Church, Sancta Eccleſia, in qua omnis Sacramenti terminatur authoritas, *&c. The Author of the third*, Ideo Sacramenti hujus concluſio per Eccleſiam terminatur quia ipſa eſt mater fœcunda. *And the Author of the fourth*, Per ſanctam Eccleſiam.

cleſiam. Propterea hujus concluſio Sacramenti per S. Eccleſiam terminatur, quoniam ſi quis abſque ea inventus fuerit, alienus erit à numero filiorum; nec habebit Deum Patrem qui Eccleſiam noluerit habere matrem. *Thus therefore they diſpoſed the laſt part of the Creed*, Credo in Spiritum S. peccatorum remiſſionem, carnis reſurrectionem & vitam æternam per S. Eccleſiam. *And the deſigne of this tranſpoſition was to ſignifie that remiſſion of ſinnes, and a reſurrection to eternall life, are to be obteined in and by the Church. As the Creed in the firſt Homily under the name of* S. Chryſoſtome, Credo in Spiritum S. Iſte Spiritus perducit ad S. Eccleſiam, ipſa eſt quæ dimittit peccata, promittit carnis reſurrectionem, promittit vitam æternam. † *So* Ruffinus, Sanctam Eccleſiam. *For* Catholicam *it added by* Pamelius. *So* S. Hierome *contra Luciferi.* Præterea cum ſolenne ſit in lavacro poſt Trinitatis Confeſſionem interrogare. Credis Sanctam Eccleſiam? Credis remiſſionem peccatorum? Quam Eccleſiam credidiſſe eum dices? Arianorum? ſed non habent; noſtram? ſed extra hanc baptizatus non potuit eam credere quam neſcivit; *and* S. Auguſt *De Fide & Symb.* Credimus & ſanctam Eccleſiam, *with this declaration*, utique Catholicam. *So* Maximus Taurin. Chryſol. *and* Venantius Fortunatus. *The Author of the firſt Book* de Symb. ad *Catechum.* Sequitur poſt Sanctæ Trinitatis commendationem *Sancta Eccleſia. The Author of the other three, who placeth this Article laſt of all*, *Sancta Eccleſia*, in qua omnis hujus ſacramenti terminatur authoritas, *l.* 2. *and l.* 4. *expreſly* Per Sanctam Eccleſiam, *as the words of the Creed with the explication before mentioned. As alſo the Interrogation of the* Novatians *ending with* per Sanctam Eccleſiam, *cited the laſt page but of Saint* Cyprian. *So likewiſe of thoſe two Homilies on the Creed which are falſly attributed to* S. Chryſoſtome, *the firſt hath* Sanctam Eccleſiam *after the Belief in the Holy Ghoſt, the ſecond concludeth the Creed with* per Sanctam Eccleſiam. In Carnis reſurrectione fides, in vita æterna ſpes, in Sancta Eccleſia charitas. *Thus the Ancient* Saxon *Creed ſet forth by* Frcherus, Tha halgan gelathinge, *i. e. the holy Church*; *the* Greek *Creed in* Saxon *letters in Sir* Robert Cotton's *Library, and the old* Latine *Creed in the* Oxford *Library. But though it were not in the* Roman *or Occidentall Creeds, yet it was anciently in the Orientall, particularly in that of* Hieruſalem, *and that of* Alexandria. *In the Creed at* Jeruſalem *it was certainly very ancient, for it is expounded by* S. Cyril *Archbiſhop of that place*, εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. *And in the* Alexandrian *it was as ancient, for* Alexander *Archbiſhop of that place inſerts it in his Confeſſion, in his Epiſtle ad* Alexandrum, μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Theodoret *Hiſt. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *And* Arius *and* Euzoius *in their Confeſſion of faith given in to* Conſtantine *thus conclude*, καὶ εἰς καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων, Socrates *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. 1. cap. 26. *The ſame is alſo expreſſed in both the Creeds the leſſer and the greater delivered by* Epiphanius in Ancorato; *the words are repeated in the next Obſervation.*

To begin then with the firſt part of the Article, I ſhall endeavour ſo to expound it, as to ſhew 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 *Catholick*, as the Fathers have taught us. For when I ſay *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church*, I mean that * there is a Church which is holy, and which is Catholick, and I underſtand that Church alone which is both Catholick and holy: and being this holineſſe and Catholiciſme are but affections of this Church which I believe, I muſt firſt declare what is the true nature and notion of the Church, how I am aſſured of the exiſtence of that Church, and then how it is the ſubject of thoſe two affections.

* Credo ſanctam Eccleſiam, *I believe there is an holy Church*; *or* Credo in Sanctam Eccleſiam, *is the ſame: nor does the particle* in *added or ſubſtracted make any difference. For although ſome of the* Latine *and* Greek *Fathers preſſe the force of that Preposition, as is before obſerv'd, though* Ruffinus *urge it far in it is particular.* Ut autem una eademque in Trinitate divinitas doceatur, ſicut dictum eſt in Deo Patre credi adjecta præpoſitione, ita & in Chriſto Filio ejus, ita & in Spiritu S. memoratur. Sed ut manifeſtius fiat quod dicimus, ex conſequentibus approbabitur. Sequitur namque poſt hunc ſermonem, *Sanctam Eccleſiam, remiſſionem peccatorum, hujus carnis reſurrectionem.* Non dixit, in ſanctam Eccleſiam, nec in remiſſionem peccatorum, nec in carnis reſurrectionem, ſi enim addidiſſet *in* præpoſitionem, una eademque vis fuiſſet cum ſuperioribus. Ne autem (*f.* Nunc autem) in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi divinitate fides ordinatur, in Deo Patre dicitur, & Jeſu Chriſto Filio ejus, & in Spiritu S. in cæteris vero ubi non de divinitate ſed de creaturis ac myſteriis ſermo eſt, *in* præpoſitio non additur ut dicatur in ſanctam Eccleſiam, ſed ſanctam Eccleſiam credendam eſſe, non ut in Deum ſed ut Eccleſiam Deo congregatam; & remiſſionem peccatorum credendam eſſe, non in remiſſionem peccatorum, & reſurrectionem carnis, non in reſurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque præpoſitionis ſyllaba creator à creaturis ſecernitur & divina ſeparantur ab humanis, Ruff. in Symb. *Though I ſay, this expreſſion be thus preſſed; yet we are ſure that the Fathers did uſe εἰς and* in *for the reſt of the Creed as well as for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. We have already produced the authorities of S.* Cyril, Arius *&* Euzolius *p.* 30. *beſide which we may obſerve that of* Epiphanius *in* Ancorato, *in his firſt and briefer confeſſion,* Εἰς Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ..... εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν; *in the latter and larger more expreſly,* πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας, καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν ..... καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. *Thus alſo the* Latines, *as S.* Cyprian, In æternam pœnam ſero credent, qui in vitam æternam credere noluerunt, *Ad* Demetrianum. *So Interpr. S Irenæi,* Quotquot autem timent Deum, & credunt in adventum Filii ejus, *&c. So* Chryſol. In ſanctam Eccleſiam. Quia Eccleſia in Chriſto, & in Eccleſia Chriſtus eſt, qui ergo Eccleſiam fatetur, in Eccleſiam ſe confeſſus eſt credidiſſe, *Serm.* 62.

For

For the understanding of the true notion of the Church, first we must observe that the nominall definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If wee look upon the old *English* word now in use, *Church* or *Kyrke*, it is derived from the *Greek*, and first signified the house of the Lord, that is of Christ, and from thence was taken to signifie the people of God, meeting in the house of God. The *Greek* word used by the Apostles to expresse 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 expresse the nature of the Church, what it is in it self, and as it is propounded to our belief.

† Κύριος *the Lord, and that properly Christ; from whence* Κυριακὸς *belonging to the Lord Christ,* οἶκος Κυριακὸς *the Lords house, from thence* Kyriac, Kyrke, *and* Church.

Our

* *The word used by the Apostles is* Ἐκκλησία, *from* ἐκκαλεῖν *evocare. From* ἐκκέκλησαι, ἔκκλητος; *from* ἔκκλητος ἐκκλησία, *of the same notation with the Hebrew* קְרִיאָה, ecclesia quippe ex vocatione appellata est *S. Aug. Exp. ad Rom. And though they ordinarily take it primarily to signifie* convocatio, *& S. Aug.* Inter congregationem, unde synagoga, & convocationem, unde Ecclesia nomen habet, distat aliquid, *Enar. in Psal. 177. yet the Origination speaks onely of evocation, without any intimation of congregation or meeting together, as there is in* σύσκλητος. *From whence arose that definition of* Methodius, Ὅτι Ἐκκλησίαν οὐδὲ τὸ ἐκκεκλῆκέναι τὰς ψυχὰς λέγεσθαι φησιν, Photius Biblioth. *whereas* ἐκκαλεῖν *is here no more then* καλεῖν, ἔκκλητος *no more then* κλῆτος; *as* κλητεύειν *and* ἐκκλητεύειν *with the Atticks were the same; From whence it came to passe that the same preposition hath bin twice added in the composition of the same words; from* ἐκκαλεῖν ἐκκλησία, *from thence* ἐκκλησιάζειν, *and because the preposition had no signification in the use of that word, from thence* ἐξεκκλησιάζειν, *to convocate, or call together. But yet* ἐκκλησία *is not the same with* ἔκκλησις, *not the evocation or the action of calling, but the* κλῆσοι, *or the company called, and that (according to the use) gathered together; from whence* ἐκκλησιάζειν *is to gather together, or to be gathered. Hence* Cyril, Ἐκκλησίαι ἦ καλεῖται φρονίμως, διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμοῦ ζωαγεῖν, Catech. 18. *So* Ammonius, Ἐκκλησίαν ἔλεγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν ζωὴν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ. *To this purpose doe the* LXX. *use* ἐκκλησιάζειν *actively, to convocate or call together an Assembly, as* ἐκκλησιάζειν λαὸν, *and* ἐκκλησιάζειν ζωαγωγίαν, *and* ἐκκλησιάζεσθαι *passively, as* ἐκκλησιάσθη πᾶσα ἡ ζωαγωγὴ, *which the Attick writers would have expressed by* ἐκκλησιάζειν, *as* Aristophanes, Ἐδόξε μοι πρῶτον ὑπνῶν ἐν τῇ πνυκὶ Ἐκκλησιάζειν περὶ βατα συσκαδησθαι, Vespis. *Where though the Scholiast hath rendred it* Ἐκκλησιάζειν, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ζωάγειν, *whereby the Lexicographers have bin deceived, yet the word is even there taken as a neuter, in the passive sense, as generally the Atticks use it. Howsoever from the notion of the word*

we

we cannot conclude that it ſignifies a number of men called together into one aſſembly out of the maſſe or generality of mankind; firſt, becauſe the prepoſition ἐκ hath no ſuch force in the uſe of the word; ſecondly, becauſe the collection or coming together is not ſpecified in the origination.

Our ſecond Obſervation is, that the Church hath bin taken for the whole complex of men and Angels worſhipping the ſame God; and again, the Angels being not conſidered, it hath bin taken as comprehending all the ſons of men believing in God ever ſince the foundation of the world. But being Chriſt took not upon him the nature of Angels, and conſequently did not properly purchaſe them with his bloud, 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 then 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 bloud; yet becauſe there was a vaſt difference between the ſeverall diſpenſations of the law and Goſpel, becauſe our Saviour ſpake expreſly of building himſelf a Church when the *Jewiſh* Synagogue was about to fail, becauſe Catholiciſme, which is here attributed unto the Church, muſt be underſtood in oppoſition to the legall ſingularity of the *Jewiſh* nation, becauſe the ancient * Fathers were generally wont to diſtinguiſh between the Synagogue and the Church, therefore I think it neceſſary to reſtrain this notion to Chriſtianity.

* Sacrificia in populo, ſacrificia & in Eccleſia, *Iren.* l. 4. c. 34. Diſſeminaverunt ſermonem de Chriſto Patriarchæ & Prophetæ, demeſſa eſt autem Eccleſia, hoc eſt, fructum percepit, *Id. l.* 4. *c.* 24. Quid Judaicus populus circa beneficia divina perfidus & ingratus? nonne quod à Deo primum receſſit impatientiæ crimen fuit? ... Impatientia etiam in Eccleſia hæreticos facit, S. Cypri. *de Bono Patient.* Quis non agnoſcat Chriſtum reliquiſſe matrem Synagogam Judæorum veteri Teſtamento carnaliter adhærentem, & adhæſiſſe uxori ſuæ S. Eccleſiæ, S. *Aug. contra Fauſt.* l. 12. c. 8. Mater ſponſi Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti Synagoga eſt; proinde nurus ejus Eccleſia .... *Idem Enar. in Pſal.* 44.

Thirdly,

Thirdly therefore I obſerve that the onely 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, mentioneth it as that which then was not, but afterwards was to be; as when he ſpake unto the great Apoſtle, *Thou art Peter, and upon 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 ſoules* which were added to the *hundred and twenty* diſciples; then was there a Church, (and that built upon † *Peter*, according to our Saviours promiſe.) for after that we reade, *The Lord added to the Church dayly 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 S. *Peter*, we find a Church built or conſtituted, and that of a nature capable of a dayly encreaſe. We cannot then take a better occaſion to ſearch into the true notion of the Church of Chriſt, then by looking into the origination and encreaſe thereof.

Matth. 16. 18.

Act. 2. 41.
Act. 1. 15.
Act. 2. 42.

† Qualis ex evertens atque commutans manifeſtam Domini intentionem perſonaliter hoc Petro confe-rentem, *Super te*, inquit, *ædificabo Eccl ſiam meam, & dabo tibi claves*, non Eccleſiæ. Sic enim & exitus docet: in ipſo Eccleſia exſtructa eſt, id eſt per ipſum, ipſe clavem imbuit, vides quam. *Vos Iſraelitæ, auribus mandate quæ dico: Ieſum Nazarenum virum à Deo vobis deſtinatum*, & reliqua, Tertull. *de Pudicitia*, cap. 21. Sic S. Baſil, Ἐνθὺς γὰρ ἐκ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης τοῦ μὲν Πέτρου.... τὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἀκροχωνιαῖον ἑαυτὸν τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δεξάμενον, Adv. *Eunom.* lib. 2. S. Peter *took upon himſelf the building of the Church, that is to be ſaid the Church, which he then performed, when he preached the Goſpell by which the Church was firſt gathered.*

Now what we are infallibly aſſured of the firſt actuall exiſtence of a Church of Chriſt is onely this. There were twelve Apoſtles with the Diſciples, before the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, and *the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty*. When the Holy Ghoſt

Act. 1. 15.

came after a powerfull and miraculous manner upon the bleſſed Apoſtles, and S. *Peter* preached unto the *Jewes*, that they ſhould *repent and be baptized in the name of Jeſus Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſinnes; they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the ſame day there were added unto them about three thouſand ſoules.* Theſe being thus added to the reſt, *continued ſtedfaſtly 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 adminiſtred, joyning in the publick prayers preſented unto God. This was then the Church, which was dayly encreaſed 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.*

Act. 2. 38, 41, 42, 47.

Act. 4. 32. 4. 14.

But though the Church was thus begun, and repreſented unto us as one in the beginning, though that Church which we profeſſe to believe in the Creed be alſo propounded unto us as one; and ſo the notion of the firſt Church in the *Acts* of the Apoſtles might ſeem ſufficient to expreſſe 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 actuall members of that one becoming the members of ſeverall 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 ſeverall Churches were conſtituted, that we may underſtand how in this one Church they are all united. To which purpoſe it will be further fit to examine the ſeverall acceptions

acceptions of this word as it is diverſly 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.

Firſt then that word which ſignifies the Church in the Originall *Greek*, is ſometimes uſed in the vulgar ſenſe, according as the native *Greeks* did uſe the ſame to expreſſe 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 has bin 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 publick ſervices unto God, and ſome † paſſages there are which ſeem to ſpeak no leſſe, 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 language of the New Teſtament doth alwayes ſignifie a company of perſons profeſſing the Chriſtian Faith, but not alwayes in the ſame latitude. Sometimes

Act. 19. 32, 39, 40.

Act. 8. 38. Heb. 2. 12.

† Act. 11. 26. 1 Cor. 11, 18, 22. *From theſe places S.* Aug. *did collect that* Ἐκκλησία *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 gloriſam Eccleſiam.* Hanc tamen vocari etiam ipſam domum orationum idem Apoſtolus teſtis eſt, ubi ait, „ *Nunquid domos non habetis ad manducandum & bibendum, Eccleſiam Dei contemnitis?* Et hoc quotidianus loquendi uſus obtinuit, ut, ad Eccleſiam prodire, aut ad Eccleſiam confugere, non dicatur, niſi quod ad locum ipſum parieteſque prodierit, vel confugerit quibus Eccleſiæ congregatio continetur, *Quæſt. ſuper Levit.* l. 3. c. 57. *By theſe words it is certain that in S.* Auguſtines *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*

same sense, as Eusebius speaking of the flourishing times of the Church, before the persecution under Diocletian, sayes the Christians μεδαμῶς ἔτι τοῖς πάλαι οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρκούμενοι ἐυρύας εἰς πάτερ ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων αἴρειν ἐκκλησίας, Hist. *lib.* 8. *cap.* 1. *But it is not so certain that the Apostle uses* 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 Peleusiota *expressly denyes it, and distinguishes between* Ἐκκλησία *and* Ἐκκλησιαστήριον, *after this manner,* Ἄλλο ἐστὶν Ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλο Ἐκκλησιαστήριον, ἡ μὲν ἐκ ψυχῶν ἁγίων συνίστηκε, τὸ δ' ὑπὸ λίθων καὶ ξύλων οἰκοδομεῖται. *And thus he proveth this distinction,* Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄλλο ἐστὶ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἄλλο θυσία, καὶ ἄλλο θυμιατήριον καὶ ἄλλο θυμίαμα, καὶ ἄλλο βωμὸς καὶ ἄλλο βωμός· τὸ μὲν γὰρ τόπον ἐν ᾧ συνδράμωσι μιμοῦνται, ἡ δὲ τοὺ βουλομένους ἀθροίζει, οἷς καὶ ὁ κίνδυνος καὶ ἡ σωτηρία ἀνήκει, ὅπου καὶ δεῖ τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστήρια καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. *Then he concludes that in the Apostles times there were no* Ἐκκλησιαστήρια, Ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Ἀποστόλων ὅτε ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἐκόμα μὴ χαείσματα μυθματικοῖς, ἔβρυε δὲ πολιτείᾳ λαμπρᾷ, ἐκκλησιαστήρια οὐκ ἦν, Epistol. 246. *lib.* 6.

times it admitteth 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.

† Act. 16. 5. 1 Cor. 14. 34. 2 Cor. 8. 19, 23, 24. 11. 8, 28. 12. 13. Rev. 22. 16. 1 Thessal. 1. 4. 1 Cor. 11. 16. Rom. 16. 4. 1 Cor. 14. 23. * Rom 16. 5. 1 Cor. 16. 19. Col. 4. 15. Philem. 2.

For first in generall 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 joyn in the worship of the same God. Again, when the Scripture speaketh of any Country where the Gospel had bin preached, it

S. Chrysostome *observeth of* Priscilla *and* Aquila, Οὕτω γὰρ ἦσαν εὐδόκιμοι ὡς καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκκλησίαν ποιῆσαι, διά τε τὸ πάντας ποιῆσαι πιστοὺς, καὶ διὰ τοὺς ξένους αὐτὴν ἀνοῖξαι πᾶσιν, *Chrysost.* Homil. 30. *in* Epist. *ad Romanos.*

nameth

nameth alwayes by way of plurality the * Churches of that Countrey, 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 severall such Churches or congregations of believers in great and populous cityes, yet the Scriptures alwayes speak of such congregations in the notion of one Church. As when Saint *Paul* wrote to the *Corinthians*, a *Let your women keep silence in the Churches*, yet the dedication of his Epistle is, *Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth*. 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*. From whence it appeareth that a collection of severall 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 Cityes where Christians were very numerous, not onely all the severall Churches within the Cityes, 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 severall Churches are reduced to the denomination of one Church, in relation to the single Governour of those many Churches, so all the Churches of all cityes and all nations in the world may be reduced to the same single denomination in relation to one supreme Governour of them all, and that one Governour is Christ the Bishop of our soules. Wherefore the Apostle speaking of that in which all Churches doe agree, comprehendeth them all

* Gal. 1. 22. Act. 9. 31. 1 Cor. 16. 1, 19 Rev. 1. 11. 1 Thess. 2. 14. 2 Cor. 8. 1. Gal. 1. 2.

a 1 Cor. 14. 34. 1 Cor. 1. 2. Act. 8. 1, 11, 22. 13. 1. 15. 3. 18. 22. 20. 17. 2 Thess. 1. 1. Col. 4. 16. Rev. 3. 14. 2. 8, 12, 18. 3. 1, 7.

And thus after they grew yet far more numerous in the time of Clemens *Bishop of* Rome. Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῦ Θεῦ, ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῦ Θεῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον, Epist. 1. *So after him* Ignatius, Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἠξιωμενῃ ἐν τῇ ἕξει ὃν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας. *And* Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίᾳ τῇ ὔσῃ ὃν Τράλλεσιν, *And so the rest.*

under the same appellation of one Church; and therefore often by the name of * Church are understood all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the Churches dispersed through the distant and divided parts of the world. 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 Generall and Universall 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 expresly termed † *one, I believe in one holy Catholick Church.*

* Mat 16.18. 1 Cor. 12. 28. 15.9. Gal. 1. 13. Eph.1. 22. 3.10,21.5. 23, 25, 27, 29, 32. Phil.3.6. Col. 1.18,24.Heb. 12. 23.

† *So the Creeds of* Epiphanius *in Ancoro,* πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, *So the* Jerusalem *Creed in* S.Cyril. *Thus the* Nicene *with the additions of the Council of* Constantinople, μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. *Thus also the* Alexandrian, *as appeareth by those already quoted of* Alexander, Arius *and* Eusebius.

It will therefore be further 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, this unity 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 bin in a manner added and conjoyned, 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 S. *Peter*, continuing stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in 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 dayly 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.

Act. 2. 41, 42, 44, 47.

From whence it appeareth that the first unity of the Church relieth upon the originall of it which is one; even as an house built upon one foundation, though consisting of

of many roomes, 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, then that is layd, which is Jeſus Chriſt.* 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 paſſe that ſuch perſons as are of the Church, being *fellow citizens with the Saints, and of the houſhould 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, groweth unto an holy Temple in the Lord.* This *ſtone* was *layd in Zion for a foundation, a tryed ſtone, a precious corner ſtone, a ſure foundation*: there was the firſt Church built, and whoſoever have bin, or ever ſhall be converted to the true Chriſtian faith, are and ſhall be added to that Church, and layd upon the ſame foundation, which is the unity of † origination. Our Saviour gave the ſame power to all the Apoſtles, which was to found the Church, but he gave that power to *Peter*, to ſhew the unity of the ſame Church.

1 Cor. 3. 11.

Eph. 2. 19, 20, 21.

Iſai. 28. 16.

† *This is the* Unitas originis *which S.* Cyprian *ſo much inſiſts upon.*

Eccleſia una eſt quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fœcunditatis extenditur; quomodo Solis multi radii, ſed lumen unum; & rami arboris multi, ſed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum. Et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numeroſitas licet diffuſa videatur exundantis copiæ largitate, unitas tamen ſervatur in origine, *&c. S.* Cypr. *de Unitate Eccl.* Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum, *Ego tibi dico*, inquit, *quia tu es Petrus, & ſuper iſtam petram ædificabo Eccleſiam meam*, &c. Et eidem poſt reſurrectionem ſuam dicit, *Paſce oves meas.* Et quamvis Apoſtolis omnibus poſt reſurrectionem ſuam parem poteſtatem tribuat, & dicat, *Sicut miſit me Pater, & ego mitto vos* &c. tamen ut unitatem manifeſtaret, unitatis ejuſdem originem ab uno incipientem ſua authoritate diſpoſuit. Hoc erant utique & cæteri Apoſtoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari conſortio præditi, & honoris & poteſtatis, ſed exordium ab unitate proficiſcitur, ut Eccleſia una monſtretur, *Ibid.* Ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἄκρως τίμιον καὶ τῶν μόνων ἐπιγνῶναι, μίμημα ὂν ἀρχῆς τῆς μιᾶς, Clem. Alexand. *Stromat. lib.* 7.

Secondly,

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 profeſſe, 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 receiv'd from Chriſt, then they 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.

Epheſ. 4. 5. Jude 3.

† *Of this doth* Irenæus *ſpeak, delivering the ſumme or brief abſtract of the materiall Object of Faith*, τὸ κήρυγμα παραληφθὲν, καὶ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη ἕως ἐσχάτου φυλάσσει, ὡς ἕνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα, καὶ ὁμοίως πιστεύει τούτοις, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κηρύσσει καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παραδίδωσιν ὡς ἓν στόμα κεκτημένη, Irenæus *Adv. Hæreſ.* lib. 1. Κατά τε οὖν τὴν θέσιν, κατά τε ἰδέαν, κατά τε ἀρχήν, κατά τε ὄγκον, μόνην εὑρίσκομεν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατ' ἐξοχὴν διαθήκης, μᾶλλον δὲ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν μιᾶν διαφόρους τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ βουλεύματος, δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ζωμάγματος τοῦ ἤδη καταστάντος μόνου, ἐφ' οἷς προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίως ἑνωμένους πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1. lib. 7. *This unity of Faith followeth the unity of origination, becauſe the true faith is the true foundation*, Si qua eſt Eccleſia quæ fidem reſpuat, nec Apoſtolicæ prædicationis fundamenta poſſideat, deſerenda eſt. Petra tua Chriſtus eſt, *S. Ambroſ.* in Luc. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. Ἡ δὲ ζωμάγματα τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ποιμὴν, ἀρετὴ ὑ πίστις ἐστὶν, Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* lib. 2. S. Jerome *in thoſe words of the* Pſalm 23. 11. Hæc eſt generatio quærentium Dominum, *hath this obſervation.* Superius ſingulariter dixit, *Hic accipiet benedictionem*; modo pluraliter, quia Eccleſia ex pluribus perſonis congregatur, & tamen una dicitur propter unitatem fidei.

Thirdly,

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 signes and badges of the people of God. When the Apostles were sent to found and build the Church, they received this Commission, *Goe, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now as there is but *one Lord,* and *one faith*, so also is there but *one baptisme*; and consequently they which are admitted to it, in receiving it are one. Again, at the institution of the Lords 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.* As therefore the *Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spirituall meat, and did all drink the same spirituall drink,* 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.

Mat. 28. 19. Eph. 4. 4. 1 Cor. 10. 17 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3, 4.

Fourthly, whosoever belongeth to any Church is some way called, and all which are so, are *called in one hope of their calling*: the same reward of eternall life is promised unto every person, and we all *through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousnesse by faith.* They therefore which depend upon the same God, and worship him all for the same end, *the hope of Eternall life, which God that cannot lye, promised before the world began* having all the same expectation may well be reputed the same Church. And this is the unity of hope.

Eph. 4. 4. Galat. 5. 5.

Fiftly, 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 by one soul, become one body. Charity is of 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.

Eph. 4. 3.
Joh. 13. 35.
† Unus Deus enim & Christus unus, Ecclesia ejus una, fides una, & plebs in solidâ corporis unitatem concordiæ glutino copulata, S. Cypr. *de Unitate Ecc.*

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 pastorall guides appointed, authorised, 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 eternall salvation, and this is the * Unity of Regiment and discipline.

* Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis insolidũ pars tenetur; Ecclesia una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremẽto fœcunditatis extenditur, S. Cypr. *ibidem.*

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 humane persons professing faith in Christ, gathered together in severall places of the world for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforsaid. 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 professe and say, *I believe a Church*, it is not onely an acknowledgement of a Church which hath bin, 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 dyed, but now is not dead. When I say, *I believe*

** *These are all expressed by* Tertullian, Una nobis & illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri sacramenta; semel dixerim, una Ecclesia sumus, *de Virg. veland. cap.* 2. Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis, & disciplinæ unitate, & spei fœdere, *Apolog. cap.* 39.

lieve the resurrection of the body, 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 alwayes past, and so believ'd for ever; that which shall never come to passe untill the end of the world, when this publick profession of faith shall cease, that must for ever be believ'd 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 it self 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 actuall 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 perpetuall accession, and by a successive augmentation be interruptedly continued in an actuall existence of believing persons and congregations in all ages unto the end of the world.

Now this indeed is a proper object of faith, because it is grounded onely 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 it self for ever. Many thousand persons have fallen totally and finally from the faith professed, and so apostatized from the Church. Many particular Churches have bin wholly lost, many candlesticks have bin removed; neither

is there any particular Church which hath any power to continue it ſelf more or longer then others; and conſequently, if all particulars be defectible, the Univerſall Church muſt alſo be ſubject of it ſelf 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 S. *Peter*, he ſealed his ſpeech with a powerfull 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.* Mat. 16. 18. When he ſpake generally to all the reſt of the Apoſtles, to the ſame purpoſe, *Goe 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 loe I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.* Mat 28:19,23. 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 flouds came, and the winds blew and beat upon that houſe, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.* Mat. 7. 24, 25. 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*; and as *a wiſe man*, he hath built his houſe upon a rock, and what is ſo built ſhall not fall. Heb. 3. 3, 6. The latter of theſe promiſes giveth not onely an aſſurance of the continuance of the Church, but alſo the cauſe of that continuance, which is the preſence of Chriſt. *Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Chriſt*, there he is in the *midſt of them*, 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

aſſure us of the exiſtence of the Church, untill 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*, as the great Prophet of the Church hath ſaid. Pſal. 48. 8.

Upon the certainty of this truth the exiſtence of the Church hath bin 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 doe believe, they muſt believe there is a Church. And thus having ſhewed in what the nature of a Church conſiſteth, and proved that a Church of that nature is of perpetuall and indefectible exiſtence 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.*

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 *Catholick*. Now the Church which we have deſcribed, may be called holy in ſeverall reſpects, and for ſeverall 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 profeſſe faith in Chriſt, is thereby engaged to holineſſe of life, according to the words of the Apoſtle, *Let every one that* 2 Tim. 1. 9. 2 Tim. 2. 19.

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 call'd 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 his 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 encreasing 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*.

Act. 9. 14, 21. *vide* 1 Cor. 1. 2.

For these four reasons the whole *Church of God*, as it conteineth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the faith of Christ, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed holy. But the Apostle hath also 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 sanctifie 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 call'd 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, wrinke, blemish, or any

Ephes. 5. 25, 26, 27.

any ſuch thing. It will be therefore neceſſary within the great complex body of the Univerſall Church, to find that Church to which this abſolute holineſſe doth belong: and to this purpoſe it will be fit to conſider both the difference of the perſons conteined in the Church, as it hath bin hitherto deſcribed, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death; whereby we ſhall at laſt diſcover in what perſons this holineſſe 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.

Where firſt we muſt obſerve that the Church as it embraceth all the profeſſours of the true faith of Chriſt conteineth in it not onely ſuch as doe truely believe and are obedient to the word, but thoſe alſo which are hypocrites, and profane. Many profeſſe the faith, which have no true belief: many have ſome kind of faith, which live with no correſpondence to the Goſpel preach'd. Within therefore the notion of the Church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both profeſſing the ſame ſame faith. For the *Kingdome of heaven is like unto a field* in which *wheat and tares grow together into the harveſt*; *like unto a net that was caſt into the ſea, and gathered of every kind*; like unto a *floore* in which are 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 onely veſſels of gold and of ſilver, but alſo of wood, and* Mat 13. 24, 30. 47. Mat. 3. 12.

Firmiſſime tene & nullatenus dubites aream Dei eſſe Eccleſiam Catholicam, & intra eam uſque in finem ſæculi frumento mixtas paleas contineri, hoc eſt, bonis malos ſacramentorum communione miſceri, *Fulgent.* ad Petrum, cap. 43, Mat. 22. 10. 2 Tim 2. 20. S. Jerome *joynes theſe two together*, Arca Noæ Eccleſiæ typus: ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita & in hac univerſarum & gentium & morum homines ſunt, ut ubi pardus & hœdi, lupus & agni, ita & hic juſti & peccatores, id eſt, vaſa aurea & argentea cum ligneis & fictilibus commorantur, *Dialog. contra* Luciferianos.

of

of earth, and ſome to honour, and ſome to diſhonour. There are *many called*, of all which the Church conſiſteth, but there are *few choſen*, of thoſe which are called, and thereby within the Church. I conclude therefore, as the ancient Catholicks did againſt the † *Donatiſts*, that within the Church, in the publick profeſſion and externall communion thereof, are conteined perſons truly good and ſanctified, and hereafter ſaved; & together with them other perſons voyd of all ſaving grace, and hereafter to be damned.

† *The Opinion of the* Donatiſts *confuted by the Catholicks is to be ſeen in S.* Auſtin's *book intituled* Breviculum Collationũ. *Upon which reflecting in his book* Poſt Collationẽ, *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 veritate Evangelica non aliud coacti ſunt confiteri quam malos occultos nunc ei permixtos eſſe, *as the good and bad fiſh are taken in the ſame net, becauſe it could not diſcern the bad from the good. And from thence he inforceth from their acknowledgement, that thoſe which are apparently evil, are conteined in the ſame Church.* Si enim propterea retibus bonos & malos congregantibus Eccleſiam comparavit, quia malos in Eccleſia non manifeſtos ſed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita neſciunt ſacerdotes, quemadmodum ſub fluctibus quid acceperint retia neſciunt Piſcatores. Propterea ergo & areæ comparata eſt, ut etiam manifeſte mali cum bonis in ea prænuntiarentur futuri. Neque enim palea quæ in area eſt permixta frumentis, etiam ipſa ſub fluctibus latet, quæ ſic omnium oculis eſt conſpicua, ut potius occulta ſint in ea frumenta, cum ſit ipſa manifeſta, *Lib. poſt. Collat.* cap. 9, 10.

Of theſe promiſcuouſly conteined in the Church, ſuch as are voyd of all ſaving grace while they live, and communicate with the reſt of the Church, and when they paſs out of this life, dye in their ſinnes, and remain under the eternall 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 conteined in it. Through their own demerit they fall ſhort of the glory unto which they were called, and being by death ſeparated from the externall Communion of the Church, and having no true internall 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 effica-

efficaciouſly called, juſtified, and ſanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they dye are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death ſeparated from the Church, but remain united ſtill by virtue of that internall union by which they were before conjoyned both to the members and the head. As therefore the Church is truly holy, not onely by an holineſſe of inſtitution, but alſo by a perſonall 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, & conſequently all cut off from the communion of the Church, when the members of the Church remaining being perfectly ſanctified, ſhall be eternally glorified, then ſhall the whole Church be truly and perfectly holy.

Then ſhall that be completely fulfilled, that *Chriſt ſhall preſent unto himſelf a glorious Church*, which ſhall *be holy and without blemiſh*. 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, admitteth or not admitteth the permixtion 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 conteined in it, by a reall infuſed ſanctity; the ſame is further yet at the ſame time perfectly holy in reference to the Saints depar-

Eph. 2. 27.

† *This wisit which the Catholicks anſwered to the* Donatiſts, *objecting that they made two diſtinct Churches.* De duabus etiam Eccleſiis calumniam eorum Catholici refutarunt identidem expreſſius oſtendentes quid dixerint, id eſt, non eam Eccleſiam quæ nunc habet permixtos malos alienam ſe dixiſſe à regno Dei, ubi non erunt mali commixti, ſed eandem ipſam unam & ſanctam Eccleſiam nunc eſſe aliter, tunc autem aliter futuram, nunc habere malos mixtos tunc non habituram, ſicut nunc mortalem quod ex mortalibus conſtaret hominibus, tunc autem immortalem, quod in ea nullus eſſet vel corpore moriturus, ſicut non ideo duo Chriſti, quia prior mortuus poſtea non moriturus, *S. Aug. Collat. 3. diei.*

ted 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 holineſſe and completed in happineſſe. And thus I conceive the affection of ſanctity ſufficiently explicated.

The next affection of the Church is that of Univerſality, *I believe the holy* CATHOLICK *Church.* Now the word *Catholick* as it is not read in the Scriptures, ſo was it not anciently in the Creed (as we have already ſhewn) 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 conſentient with the Scriptures. To grant then that the word was not uſed by the † Apoſtles, we muſt alſo acknowledge that it was moſt anciently in uſe among the Primitive Fathers, and that as to ſeverall intents. For firſt, they called the Epiſtles of S. *James*, S. *Peter*, S. *John*, S. *Jude*, the * Catholick Epiſtles, becauſe

† *It was the ordinary objection of the Schiſmaticall* Novatians *that the very name of Catholicks was never uſed by the Apoſtles, and the anſwer to it by the Catholicks was by way of confeſſion.* Sed ſub Apoſtolis, inquies, nemo Catholicus vocabatur; Eſto, ſic fuerit, vel illud indulge, &c. Pacianus *ad* Sympronianum, *Epiſt.* 1.

* So S. Jerome *of* S. James, Unam tantum ſcripſit Epiſtolam quæ de ſeptem Catholicis eſt. *Of* S. Peter, Scripſit duas Epiſtolas quæ Catholicæ nominantur. *Of* Saint Jude, Judas frater Jacobi, parvam quidem, quæ de ſeptem Catholicis eſt, Epiſtolam reliquit. *This therefore was the common Title of theſe Epiſtles in* S. Jerome's *time among the* Latines, *and before among the* Greeks, *as appeareth by* Euſebius, Τοιαῦτα μὲν τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἰάκωβον, ἃ δὴ πρώτην τῆς λεγομένης Καθολικῶν ἐπιστολὰν ἔθεσαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι λέγεσθαι, ἰστέον ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν γοῦν τῆς παλαιᾶς αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσάν, ὡς καὶ ἡ λεγομένη Ἰούδα μιᾶς μὲν αὐτὴ ὤσης τῶν ἑπτὰ Καθολικῶν, Hiſt. *lib.* 2. 23. *before the time of* Euſebius, *as appeareth by* Dionyſius *Biſhop of* Alexandria, Ὁ δὲ Εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδὲ τῆς Καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προσέγραψεν αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα, Euſeb. *Hiſt. l.* 7. *c.* 25. *and before him, as appeareth by* Origen, Δεύτερον δὲ τὸ περὶ Μάρκον ὡς Πέτρῳ ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα, ὃν καὶ ὑὸν ἐν τῇ Καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ διὰ τούτων ὡμολόγησε, Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. 6. cap. 25. *Thus anciently* Epiſtola Catholica *was uſed for a Generall Epiſtle, and ſo continued, not onely in relation to the Scriptures, but to the Epiſtles of others, as* Euſebius *of* Dionyſius *Biſhop of* Corinth, Χρησιμώτατον ἁπάντων ἑαυτὸν καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἐν αἷς ὑπέτυπώσατο Καθολικὰς πρὸς ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις Ἐπιστολάς, Hiſt. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 23.

when

when the Epiſtles written by S. *Paul* were directed to particular Churches congregated in particular Cityes, 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 Catholick for nothing elſe but generall, or univerſall in the ordinary or vulgar ſenſe; as the * Catholick reſurrection is the reſurrection of all men. Sometimes it was uſed as a word of ſtate ſignifying an Officer which collected the Emperours revenue in ſeverall Provinces united into one Dioceſſe, who becauſe there were particular Officers belonging to the particular Provinces, and all under him, therefore he was called the † *Catholicus* as Generall Procurator of them all, from whence that title was by ſome transferred upon the Chriſtian Patriarchs.

* So Juſtine Martyr, Μεγὰ παῦτα τῶν Καθολικὴν ἢ (σωζελόντι φάναι) αἰωνίαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα παίτων ἀνάςασιν γενήσεθαι ἢ κρίσιν, *Dial. adv. Trypho.* So Tertullian *uſes* Catholicè *for* ex toto, Ab eo permittatur vel imperetur neceſſe eſt, catholicè fieri hæc, à quo & ex parte, *De Fuga in Perſ. and for* generaliter, Etſi quædam inter domeſticos differebant, non tamen ea fuiſſe credendum eſt, quæ aliam regulam fidei ſuperducerent, diverſam & contrariam illi quam catholicè in medium proferebant, *De præſc. adv. Hæret.* c 26. † *We read in the old Gloſſary,* Καθολικὸς, Racionalis; *that is, the Receiver of the Imperiall Revenue; not that it ſignifies ſo much of it ſelf, but becauſe he was the Generall Receiver, and ſo not from receiving or accounting, but for the Generality of his accounts in reſpect of others, who were inferiour, and whoſe receits and accounts were more particular; therefore he was called* Catholicus. *Thus* Conſtantine *ſignified to* Cæcilianus *Biſhop of* Carthage, *that he had written to his Procurator Generall to deliver him monies,* Ἔδωκα γράμματα πρὸς Οὔρσον τὸν λαμπρότατον Καθολικὸν τῆς Ἀφρικῆς, ἢ ἐδήλωσα αὐτῷ ὅπως τελεσθῆναι φόλλεις ἓξ σὺν τετρόπτοι ἀπεσταλμένας φροντίσαι, Euſeb. *Hiſt.* lib. 10. cap. 6. *And in the ſame manner to* Euſebius, Ἀπέσταλται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γράμματα διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἡμερότητος πρὸς τὸν τῆς διοικήσεως Καθολικὸν ὅπως αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου αὐτῆς ἐπιτήδεια παρασχεῖν φροντίσειεν, Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. 1. cap. 9.

When this title is attributed to the Church it hath not alwayes 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 *Catholick Church* is meant no more then the common Church,

into which all such persons as belonged to that parish in which 'twas built were wont to congregate. For where Monasteries were in use, as there were separate habitations for men, and distinct for women, so were there 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 receiv'd them both, and therefore called † *Catholick*.

† *Thus* Ἐκκλησία Καθολικὴ *is often to be understood, especially in the latter Greeks, for the common or parochiall Church. As we read in* Codinus de Officiis Constant. Ὁ Σακελλίου τῶν ὀπαδῶν ἔχων τῆς Καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. *And again,* Ὁ Ἄρχων τῆς ἐκκλησιῶν ἔχων τὸν ὀπαδὸν τῆς Καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν μετὰ τὸν τοπότην τοῦ Σακελλίου. *So likewise* Balsamon, Λέγει Σακελλάειος ὁ τῆς μοναστηρίων διοικητὴς, ὡς ὁ Σακελλίου οἰκονομικὸς ὁ τῆς Καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ψάλτης, *lib.* 7. Juris Græcorum. *Where appeareth a manifest distinction of the Monastick, and the Catholick Churches. Hence* Alexius *Patriarch of* Constantinople *complaineth of such as frequented the private chappells, and avoided the common Churches, describing those persons in this manner,* Πατειαρχικοῖς γράμμασι ἢ τοῖς ἐπισκοπικοῖς διαῤῥήγνυντες, ἀλλὰς Καθολικὰς παραιτούμενοι, καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς πλήθεσι συνάξεως καταφρονοῦντες, *lib.* 4. Juris Græcor. * *As the* Smyrneans *spake in* Eusebius *of* Polycarpus, ἡνώμεθα ἐπίσκοπον τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, lib: 4. cap. 15. *So* Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, *in* Epiphanius; *and all Churches which retein the Catholick faith, are called Catholick Churches. Whence where we read in the Synod of* Ariminum, εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πάντες ἐπίσκοποι (συνήλθομεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ πίστις τῆς Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας γνωσθῇ, καὶ οἱ παρανομία φερόμενοι ἔκδηλοι γένωνται), *although in* Athanasius, Theodoret, *and* Socrates *it be constantly written* τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας; *yet* S. Hilary *did certainly read it* τῆς Καθολικῶν Ἐκκλησίας, *for it is thus translated in his Fragments,* Ut fides clarescret omnibus Ecclesiis Catholicis, & hæretici noscerentur. *From whence it came to passe that in the same City Heretick and Catholicks having their severall congregations, each of which was called the Church, the Congregation of the Catholicks was by way of distinction called the Catholick Church. Of which this was the old advice of* S. Cyril *of* Jerusalem, Ἂν ποτὲ ἐπιδημήσῃς ἐν πόλει, μὴ ἁπλῶς ἐξέτασῃς τοῦ Κυριακὸν ὅτι· καὶ γὰρ αἱ λοιπαὶ τῆς αἱρετῶν αἱρέσεις Κυριακὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀπόλαυσι καλοῦν ἐπιχειροῦσι· μηδὲ τοῦ ἔστιν ἁπλῶς ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, Catech. 18. Ego forte ingressus populo-

populoſam urbem hodie cum Marcionitas, cum Apollinaricos, Cataphrygas, Novatianos, & cæteros ejuſmodi comperiſſem, qui ſe Chriſtianos vocarent, quo cognomine congregationem meæ plebis agnoſcerem niſi Catholica diceretur? *Pacianus* ad Sympron *Epiſt.* 1. Tenet poſtremo ipſum Catholicæ nomen, quod non ſine cauſa iſta Eccleſia ſola obtinuit, ut cum omnes hæretici ſe Catholicos dici velint, quærenti tamen peregrino alicui, ubi ad Catholicam conveniatur, nullus hæreticorum, vel Baſilicam ſuam vel domum audeat oſtendere, *S. Auguſt. con. Epiſt. Fundamenti*, cap. 4.

Now being theſe particular Churches could not be named Catholick as they were particular, in reference to this or that City in which they were congregated, it followeth that they were called Catholick by their coherence and conjunction with that Church which was † properly and originally called ſo; which is the Church taken in that acception 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, receiving continued acceſſion, and diſſeminated in ſeverall parts of the earth, conteining within it numerous Congregations, all which were truely called Churches, as members of the ſame Church; that Church, I ſay, was after ſome time called the *Catholick Church*, that is to ſay, the name *Catholick* was uſed by the *Greeks* to ſignifie the whole. For being every particular congregation profeſſing the name of Chriſt, was from the beginning call'd 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 paſſe 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 * Catholick Church.

† Nonne appellatione propria docuit caput principale ſignari? *Pacianus* ibid.

* *I conceive at firſt there was no other meaning in the word* Καθολικὴ then *what the* Greek *language did ſignifie thereby, that is,* tota *or* univerſa. *The moſt ancient Author which I find it in, is* Clemens Alexandrinus, μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, Stromat. lib. 7. *But the Paſſion of* Polycarpus *written in the name of the Church of* Smyrna, *may be much ancienter, in which the Originall notion ſeemeth moſt clear,* Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα

κῶτα Σμύρναν ἢ παροικίαν ὁν φιλομιλῶ, ἢ πάσας πᾶς κᾶτ' πανταχόθεν τῆς ἁγίας Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίας, i.e. omnibus totius Ecclesiæ parœciis, *Euseb.* Hist. Eccl. 4. 15. *It was otherwise called in the same not only* ἡ καθόλου. *As* Apollinarius *Bishop of* Hierapolis, Τὴν δὲ καθόλου καὶ πᾶσι τὴν κατὰ τὸν ὑσεγνὸν ἐκκλησίαν βλασφημῶν διδάσκοντες τὸ ἁπλανὲς δισμένου πνεύματος, *apud* Euseb. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 16. *And* Eusebius, Περιῆει δὲ εἰς αὔξησιν καὶ μέγεθος ἀνὰ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσα ἡ τῆς καθόλου καὶ μόνης ἀληθοῦς ἐκκλησίας λαμπρότης, Hist. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 7. Καθολικὴ *then and* ἡ καθόλου *is the same, the whole, generall, or universall.*

Although this seem the first intention of those which gave the name Catholick to the Church, to signify thereby nothing else but the whole or universall Church, yet those which followed did signifie 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 Catholick, meaning no more then the Universall Church; but having us'd that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the Church was to be Universall, and in what that Universality did consist.

As far then as the ancient Fathers have expres's'd 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 Catholick, and that the truly Catholick 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 Catholick Church.*

The most obvious and most generall notion of this Catholicisme consisteth in the diffusiveness of the Church, grounded upon the Commission given to the builders of it, *Goe teach all nations*, whereby they and their successors were authorized and impowered to gather congregations of believers, & 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 publick worship of

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 shewed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgements unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation.* The Temple was the onely 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 inclosure divided from all the world beside. But God said 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, *Goe ye into all the world, and preach the Gospell to every creature; that repentance and remission of sinnes should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.* Thus the Church of Christ in it's primary institution was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend it self, from the City of *Jerusalem*, where it first began, to all the parts and corners of the earth. This reason did the ancient Fathers render why the Church was called * Catholick, and the nature of the Church is so described in the Scriptures.

Psal. 76. 1, 2.
Psal. 147. 19.
Psal. 2. 8.
Mar. 16. 15.
Luc. 24. 47.

* *We have before observed of* Arius *and* Euzoius, *that naming the Catholick Church in their Creed they gave withall the interpretation of it.* Εἰς μίαν Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τῆς Θεοῦ, τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων. *S.* Cyril *of* Jerusalem *gives this as the first importance of the word.* Καθολικὴ δὲ οὖσα καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων, *Catech.* 18. Ipsa est enim Ecclesia Catholica: unde Καθολικὴ Græce appellatur, quod per totum orbem diffunditur, *S.* Aug. *Epist.* 170. Ecclesia illa est quam modo dixi unicam suam, hæc est unica Catholica quæ toto orbe copiosè diffunditur, quæ usque ad ultimas gentes crescendo porrigitur, *Idem* Epist. 30. Si autem dubitas quod Ecclesiam quæ per omnes gentes numerositate copiosa dilatatur, S. Scriptura commendat, multis & manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem autoritate prolatis te onerabo, *Idem* c ntra *Gresc*on. lib. 1. cap 33. Sancta Ecclesia ideo dicitur Catholica, pro eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa, *Isidor.* de Summo Bono, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 9.

Secondly, they called the Church of Christ the Catholick Church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whither they be things

10

in heaven or things in earth, whither 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*, so did the Apostles leave all truth unto the Church, which teaching all the same may well be called † Catholick, from the Universality of necessary and saving truths retained in it.

† *This is the second interpretation delivered by S.* Cyril, Καὶ διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν καθολικῶς καὶ ἀπελλειπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα περί τε ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων πραγμάτων ἐπουρανίων τε καὶ ἐπιγείων, *Catech.* 18. Ecclesia Græcum nomen est, quod in Latinum vertitur *Convocatio*, propterea quod ad se omnes vocet. Catholica (id est Universalis) ideo dicitur quia per universum mundum est constituta: vel quoniam Catholica, hoc est, generalis in eadem doctrina est ad institutionem, *In Decret.* Ivo. *lib.* 1.

Thirdly, the Church hath bin thought fit to be called Catholick in reference to the universall obedience which it prescribeth: both in respect of the persons, obliging men of * all conditions, and in relation to the precepts, requiting the performance of † all the Evangelicall commands.

* *This is the third interpretation of S.* Cyril, Καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων εἰς εὐσέβειαν ὑποτάσσειν ἀρχόντων τε καὶ ἀρχομένων λογίων τε καὶ ἰδιωτῶν, *Catech.* 18. Fourthly,

† Si reddenda Catholici vocabuli ratio est, & exprimenda de Græco interpretatione Latina, Catholicus ubique unum, vel (ut doctiores putant) obedientia omnium nuncupatur, mandatorum scilicet Dei. Unde Apostolus, *Si in omnibus obedientes estis*, & iterum, *Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius peccatores constituti sunt multi, sic per dicto-audientiam unius justi constituentur multi*, Ergo qui Catholicus, idem justi obediens, *Pacianus* Epist. 1. ad *Sympron.* Acutum aliquid videris dicere cum Catholicæ nomen non ex orbis totius communione interpretaris, sed ex observatione præcepto um omnium divinorum atque omnium Sacramentorum: quasi nos etiam, si forte hinc sit appellata Catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat, cujus veritatis nonnullæ particulæ etiam in diversis inveniuntur hæresibus, hujus nominis testimonio nitamur ad demonstrandam Ecclesiam in omnibus gentibus, & non promissis Dei & tam multis tamque manifestis oraculis ipsius veritatis. Sed nempe hoc est totum, quod nobis persuadere conaris, solos remansisse Rogatistas, qui Catholici recte appellandi sunt ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinorum atque omnium Sacramentorum, *S. Aug.* Vincentio, Epist. 48. *Indeed this Notion of the Catholick Church was urged by the* Donatists *as the only notion of it in opposition to the Universality of place and communion. For when the Catholicks answered for themselves*, Quia Ecclesiæ toto orbe diffusæ, cui testimonium

nium perhibet Scriptura divina, ipſi, non Donatiſtæ communicant, unde Catholici merito & ſunt & vocantur: Donatiſtæ autem reſponderunt. Non Catholicum nomen ex univerſitate gentium, ſed ex plenitudine Sacramentorum inſtitutum, *Idem Gollat.* 3. *dici*, cap. 2.

Fourthly, the Church hath bin yet further called Catholick, by reaſon of all graces given in it, whereby all diſeaſes of the ſoul are healed, and ſpirituall virtues are diſſeminated, all the works, and words & thoughts of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in Chriſt Jeſus. In all theſe four acceptions did ſome of the ancient Fathers underſtand the Church of Chriſt to be Catholick, and every one of them doth certainly belong unto it. Wherefore I conclude that this Catholiciſme, or ſecond affection of the Church, conſiſteth generally in Univerſality, as embracing all ſorts of perſons, as to be diſſeminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as conteining 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 ſoules of men.

† *This is the fourth and laſt explication given by S. Cyril,* Διὰ τὸ καθολικῶς ἰατρεύειν ἅμα καὶ θεραπεύειν ἅπαν τὸ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων εὐσεβὲς καὶ διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος καὶ ὁπωσοῦν τελειώσεως, κεκλῆσθαί τε ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ὀνομάζομεν ἀρετῆς ἐν ἔργοις τε καὶ λόγοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς παντοίοις χαρίσμασι, Catech. 18.

The neceſſity of believing the Holy Catholick Church, appeareth firſt in this, that Chriſt hath appointed it as the onely way unto eternall life. We read at the firſt, that *the Lord added to the Church dayly ſuch as ſhould be ſaved*; and what was then dayly done, hath bin done ſince continually. Chriſt never appointed two wayes to heaven, nor did he build a Church to ſave ſome, and make another inſtitution. *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 heauen then 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* liv'd, but ſuch as were within thoſe habitations whoſe door-poſts were ſprinkled with bloud by the appointment of God for their preſervation; as none of the inhabitants of *Jericho* could eſcape the fire or

Act. 2. 47.

Act. 4. 12.

ſword, but ſuch as were within the houſe of *Rahab*, for whoſe protection a Covenant was made; ſo none ſhall ever eſcape the eternall 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.

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 our ſelves, or be ejected, out of it. There is a power within the Church to caſt thoſe out which doe 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 incorrigable miſdemeanours, we may incurre 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, *Whoſeſoever ſinnes ye remitt they are remitted unto them, and whoſeſoever ſinnes ye retain they are retained.* Again, a man may not not onely paſſively and involuntarily be ejected, but alſo may by an act of his own, caſt out or eject himſelf, not onely by plain and complete Apoſtacy, but by a defection from the unity of truth falling into ſome damnable hereſie, or by an active ſeparation, deſerting all which are in communion with the Catholick Church, and falling into an irrecoverable Schiſm.

Matth. 18.17.

Joh. 20. 23.

Thirdly, it is neceſſary to believe the Church of Chriſt to be holy, leaſt we ſhould preſume to obtain any happineſſe by being of it, without that holineſſe 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 reall and permanent advantage received by it, it is neceſſary that the perſons abiding in the communion of it ſhould be really and effectually ſanctified.

ctified. Without which holineſſe the priviledges of the Church prove the greateſt advantages, and the means of ſalvation neglected, tend to a puniſhment with aggravation. It is not onely 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 oyl in our lamps. We muſt acknowledge a neceſſity of holineſſe, when we confeſs that Church alone which is holy can make us happy.

Fourthly, there is a neceſſity of believing the Catholick Church, becauſe except a man be of that he can be of none. For being the Church which is truly Catholick conteineth within it all which are truely Churches, whoſoever is not of the Catholick Church, cannot be of the true Church. That Church alone which firſt began at *Jeruſalem* on earth, will bring us to the *Jeruſalem* in heaven, and that alone began there which alwayes embraceth *the faith once delivered to the Saints*. Whatſoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the ſame time to a new Churchdome, and whatſoever is ſo new in none. So neceſſary it is to believe *the holy Catholick Church*.

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 profeſſe to believe *the Holy Catholick Church*. For thereby every one is underſtood to declare thus much, I am fully perſwaded, 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 dayly added ſuch as ſhould be ſaved, and will ſucceſſively dayly adde unto the ſame untill the end of the world: ſo that by the virtue of his allſufficient promiſe, I am aſſured that there was, hath bin 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 generall 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 contein 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 graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well pleasing in the sight of God. And thus *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church.*

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

THis part of the Article beareth something a † latter date then any of the rest, but yet is no way inferiour 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. If

† *These words* Communionem Sanctorum, *were not in the* Aquileian *Creed expounded by* Ruffinus; *they were not mentioned by him as being either in the Orientall or the* Roman *Creed. They were not in the* African *Creed expounded by Saint* Austin *De Fide & Symbolo*, *not in the Creed delivered by* Maximus Taurinensis; *not in any of the Sermons of* Chrysologus; *not in any of the four Books* de Symbolo ad Catechumenos *attributed to S.* Austin; *not in the* 119. *Sermon under his name De Tempore*, Cum dixerimus *Sanctam Ecclesiam*, adjungamus *Remissionem peccatorum. They are not in the* Greek *Creed in Sir* Robert Cotton's *Library*, *nor in the old*

old Latine *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* Euzoius *presented to* Constantine, *not in either of the Creeds preserved in the* Ancoratus *of* Epiphanius, *not in the* Jerusalem *Creed expounded by S.* 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 S.* Chrysostome. *It was therefore of a latter date, and is found in the* Latine *and* Greek *Copy in* Lennet *Colledge Library, and is expressed and expounded in the* 115. *and* 181. *Sermon to* Tempore, *attributed to S.* Austin.

If we look upon the first institution of the Church, and the originall condition of those persons which received the Gospell, 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 S. *Paul* urged *an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, as it was written, He that had gather'd 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 signifie the great * charity, bounty and community, among the people of God. Act. 2. 44, 45. 2 Cor. 8. 14, 15.

But being that community precisely taken, was not of eternall 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 custome, nor that notion was then generally received in the Church when this communion of Saints was first inferted, I shall therefore endeavour to shew that communion which the Saints have both according to the Fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures from whence they derived it.

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

* *As* Grotius *upon that place of the* Corinthians *observes,* Spectat & huc ea quam in Symbolo profitemur Sanctorum communionem.

themſelves, as diſtinct in perſon onely, 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, & 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 will 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 further 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.

† Κοινωνία ἁγίων *may be as well underſtood in the Neuter as the Maſculine, as* Exod. 28. 38. Ἐξαρεῖ Ἀαρὼν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἁγίων, *that* Aaron *may bear the iniquity of the holy things. So* Levit 5. 15. Καὶ ἁμάρτῃ ἀκουσίως ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων Κυρίου. 22. 2. Καὶ ἀφεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. 1 Chron 24. 5. ἄρχοντες τῶν ἁγίων, *the Governours of the Sanctuary, of which notion afterwards.*

I take it firſt for granted, that though the *Greek* word which we tranſlate *Saints*, is in it ſelf 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 conteined

* *This is one of the common names of God in the Old Teſtament,* קדוש ישראל ὁ ἅγιος Ἰσραήλ, *which is alſo ſometimes tranſlated plurally by the* LXX. *as* Eſ. 41. 16. בקדוש ישראל ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις Ἰσραήλ. Jer. 51. 5. מקדוש ישראל, ἀπὸ ἁγίων Ἰσραὴλ; *and if it were ſo taken, then* κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων, *would be the communion of God, as* τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ.

in it.

in it. Thirdly, I take it further for granted that the word in this Article is not taken in the Originall of the Creed, as it is often taken in the Translation of the Old Teſtament, for the † 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 ſaid to have the communion, though the Saints have communion with them.

† Τὰ ἅγια is frequently uſed in the Scriptures for the Sanctuary; and then κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων might be taken for the communion in all thoſe things which belonged to the worſhip of God; as ἀκοινώνητος was a man excluded from all ſuch communion.

* The Angels are not onely called holy in the Scriptures by way of addition or epithite, as πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι, Mat. 25. 31. μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων, Mar. 8. 38. Luc. 9. 26. ἐχθηματίσθη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων ἁγίων, Act. 10. 22. ἐνώπιον τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, Rev. 14. 10. But alſo the ἅγιοι, holy ones, or Saints, taken ſubſtantively or ſingly ſignifie ſometimes the Angels, as Deut. 32. 2. ואתה מרבבת קדש, he came with ten thouſands of Saints, which the Jeruſalem Targum renders יטמיה ריבון מלאכין קדישין, and with his ten thouſands of holy Angels; and Jonathan, ועמיה רבן רבוון מלאכין קדישין, and with him myriads of myriads of holy Angels. And although the LXX. keep the Hebrew קדש, yet they underſtood the Angels in that place; Ζὼν μυριάσι Κάδης, ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτῷ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτῶν. So Job 5. 1. To which of the Saints wilt thou turn? οἱ ἅγια ἀγγέλων ἁγίων ὄψῃ, LXX. Thus in the viſion of Daniel, he heard one Saint ſpeaking, and another Saint ſaid unto that certain Saint which ſpake, Dan. 8. 13. So Zach. 14. 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 Teſt. 1 Theſſ. 3. 13. ὁν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τῦ Κυρίυ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῦ, in correſpondence to that 2 Theſſ. 1. 7. ὁν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῦ Κυρίυ Ἰησῦ ἀπ' ὐρανῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτῦ. Theſe are the μυριάδες ἁγίαι in S. Jude רבבת קדש, the myriads of Angels; and thus κοινωνία ἁγίων ſhould be the communion of the Angels.

For this part of the Article hath a manifeſt relation to the former, in which we profeſſe 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 it ſelf being nothing elſe but a Collection of ſuch perſons. To that confeſſion is added this Communion; but becauſe though the Church be holy, yet every perſon con-

conteined 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 doe not onely profeſſe the Goſpel, but alſo are ſanctified thereby.

The onely queſtion then remaining is, in what their ſanctity or Saintſhip doth conſiſt, and, (becauſe though they which are believers ſince our Saviours death be truely and more highly ſanctified, yet ſuch as lived before and under the Law, the Patriarchs, the Prophets and the ſervants of God were alſo 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's the command, as *the Lord your God is holy*, there's 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 holineſſe which maketh men to be accounted holy ones, and to be called *Saints*.

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 holineſſe*; ſuch are the perſons underſtood in this Article, which is the communion of men of holineſſe. Now holineſſe 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, & applied to the ſervice of God, & their ſanctity was nothing elſe but that ſeparation from and to thoſe termes, from an uſe and exerciſe profane and common, to an uſe and exerciſe peculiar and divine.

Exod. 22. 31. אנשי קדש׃

vine. 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 doe often ſpeak of the people of *Iſrael* as of an holy nation, and God doth ſpeak unto them as to a 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 voyd of all true inherent and actuall ſanctity, yet becauſe they were all in that manner ſeparated, they were all, as to that 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 Baptiſme 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 bin received into the Church, may be in ſome ſenſe called holy.

But becauſe there is more then 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 onely by an extrinſecall denomination, but by a reall and internall 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

1 Cor. 1. 2. Saints, which are *ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus*; firſt, in reſpect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated; 1 Joh. 5. 1. for *whoſoever believeth that Jeſus is the Chriſt, is born of* Act. 15. 9. *God*; by which they are purged, God himſelf *purifying* 1 Cor. 6. 11. *their hearts by faith*, whereby they are *waſhed, ſanctified,* Eph. 1. 13. *and juſtified in the name of the Lord Jeſus, in whom alſo after that they believe, they are ſealed with the holy Spirit of promiſe*; ſecondly, in reſpect of their converſation: For *as he which hath called them is holy*, ſo are *they ho-* 1 Pet. 1. 15. *ly in all manner of converſation*; *adding to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience brotherly kindneſſe, and to brotherly kindneſſe charity, that they* 2 Pet. 1. 8. *may neither be barren nor unfruitfull 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 holineſſe in the fear of God*, 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 Catholick Church.*

Now as theſe are the Saints of the Church of Chriſt, 1 Cor. 14. 33. from whence they were called *the Churches of the Saints*: ſo there was never any Church of God but there were ſuch perſons in it as were Saints; we read in the *Pſalmes* of Pſal. 89. 5, 7. בקהל 149. 1. קדשים: Lxx. ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων, בסוד קדשים: ἐν βουλῇ ἁγίων, *Vulg. Lat.* in *the congregation* and *the aſſembly of the Saints*; and *Moſes* aſſured the people of *Iſrael*, that *all the Saints* of God were *in* his *hand*; we read in the Prophets of *the Saints of the moſt High*, and at our Saviours death *the bodies of* ſuch *Saints which ſlept aroſe*. Where again we may ob-

Eccleſia & in conſilio ſanctorum. Deut. 33. 3. Mat. 27. 52. Pſal. 106. 16. Quis ignorat ſub alte a diſpenſatione Dei omnes retro Sanctos ejuſdem fuiſſe meriti cujus nunc Chriſtiani ſunt? S. *Hieron. adv. Jovinian.*

ſerve

ſerve that they were Saints while their bodies were in the grave; as *Aaron* in the time of *David* kept the name of *the Saint of the Lord*. Such as are holy in their lives doe not looſe their ſanctity but improve it at their deaths, nor can they looſe the honour of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection.

Hence growes 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 expreſly, *Thou art my Lord, my goodneſſe 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 S. *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 earth, if truly ſuch and departed ſo, are now, and ſhall for ever continue, Saints in heaven. Pſal. 16. 2, 3. 1 Corinth. 6. 2.

Having thus declared what is the ſanctity required to make a Saint, that is, a man of holineſſe; having alſo diſtinguiſhed the Saints before, and under the Goſpel, (which difference is onely 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 ſhewed that of all theſe, thoſe Saints are here particularly underſtood which 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.

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* 1 Joh. 1. 3.

may have fellowship with us, ſaith S. *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 righteouſneſſe, 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 onely friends, but alſo ſonnes; for *behold what manner of love the Father hath beſtowed upon us, that we ſhould be called the ſonnes 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.*

κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ Πατρός.

Jac. 2. 23.

1 Joh. 3. 1.

2 Pet. 1. 4. θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως.

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*; and this connexion is infallible, becauſe *he that abideth in the doctrine of Chriſt, he hath both the Father and the Son*; 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 in them*, ſaith Chriſt, *and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.* 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 ſinnes, and the curſe due unto them; while we all *have received of his fulneſſe, grace for grace*; and are all called to the *fellowſhip of his ſufferings* that we may *be*

1 Joh. 1. 3.

2 John 9.

Joh. 17. 20, 21, 23.

Joh. 1. 16.

Philip. 3. 10.

con-

conformable to his death. What is the fellowſhip of brethren and coheirs, of the Bridegroom and the Sponſe: 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 unto us the fellowſhip of his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* 1 Cor. 1. 9. κοινωνία τῦ Τἱῦ.

Thirdly, the Saints of God in the Church of Chriſt have communion with the Holy Ghoſt; and the Apoſtle hath two wayes aſſured us of the truth thereof, one Rhetorically, by a ſeeming doubt, *if there be any fellowſhip of the Spirit*; the other devoutly, praying for it, *The grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the love of God, & the communion of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all.* 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*; and thereby doe we become coheirs 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.* 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 to him, and three men ſtood by him*; 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, & we will come unto him & make our abode with him.* Here is the ſoul of man made the habitation of God the Father and of God the Son, & 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.* The Spirit therefore with the Father and the Son inhabiteth

Philip. 2. 1. κοινωνία Πνεύματος. 2 Cor. 13. 14.

Gal. 4. 6, 7.

Gen. 18. 1, 2.

Joh. 14. 23.

Rom. 8. 9.

in the Saints; for *know ye not*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *that ye are*
1 Cor 3. 16. *the Temple of God, and that the ſpirit of God dwelleth in you?*

Fourthly, the Saints of God in the Church of Chriſt have communion with the holy Angels. They which did foretell the birth of *John* the forerunner of Chriſt, they which did annunciate unto the bleſſed Virgin the conception of the Saviour of the world, they which ſung a glorious hymn at the Nativity of the Son of God, they which carried the ſoul of *Lazarus* into *Abrahams* boſome, they which appeared unto Chriſt from heaven in his agonie to ſtrengthen him, they which opened the priſon doors and brought the Apoſtles forth, they which 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 perpetuall relation to the children of God. Nay,
Heb. 1. 14. *are they not all miniſtring ſpirits ſent forth to miniſter for them who ſhall be heirs of ſalvation?* They have a particular ſenſe of our condition, for Chriſt hath aſſured us that
Luc. 15. 10. *there is joy in the preſence of the Angels of God over one ſinner that repenteth.* And upon this relation the Angels, which are all the Angels of God, are yet called the Angels of men, according to the admonition of Chriſt, *Take*
Mat. 18. 10. *heed that ye diſpiſe not one of theſe little ones for I ſay unto you, That in heaven their Angels doe alwayes behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

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 holineſſe with them.

Fiftly 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 not truly Saints. There were not hypo-

hypocrites among the *Jewes* alone, but in the Church of Chriſt many cry Lord Lord, whom he knoweth not. The tares have the priviledge of the field, as well as the wheat, and the bad fiſh of the net, as well as to 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 baptized alike; they communicate in the ſame Creed, both make the ſame profeſſion of faith, both agree in the ſame principles of religion; they communicate in the ſame word, both hear the ſame doctrine preach'd; 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 ſinnes, in the ſame unfruitfulneſſe under the means of grace, in the ſame falſe pretence and empty form of godlineſſe, for then he were not a Saint but an Hypocrite. Thus the Saints may communicate with the wicked, ſo they communicate not with their wickedneſſe, and may have fellowſhip with ſinners ſo they have no fellowſhip with that which makes them ſuch, that is their ſinnes. The Apoſtles command runneth thus, *Have no fellowſhip with the unfruitfull works of darkneſſe*, and again, *Be not partaker of other mens ſinnes*, and a voice from heaven ſpake concerning *Babylon*, *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her ſinnes.* 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.

Eph. 5. 11. Μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις. 1 Tim. 5. 22. Μὴ κοινώνει ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις. Rev. 18. 4. ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις.

Duobus modis non te maculat malus, ſi ei non conſentias, & ſi redarguas. Communicatur enim quando facto ejus conſortium voluntatis vel approbationis adjungitur. Hoc ergo admonens Apoſtolus ait, *Nolite communicare operibus infructuoſis tenebrarum, magis autem & redarguite*, S. Aug. *de Verbis Dom. Serm.* 18.

Having

Having thus considered those which differ among 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 holinesse: we are now to consider such as differ either onely in person, as the Saints alive, or in present condition also, as the Saints departed.

Sixtly 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, all endued with the graces of the same spirit, all united with the same mutuall 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 joynts and bands having nourishment ministred and knit together, encreaseth with the encrease of God.* For in the philosophy of the Apostle the nerves are not onely 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.

1 Joh. 1. 7. κοινωνίαν μετ' ἀλλήλων.

Coloss. 2. 19.

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 shew 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*

† *This is that part of the Communion of Saints which these of the Ancients especially insisted upon, who first took notice of it in the Creed.* Sanctorum Communionem, id est, cum illis Sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt societate & spei communione teneamur, *Serm.* 181. *de Tempo.* c.

unto

unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jeruſalem, and an innumerable company of Angels, to the generall aſſembly and Church of the firſt born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, Heb. 12. 22, 23. *and to the Spirits of juſt men made perfect, and to Jeſus the Mediatour of the new covenant.* Indeed, the Communion of the 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 myſticall union between Chriſt and his Church, the ſpirituall 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 encreaſing 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 myſticall union, no breach of the ſpirituall 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 onely externall, as they were common to them both, and all ſuch externall actions ceaſing in the perſon dead, the hypocrite remaining looſeth all communion with the Saint departing, and the Saints ſurviving ceaſe to have further fellowſhip with the hypocrite dying. But being the true and unfeigned holineſſe of man wrought by the powerfull influence of the Spirit of God not onely remaineth, but alſo is improved after death; being the correſpondence of the internall holineſſe was the true 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 conjoyned.

This Communion of the Saints in heaven and earth upon the myſticall union of Chriſt, their head being fundamentall and internall, what acts or externall operations it produceth is not ſo certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happineſſe 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 conſider'd, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beſide a reverentiall 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, then the ſociety * of hope, eſteem and imitation on our ſide, of deſires and ſupplications on their ſide: and what is now taught by the Church of *Rome*, is, as unwarrantable, ſo a novitious interpretation. The

* *We have already produced the words of the* 181. *Sermon* de Tempore, *concerning Hope.*

In the ſame we find alſo that of imitation, Si igitur cum Sanctis in æterna vita communionem habere volumus, de imitatione eorum cogitemus. Debent enim in nobis aliquid recognoſcere de ſuis virtutibus, ut pro nobis dignentur Domino ſupplicare, *ibi.* Hæc ſunt veſtigia quæ nobis Sancti quoque revertentes in patriam nobis reliquerant, ut illorum ſemitis inhærentes ſequeremur ad gaudia, *ib. Beſide this imitation, he addeth their deſires and care for us below.* Cur non properamus & currimus ut patriam noſtram videre poſſimus? Magnus illic charorum numerus expectat, parentum, fratrum, filiorum, frequens nos & copioſa turba deſiderat jam de ſua incolumitate ſecura, adhuc de noſtra ſalute ſolicita, *ib. Of the Veneration eſteem we ought to have of them, ſpeaks* Euſebius Gallicanus, Credamus & Sanctorum communionem, ſed Sanctos non tam pro Dei parte, quam pro Dei honore veneremur. *And again*, Digne nobis venerandi ſunt dum Dei cultum, & futuræ vitæ deſiderium contemptu mortis inſinuant. *Thus far anciently they with reſpect expounded this Article: but the late Expoſition of the Church of* Rome *runneth thus*, Non ſolum Eccleſia quæ eſt in terris communicat bona ſua cum omnibus membris ſibi conjunctis, ſed etiam communicat ſuffragia Eccleſiæ quæ eſt in Purgatorio, & Eccleſia quæ eſt in cœlis communicat orationes, & merita ſua cum Eccleſia quæ eſt in terris, *Bellarmin.* in Symbolum. *Where the communication of the Suffrages of the Saints alive to the Church in Purgatory, and the communication*

tion 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 Explication of the Creed, much leſſe to be found in any of the Ancienter Expoſitors of it.*

The neceſſity of the belief of this Communion of Saints appeareth, firſt, in that it is proper to excite and encourage us to holineſſe of life. *If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowſhip one with another.* 1 Joh. 1, 6, 7. But *if we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in darkneſſe we lye, and do not the truth. For what fellowſhip hath righteouſneſſe with unrighteouſneſſe? and what communion hath light with darkneſſe? and what concord hath Chriſt with Belial?* When Chriſt ſent S. *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 forgiveneſſe of ſins, and inheritance among them which are ſanctified by faith that is in Chriſt.* Act. 26. 18. Except we be turned from darkneſſe, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of ſin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them which are ſanctified, we cannot be thought *meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light.* Col. 1. 12. 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.

Secondly, the belief of *the Communion of Saints* is neceſſary to ſtir us up to a proportionate gratitude unto God, and an humble and cheerfull acknowledgement 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. What am I?* ſaid David, *and what is my life that I ſhould be ſon in law to the King?* What are we the ſons of men, what are they which are called to be Saints, that they ſhould have fellowſhip with God the Father? S. *Philip* the Apoſtle ſaid unto our Saviour, *Lord, ſhew us the Father and it ſufficeth*; where- Joh. 14. 8.

as he hath not onely ſhewn 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.

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. Nearneſſe of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnaturall who loveth not thoſe perſons which nature hath more immediately conjoyned to him. Now no conjunction naturall can be compared with that which is ſpirituall, no temporall relation with that which is eternall. If ſimilitude of ſhape and feature will create a kindneſſe, if congruity of manners and diſpoſition will conjoyn affections; what ſhould be the mutuall 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 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 bin 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.

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 expreſſe thus much; I am fully perſwaded 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

lowſhip 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 kindneſſe of the bleſſed Angels, who take delight in the miniſtration for their benefit: that beſide the externall 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 whome 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 Forgivenesse Of Sins.

THis Article hath *alwayes bin expreſſly conteined 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 ſhew that 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

** Therefore* Carolus Magnus *in his Capitular* l. 3. c. 6. *inveighs againſt* Paſſilius *the Biſhop of* Ancyra, *becauſe in his Confeſſion of Faith which he delivered in the ſecond Council of* Nice (*Act.* 1.) *he omitted the Remiſſion of ſins, which the Apoſtles in ſo ſhort a* Compendium *as the Creed would not omit.* Hanc Apoſtoli in conlatione fidei, quam ab invicem diſceſſuri quaſi quandam credulitatis & prædicationis normam ſtatuerunt, poſt confeſſionem Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti poſuiſſe perhibentur; & in tanti verbi brevitate, de quo per Prophetam dictum eſt, Verbum abbreviatum faciet Dominus ſuper terram, hanc ponere minime diſtulerunt, quia ſine hac fidei ſinceritatem integram eſſe minime perſpexerunt. Nec cohibuit eos ab ejus profeſſione iſtius Symboli brevitas, quam expoſcebat ſacræ fidei integritas, tantique doni veneranda ſublimitas. † Concordant autem Angeli nobiſcum etiam tunc cum remittuntur noſtra peccata. Ideo poſt commemorationem S. Eccleſiæ in ordine Confeſſionis ponitur Remiſſio peccatorum: per hanc enim ſtat Eccleſia quæ in terris eſt, per hanc non perit, quod perierat & inventum eſt, *S. Aug.* Enchirid. cap. 64. *And to this purpoſe it is that in his book* de agone Chriſtiano, *paſſing from one Article to another with his generall 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 alſo* Venantius Fortunatus, *and in ſuch other Creeds as want that part of the former Article of the Communion of Saints.* ‡ Sanctam Eccleſiam teneat.... in qua & remiſſio peccatorum & carnis reſurrectio prædicabatur, *Ruffin. in Symb.* Sed neque de ipſis criminibus quamlibet magnis remittendis in S. Eccleſia deſperanda eſt miſericordia, *S. Aug. Enchir.* cap. 65. In remiſſionem peccatorum. Hæc in Eccleſia ſi non eſſet, nulla ſpes eſſet. Remiſſio peccatorum ſi in Eccleſia non eſſet, nulla futuræ vitæ & liberationis æternæ ſpes eſſet. Gratias agimus Deo, qui Eccleſiæ ſuæ dedit hoc donum, *Author Himl.* 119. de Tempore.

Ghoſt,

Ghoſt, in whoſe name baptiſm was adminiſtred; they propounded unto them *the Holy Church*, into which by baptiſme they were to be admitted, and *the forgiveneſſe of ſins*, which by the ſame baptiſm was to be obteined; and therefore in ſome Creeds it was particularly expreſs'd, † *I believe one baptiſme for the forgiveneſſe of ſins.*

† *Theſe are the words of the* Conſtantinopolitan *Creed*, Ὁμολογῶ ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. *Before which* Epiphanius *in his leſſer Creed*, Ὁμολογῶμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *in the Larger*. Πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς βάπτισμα μετανοίας, in Ancorato. *S.* Cyril *both theſe together*, Εἷς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

Looking thus upon this Article, with this relation, we find the ſenſe of it muſt be this, that we believe *forgiveneſſe of ſins* is to be obteined 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 ſhew how ſo great a Priviledge is propounded in the Church, and how it may be procured by the members of the Church. That we may underſtand the notion of *forgiveneſſe 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 forgiveneſſe; thirdly, what is the remiſſion it ſelf, or the looſing of that obligation.

As the power of Sin is revealed onely 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 *S. John*, and then rendreth this reaſon of that univerſall 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 bin neceſſary, if he had ſpoken by way of propoſition onely, to have proved the Univerſality of his Aſſertion, but

1 Joh. 3. 4.

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 a *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 unto 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 an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by actions committed against the law of God, is a sinne constituting a man truly a sinner, even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul to doe that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that

a Rom. 4. 15.

† *The manner of the Apostles speech is also to be observ'd 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,* Ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία.

* Quid est peccatum nisi prævaricatio legis divinæ & cœlestium inobedientia peccatorum? *S. Ambros.* de Paradiso, *cap.* 8. Peccatum est factum vel dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra æternam legem, *S. Aug. contra Faustum, l.* 22. *c.* 27. Quid verum est nisi & Dominum dare præcepta, & animas liberæ esse voluntatis, & malum naturam non esse, sed esse aversionem à Dei præceptis? *Idem de Fide contra Manich. cap.* 10. Neque negandum est hoc Deum jubere, ita nos in facienda justitia esse debere perfectos ut nullum habeamus omnino peccatum: nam neque peccatum erit, si quid erit, si non divinitus jubeatur ut non sit, *Idem de Pec. Meritis, & Rem. lib.* 2. *cap.* 16.

soul

foul, whither 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.

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 Lawes in generall to be attended with these two, punishments, and rewards, the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatned upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penall denuntiations accompanying the Lawes 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 passe away in the acting or performing of them, so that he which acteth against a negative precept, after the act is pass'd, cannot properly be said to sin. Sins of omission, when the time is pass'd in which the affirmative precept did oblige unto performance, passe away: so that he which did then omit his duty when it was required, and in omitting sinn'd, after that time cannot be truly said to sin. But though the sin it self doe passe away together with the time in which it was committed, yet the guilt thereof doth never passe 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, & † obliged to suffer the punishment due unto adultery.

† *This obligation unto punishmen, remaining after the act of sin, is that* Peccati Reatus, *of which the Schol, and before them the Fathers spake. The nature of this* Reatus *is excellently declared by* S. Austin *delivering the distinction between actuall and originall sin.* In eis qui regenerantur in Christo cum remissionem accipiunt prorsus omnium

omnium peccatorum, utique neceſſe eſt ut reatus etiam hujus licet adhuc manentis Concupiſcentiæ remittatur, ut in peccatum non imputetur. Nam ſicut peccatorum quæ manere non poſſunt, quoniam cum fiunt prætereunt, reatus tamen manet, & niſi remittatur in æternum manebit, ſic illius Concupiſcentiæ, quando remittitur, reatus aufertur. Hoc eſt enim non habere peccatum, reum non eſſe peccati. Nam ſi quiſquam v. g. fecerit adulterium etiamſi nunquam deinceps faciat reus eſt adulterii, donec reatus ipſius indulgentia remittatur. Habet ergo peccatum, quamvis illud quod admiſit jam non ſit, quia cum tempore quo factum eſt præteriit. Nam ſi à peccando deſiſtere hoc eſſet non habere peccatum, ſufficeret ut hoc nos moneret Scriptura. *Fili peccaſti, non adjicias iterum:* Non autem ſufficit, ſed addidit, *Et de priſtinis deprecare, ut tibi remittantur.* Manent ergo niſi remittantur. Sed quomodo manent ſi præterita ſunt, niſi quia præterierunt actu, manent reatu, *S. Aug. de Nupt. & Concupiſc.* lib. 1. cap. 26. Ego de Concupiſcentia dixi quæ eſt in membris repugnans legi mentis, quam vis Reatus ejus in omnium peccatorum remiſſione tranſierit, ſicut è contrario ſacrificium idololatriæ tactum, ſi deinceps non fiat, præteriit actu, ſed manet reatu, niſi per indulgentiam remittatur. Quiddam enim tale eſt ſacrificare idolis ut opus ipſum cum fit prætereat, eodemque præterito Reatus ejus maneat venia reſolvendus, *Idem contra Julianum*, lib. 6 cap. 8.

This debt or obligation to puniſhment is not onely neceſſarily reſulting from the nature of ſin, as it is a breach of the law, nor onely generally delivered in the Scriptures revealing the wrath of God unto all unrighteouſneſſe, but is yet more particularly repreſented in the Word, which teacheth us, if we do ill, how *ſin lyeth at the door.* Our bleſſed Saviour thus taught his Diſciples. *Whoſoever is angry with his brother without a cauſe ſhall be lyable* (obnoxious or bound over) *to the Judgement; and whoſoever ſhall ſay to his brother, Racha, ſhall be lyable* (obnoxious or bound over) *to the Council; but whoſoever ſhall ſay, Thou fool, ſhall be lyable* (obnoxious or bound over) *to hell fire.* So ſaith our Saviour again, *All ſins*

Mat. 5. 22. Ἔνοχος 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 debter, ſubject, and obliged to endure it,* Heſych. Ἔνοχος, χρεώστης, ὑπεύθυνος, ὑποκείμενος. *The old Latine Tranſlation,* Reus erit judicio. *As in Virgil,* Conſtituam ante aras voti reus. *Servius,* Voti reus, Debitor. Unde vota ſolventes dicimus abſoluti. Inde eſt, Damnabis tu quoque votis, quaſi reos facies. *So the* Syriack חַיָּב הוּ לְרִינָא, *from* חוֹב, obligatum, debitorem, reum eſſe. *As therefore* Ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστί, Mat. 26. 66. חַיָּב הוּ מוֹתָא, *is not in the intention of the Jewes, be is in danger of death, but, be deſerveth death, ſo here,*

ſhall

ſhall be forgiven unto the ſonnes of men, and blaſphemies wherewith ſoever they ſhall blaſpheme. But he that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt, hath never forgiveneſſe, but is lyable (obnoxious or bound over) *to eternall damnation.* Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of Sin and obligation to eternall puniſhment, if there be no remiſſion or forgiveneſſe of it. God who hath the Soveraign power and abſolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetuall and univerſall rule of humane actions; which law whoſoever doth violate or tranſgreſſe, 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 vindicative Juſtice of God, and is obliged to endure the puniſhment due unto it, which was the ſecond particular to be conſidered. Mar. 3. 28, 29.

The third Conſideration now followeth, what is *the Forgiveneſſe of Sin*, or in what *Remiſſion* doth conſiſt. Which at the 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 ſo eaſie to determine; nor can it be concluded out of the words themſelves which doe expreſſe it, the nicetyes of whoſe † originations will never be able to yield a juſt interpretation. For

† *The word uſed in the Creed is ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, 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 ἀφίημι and ἄφεσις are capable of ſeverall interpretations. For ſometimes ἀφίημι is* emittere, *and ἄφεσις* emiſſio. *As* Gen. 35. 18. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀφιέναι αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχὴν, *not* cum dimitteret eam anima, *as it is tranſlated, but* cum emitteret ea animam, *i. e.* efflaret; *as* ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, emiſit Spiritum, *Mat.* 25. 50. *So* Gen. 45. 2. Καὶ ἀφῆκε φωνὴν μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ, *not* dimiſit, *but* emiſit vocem cum fletu, *as* ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην,

emissa voce magna, *Mar.* 15 37. *In the like manner* ἀφέσεις θαλάσσης *are* emissiones maris, 2 *Sam.* 22. 16. *as* ἀφέσεις ὑδάτων, Joel 1. 20. *to which sense may be referred that of* Hesych. Ἄφεσιν, ὕσαλυγγα. *And this interpretation of* ἄφεσις *can have no relation to the remission of sins. Secondly,* ἀφιέναι *is often taken for* permittere, *as* Gen. 20. 6. ἐκ ἀφῆκά σε ἁμαρτεῖν αὐτῆς. Mat. 3. 15. ἄφες ἄρτι, οὕτω γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην· τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν, *which the Vulgar first translated well* Sine modo, *and then ill,* Tunc dimisit eum, *Mat.* 7. 4. ἄφες ἐκβάλω, Sine ejiciam; *So* Hesych. ἄφεσις συγχώρησις. *And this hath as little relation to the present subject. Thirdly,* ἀφιέναι *is sometime* relinquere, *and* deserere, *as* Gen. 43. 33. ἀδελφὸν ἕνα ἀφετε ὧδε μεθ' ἐμοῦ. Mat. 5. 24. ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου. 7. 4. καὶ ἀφήκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός. 19. 27 ἰδοὺ, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα. 26. 56. τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον. *And in this acception it cannot explicate unto us what is the true notion of* ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας. *Fourthly, it is taken for* omittere, *as* Mat 23. 23. καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, *and* Luc. 11. 42. ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι, κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι, *and yet we have nothing to our present purpose. But fifthly it is often taken for* remittere, *and that particularly in relation to a debt, as* Mat. 18. 27. τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ; *and vers.* 32. πᾶσαν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἐκείνην ἀφῆκά σοι. *Which acception is most remarkable in the year of release,* Deut. 15. 1, 2. Δι' ἑπτὰ ἐτῶν ποιήσεις ἄφεσιν. Καὶ ἔστω τὸ πρόσταγμα τῆς ἀφέσεως· ἀφέσεις πᾶν χρέος ἴδιον ὃ ὀφείλει σοι ὁ πλησίον, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν σου οὐκ ἀπαιτήσεις, ὅτι κέκληται τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ σου. *Now this remission or release of debts hath a great affinity with remission of sins; for Christ himself hath conjoyned 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 ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, Mat 6.12. *Besides he hath not onely made use of the notion of debt, but any injury done unto a man, he calls a sin against man, and exhorteth to forgive those sins committed against us, that God may forgive the sins committed by us, which are injuries done to him,* Luc. 17. 3. Ἐὰν ἁμάρτῃ εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ, ἄφες αὐτῷ.

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 bin often used to signifie the same action of God in forgiving sins, where it could have no such particular notion, but severall times hath another signification tending to the same effect, and as proper to the remission of sins, therefore

† *We must not onely 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* ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας *is there used for the verb* כפר, *as* Isa. 22. 15. : אם יכפר העון הזה לכם עד תמותין Οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἁμαρτία ἕως ἂν ἀποθάνητε, *Sometimes for the verb* נשא

נשא, *as* Gen. 50. 17. שא נא פשע אחיך וחטאתם, ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀδικίαν καὶ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν. Psal. 25. 18. ושא לכל חטאותי, καὶ ἄφες πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας μου. *And in that remarkable place, which S.* Paul *made uſe of to declare the nature of Remiſſion of ſins.* Psal. 32. 1. אשרי נשוי פשע, μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι. *Sometime it is taken for* סלח, *as* Num. 14. 19. סלח נא, ונסלח להם, לעון העם הזה, ἄφες τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. Lev. 4. 20. καὶ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτοῖς ἡ ἁμαρτία. *Now being* ἄφεσις *in relation to ſins, is uſed for* כפר, *ſignifying expiation, and reconciliation; for* נשא, *ſignifying elevation, portation or ablation; for* סלח, *ſignifying pardon and indulgence; we cannot argue from the word alone, that God in forgiving ſins doth onely and barely releaſe the debt. There is therefore no force to be layd upon the words* ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, Remiſſio peccatorum, *or as the Ancient Fathers* Remiſſa peccatorum. *So* Tertullian, Diximus de remiſſa peccatorum, *adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 18.* S. Cyprian. *Epiſt. 14.* Qui blaſphemaverit in Spiritum Sanctum non habet remiſſam, ſed reus eſt æterni peccati. *Idem de Bono Pati.* Dominus baptizatur à ſervo, & remiſſam peccatorum daturus, ipſe non dedignatur lavacro regenerationis corpus abluere. *Idem lib. 3. Epiſt. 8. of an infant,* Qui ad remiſſam peccatorum recipiendam hoc ipſo facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria ſed aliena peccata. *Adde the Interpreter of* Irenæus *concerning Chriſt,* Remiſſam peccatorum exſtentem his qui credunt in eum.

therefore I conceive the true nature of *forgiveneſſe of ſins* is rather to be underſtood by the conſideration of all ſuch wayes and means which were uſed by God in the working and performing of it, then in this, or any other, word which is made uſe of in expreſſing it.

Now that we may underſtand what was done toward 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 bloud, and without ſhedding of bloud there is no remiſſion.* And what was then legally done, was but a type of that which was to be performed by Chriſt; and therefore the bloud 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 denyed by none, that Chriſt did ſuffer a painfull and a ſhamefull 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* Heb. 9. 22. χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις. Heb. 9. 26. *it is not onely* ἄφεσις, *but* ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας. Heb. 10. 12.

ſins; that the ſins for which he ſuffered were not his own,
1 Pet. 3. 18. for *Chriſt hath once ſuffered for ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt*; he was *holy, harmleſſe, undefiled, and ſeparate*
Heb. 7. 26. *from ſinners*, and therefore had no ſin to ſuffer for; that the ſins for which he ſuffered, were ours, for *he was wounded*
Iſa. 53. 5. *for our tranſgreſſions, he was bruiſed for our iniquities*;
Rom. 4. 25. Gal. 1. 4. *He was delivered for our offences*, he *gave himſelf for our*
1 Cor. 15. 3. *ſins, he dyed 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*
Iſa. 53. 6. *made him to be Sin for us who knew no Sin: he hath born*
2 Cor. 5. 21. *our griefs and carried our ſorrows, the chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him, and with his ſtripes are we healed*; that by the ſuffering of this puniſhment to free us from the puniſhment due unto our ſins it cometh to paſſe that our
Mat. 26. 28. ſins are forgiven, for, *This is my bloud*, ſaith our Savi-
our *of the New Teſtament*, or *Covenant*, *which is ſhed for*
Epheſ. 1. 7. *many for the remiſſion of ſins. In* Chriſt *we have redemption through his bloud, the forgiveneſſe of ſins according to the riches of his grace.*

In which deduction or ſeries of truths we may eaſily perceive that *the forgiveneſſe of ſins*, which is promiſed unto us, which we upon that promiſe doe believe, conteineth 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 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 Chriſts death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordein Chriſts death to be a propitiation for us. For we are *juſtified freely by his*

grace

grace through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt, whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation through faith in his bloud. 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 bloud, (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 kindneſſe 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 & 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 onely 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.

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 bloud of his croſſe, and by him reconciling all things unto himſelf.* In vain it is objected that the Scripture ſaith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but no where 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

2 Cor. 5. 18. Rom. 5. 10. Col. 1. 20.

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 remembreſt that thy brother hath ought againſt thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and goe thy way, firſt be reconciled to thy brother*, that is, reconcile thy brother to thy ſelf, whom thou haſt injured, render him by 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 reconciled to her husband*, 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 obteined 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, notwithſtanding he was offended with us for our ſins, we were reſtored unto his favour *by the death of his Son.*

1 Sam. 29. 4. Ἐν τίνι διαλλαγήσεται οὗτος τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ; οὐχὶ ἐν ταῖς κεφαλαῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων; רָצָה, acceptum ſe reddet, ita ſe geret ut Saul eum in gratiam recipere velit.

Mat. 5. 23, 24. πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου.

1 Cor. 2. 11.

Rom. 5. 10.

Nor is it any wonder God ſhould be thus reconciled to ſinners by the death of Chriſt, who *while we were yet ſinners dyed for us*, becauſe the puniſhment which Chriſt, who was our Surety, endured, was a full ſatisfaction to the will and juſtice of God. *The Son of man came not to be miniſtred unto but to miniſter, and to give his life a ranſome for many.* Now *a ranſome* is a price given to redeem ſuch

Mat. 20. 28. δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. *What is the true notion of* λύτρον *will eaſily appear,*

becauſe both the origination and uſe of the word is ſufficiently known. The origination is from λύειν ſolvere, *to looſe,* λύτρον quaſi λυτήριον. *Etym.* Θρέπτρα τὰ θρεπτήρια, ὥσπερ λύτρα τὰ λυτήρια. Euſtath. Λέγει δὲ Θρέπτρα (ita leg.) τὰ τροφεῖα ἐκ τοῦ θρεπτήρια καὶ συγκοπὴν, ὡς λυτήρια λύτρα, σωτήρια σῶτρα, Ilia δ'.

Λύτρον

Λύτρον igitur quicquid datur ut quis ſolvatur. Ἐπὶ αἰχμαλώτων ἐξωγήσιος οἰκεῖον τὸ λύσασθαι· ὅθεν καὶ λύτρα τὰ δῶρα λέγονται καὶ τὰ εἰς τοῦτο διδόμενα. Euſtathius upon that of Homer Iliad. α'. Λυσόμενός τε θύγατρα. It is properly ſpoken of ſuch things as are given to redeem a captive, or recover a man into a free condition. Heſych πάντα τὰ διδόμενα εἰς ἀνάκλησιν ἀνθρώπων, (ſo I read it, not ἀνάκλησιν.) So that whatſoever is given for ſuch a purpoſe is λύτρον, 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. Ὅτι Ἀσκάνιος αἰχμάλωτος ἐλύσατο τὰ Ἴλιον καὶ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ τὴν πόλιν Ἄνδρα λύτρα, καὶ ἀπῳκίσθη, Etym. So that there can be nothing more proper in the Greek language then the words of our Saviour, δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν· δοῦναι λύτρον for λύτρον is τὸ διδόμενον, and ἀντὶ πολλῶν, for it is given ἀντὶ ἀνθρώπων, as that city was called Ἀντανδρος, ἤγουν ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς δεδομένη. And therefore 1 Tim. 2. 6. it is ſaid, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.

ſuch as are any way in captivity; any thing laid down by way of compenſation, to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he which before was bound becometh free. Now all ſinners were obliged to undergoe ſuch puniſhments as are proportionate to their ſins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and Chriſt did give his life a ranſome for them, and that a proper ranſome, if that his life were of any price, and given as ſuch. For a ranſome is properly nothing elſe but ſomething of † price given by way of redemption, to buy or purchaſe that which is deteined, or given for the releaſing of that which is inthralled. But it is moſt evident that the life of Chriſt was layd down as a price, neither is it more certain that he dyed, then that he bought us; *Ye are bought with a price*, ſaith the Apoſtle, and it is the *Lord who bought* us, and the price which he paid was his bloud, for *we are not redeemed with corruptible things, as ſilver and gold, but with the precious bloud of Chriſt*. Now as it was the bloud of Chriſt, ſo was it a price given by way of compenſation, and as that bloud 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 encreaſeth 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,

† Heſych. Λύτρον, τίμημα.

1 Cor. 6. 20. 7. 23.
2 Pet. 2. 1.
1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

ſation, 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 ranſome for ſinners; for *God* hath
Act. 20. 28. *purchaſed* his *Church with his own blood.*

If then we conſider together, on our ſide the nature & 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 Soveraign power and dominion over him, and therefore owing abſolute obedience to that law, whenſoever 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 Law-giver and Soveraign, becoming now the party wronged & 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, 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 eternall puniſhment, and in this act of God conſiſteth *the forgiveneſſe 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 what that action doth conſiſt.

The ſecond part of the Explication, taking notice not onely 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 Priviledge of *forgiveneſſe of ſins* is propounded in the Church, how it may be procured and obteined by the members of the Church.

At

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 whome 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 forgiveneſſe 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 propounded 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 wayes gave knowledge of ſalvation unto his people by the remiſſion of their Sins.*

Luc. 24. 47. Act. 3. 29. 13. 38. Act. 13. 39.

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 it ſelf ſtrictly and under the bare notion of a Law, it promiſed life onely upon perfect, abſolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was onely this, *Do this and live.* Some of the greater ſins nominated & 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 leſſe 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. Whatſoever elſe we read of ſins forgiven under the law, was of ſome ſpeciall divine indulgence, more then was promiſed by *Moſes.*

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*, ſo all atonements which were ever made, were onely effectuall by his bloud. 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 generall doctrine of remiſſion of ſins was never clearly revealed, and publickly 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.*

Being therefore we are aſſured that the preaching Remiſſion of ſins belongeth not onely certainly, but in ſome ſenſe peculiarly, to the Church of Chriſt; it will be next conſiderable how this Remiſſion is conferred upon any perſons in the Church.

For a full ſatisfaction in this particular two things are very obſervable, one at the Initiation, the other at the Continuation of a Chriſtian. For the firſt of theſe, it is the moſt Generall 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 Baptiſme of the ſame perſon. For the ſecond, it is as certain that all ſins committed by any perſon after baptiſme, are remiſſible, and the perſon committing thoſe Sins, ſhall receive forgiveneſſe upon true Repentance at any time according to the Goſpel.

Firſt, it is certain that *Forgiveneſſe 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 wilderneſſe and preach the Baptiſm of repentance for the remiſſion of Sins.*

Mar. 1. 1.

And

And S. *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.* It is therefore sufficiently certain that Baptism as it was instituted by Christ after the publike administration of S. *John*, whatsoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administring, was most infallibly efficacious, as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this Sacrament. Act. 2. 38.

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 thus made 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 forgiveneſſe of our sins; that as we through the frailty of our nature are alwayes subject unto sin, so we should alwayes 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 incompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the stratagemes of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our nature

* Excepto baptismatis munere, quod contra originale peccatum donatum est, (ut quod generatione attractum est regeneratione detrahatur, & tamen activa quoque peccata quæcunque corde, ore, opere commissa invenerit tollit) hac ergo excepta magna indulgentia (unde incipit hominis renovatio) in qua solvitur omnis reatus & ingeneratus & additus, ipsa etiam vita cætera jam ratione utentis ætatis, quantalibet præpolleat fœcunditate justitiæ, sine remissione peccatorum non agitur; quoniam filii Dei quamdiu mortaliter vivunt cum morte confligunt: & quamvis de illis sit veraciter dictum, *Quotquot Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi filii sunt Dei*: sic tamen Spiritu Dei excitantur, & tanquam filii Dei proficiunt ad Deum, ut etiam spiritu suo (maxime aggravante corruptibili corpore) tanquam filii hominum quibusdam motibus humanis deficiant ad seipsos & peccent, S. Augustin. *Enchirid.* cap. 44.

ture betray us to the tranſgreſſion of the law of God, we are alwayes ſubject to offend, from whence, whoſoever ſaith *that he hath no ſin is a lyer*, contradicting himſelf, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency.

The neceſſity of the belief of this Article appeareth firſt, becauſe there can be no Chriſtian conſolation without this perſwaſion. For we have all ſinned, and come ſhort of the glory of God; we muſt acknowledge that every ſinner is a guilty perſon, and that guilt conſiſteth in an obligation to endure eternall puniſhment from the wrath of God provoked by our ſins; from whence nothing elſe can ariſe but a fearfull expectation of everlaſting miſery. So long as guilt remaineth on the ſoul of man, ſo long is
2 Pet. 2. 4. he in the condition of the Devils, *delivered into chains and reſerved unto judgement*. 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.

Secondly, it is neceſſary to believe the *forgiveneſſe of ſins*, that thereby we may ſufficiently eſteem Gods goodneſſe and our happineſſe. 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 dye, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which ſhould move God not to ſhew 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 goodneſſe of our God appear, who diſpenſeth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who looſeth the obligation, who not imputeth the ſin. This is Gods goodneſſe, this is mans happineſſe. For *bleſſed is he whoſe tranſgreſſion is forgiven, whoſe ſin is covered*; *bleſſed is the man unto whom*
Pſal. 32. 1, 2. *the Lord imputeth no iniquity*. The year of releaſe, the year of Jubilee, was a time of publick joy; and there is no voice like that, *thy ſins are forgiven thee*. By this a man

man is rescued from infernall pains, secured from the everlasting flames; by this he is made capable of heaven, by this he is assured of eternall happinesse.

Thirdly, it is necessary to believe *the forgivenesse of sins*, that by the sense thereof we may be enflamed 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 creditour which had two debtors, the one ought him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both.* Luc. 6. 41, 42. Upon which case our Saviour made this question, *which of them will love him most?* He supposeth both the debters will love him, because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionably to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debters, 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.

Fourthly, the true notion of *forgivenesse of sins* is necessary to teach us what we owe to Christ, to whome, and how far we are indebted for this forgivenesse. *Through this man is preached unto us forgivenesse of sins*, Act. 13. 38. and without a surety we had no release. He rendred 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 *glorifie God in our bodies and in our spirits, which are Gods.* 1Cor. 6. 19, 20. We must be no longer *the servants of men*; we are *the servants of Christ who are bought with a price.* 1Cor. 7. 22, 23.

Fiftly, it is necessary to believe remission of sins as wrought by the bloud 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 forgivenesse promised, we must perform repentance commanded.

manded. These two were alwayes preached together, and those which God hath joyned ought no man to put asunder. Christ did truly appear *a Prince and a Saviour*, and it was *to give repentance to Israel and forgivenesse of sins*; He joyned these two in the Apostles commission, saying, that *Repentance and Remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations.*

Act. 5. 31.

Luc. 24. 47.

From hence every one may learn what he is explicitely to believe and confesse in this Article of *forgivenesse of sins*; for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much, I do freely and fully acknowledge, 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, and upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternall punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternall 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 bloud there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a ransome, even his precious bloud 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 eternall punishment, which is the guilt of our sins; and appointed in the Church of Christ the Sacrament of Baptisme for the first remission, and repentance for the constant forgivenss of all following trespasses; and thus *I believe the forgivenesse of sins.*

ARTI-

ARTICLE XI.

The Resurrection Of The Body.

THis Article was anciently deliver'd and acknowledged † by all Churches, onely with this difference, that whereas in other places it was expres'd in generall terms, *the Resurrection of the flesh*, they of the Church of *Aquileia* by the addition of a Pronoune 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 *Latine* ever delivered this Article in those terms, but in these, *the* * *Resurrection of the flesh*; because there may be ambiguity in the one, in relation to the celestiall and spirituall bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other. Onely it will be necessary, for shewing 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

† Cum omnes Ecclesiæ in sacramentum Symboli tradant, ut post quam dixerant *peccatorum remissionem*, addant *carnis resurrectionem*; sancta Aquileiensis Ecclesia ubi tradit carnis resurrectionem, addit unius pronominis syllabam; & pro eo quod cæteri dicunt, *carnis resurrectionem*, nos dicimus, *hujus carnis resurrectionem*, Ruffin. *Apol. adverſ. Hieron.* Satis cauta & provida adjectione fidem Symboli Ecclesia nostra docet, quæ in eo quod à cæteris traditur, *carnis resurrectionem*, uno addito pronomine tradit, *hujus carnis resurrectionem*, Id. in Symb.

* The Greeks always σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, the Latines carnis resurrectionem. And this was to be observed because, being we read of spirituall bodies, some would acknowledge the resurrection of the body, who would deny the resurrection of the flesh. Of this S. Jerome gives an account, and withall of the words of the Creed. Exempli causa pauca subjiciã, *Credimus*, inquiunt, *resurrectionem futuram corporum*. Hoc si bene dicatur, pura confessio est; sed quia corpora sunt cœlestia, & terrestia, & aër ille & aura tenuis juxta naturã suã corpo a nominantur, *corpus* ponunt, non *carnem*, ut Orthodoxus corpus audiens carnẽ putet, Hæreticus spiritum recognoscat. Hæc enim eorũ est prima decipula; quæ si deprehensa fuerit, instruunt alios dolos, & innocentiã simulant, & malitiosos nos vocant, & quasi simpliciter credentes aiunt, *Credimus resurrectionem carnis*. Hoc vero cũ dixerint vulgus indoctum putat sibi sufficere, maxime quia idipsũ & in Symb. creditur, *Ep. 55. ad Pam. & Oceã.*

ſuch a body of fleſh, of the ſame nature which it had before it was by death ſeparated from the Soul. We ſee by dayly experience, that all men are mortall, that the body left by the ſoul the ſalt and life thereof, putrifieth and conſumeth, and according to the ſentence of old, returneth unto duſt; but theſe bodies, as frail and mortall as they are, conſiſting of this corruptible fleſh, are the ſubject of this Article, in which we profeſſe to believe *the Reſurrection of the body.*

When we treated concerning the Reſurrection of Chriſt, we † delivered the proper notion and nature of the Reſurrection in Generall, 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 onely 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 onely depoſited in a Sepulcre, otherwiſe the grave had no power over them. But other mortall 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*; our corps go *down to the barrs of the pit, and reſt together in the duſt.* Our death is not a ſimple diſſolution, 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.

† Pag. 515.

Job 17. 14, 16.

There

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 liv'd 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. Ezek. 37. 1, 7, 8. 10.

We muſt therefore endeavour to ſhew 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 facil 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 it ſelf impoſſible. Secondly, to ſhew that it is upon generall conſiderations highly probable. Thirdly, to demonſtrate that it is upon Chriſtian principles infallibly certain. It is not in it ſelf impoſſible, therefore no man can abſolutely deny it; it is upon naturall and morall grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon Evangelicall principles infallibly certain, therefore all Chriſtians muſt firmly believe it.

* Pliny *reckoning up thoſe things which he thought not to be in the power of God, mentions theſe two*, mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos, *lib. 2. cap. 7.* *And Æſchylus though a* Pythagorean, *yet abſolutely denies it to be in the power of God, for ſo he makes* Apollo *ſpeak to the* Eumenides,

Πέφυκε γὰρ λύσσειν, ἔστι τῶδ' ἄκος·
Καὶ κάρτα πολλὴ μηχανὴ λυσήσεται·
Ἀνδρὸς δ' ἐπιδὺς αἷμ' ἀναπτύσῃ χόρις
Ἄπαξ θανόντος, ὔπις ἔς' ἀνάστασις.
Τύπων ἐπῳδὰς οὐκ ἐποίησεν πλέᾳ
Οὗμὸς, τελεῖ' ἄλλα πάντ' ἄνω τε κἀτω
Σβέσῃ πίδυσιν, ἐδὲν αἰθαίνων μένος. Æſchyl. *Eumenid.*

First, I confeſſe the * *Philoſophers* of old did look upon the Reſurrection of the body as impoſſible, and

Uti anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis obſervatur: Ut carnis reſtitutio negetur, de una omnium Philoſophorum ſchola ſumitur, *Tertull.*

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 conjoyned to the spirit of a man. We read of *certain Philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks, who encountred S. Paul, and when they heard of the resurrection they mocked him, some saying, that he seemed to be a setter forth of strange Gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the Resurrection.* But as the Ancient Philosophers thought a Creation impossible, because they looked onely upon the constant works of nature, among which they never find any thing produced out of nothing, and yet we have already proved a Creation not onely possible, but perform'd; 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 tyed to the consideration of nature onely, but estimating things possible or impossible by the power of God, will easily demonstrate that there is no impossibility that the dead should rise.

Act. 17. 18.

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 wisdome, 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 former 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.

Now

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; for if either the Agent know not what is to be done, or if he know it, but hath no 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 endued with ſuch knowledge, armed with ſuch power.

† Τὸ ἀδύνατόν τινι γινώσκεται κατ' ἀλήθειαν τοιοῦτον ἢ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ γινώσκειν τὸ γενησόμενον ἢ ἐκ τοῦ δύασθαι ἀρκοῦντος μὴ ἔχειν πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι κωλοῦσι τὸ ἐγγωσμένον. Ὁ γὰρ ἀγνοῶν ἢ μὴ δυνάμενος δύνασθαι ἢ οὐκ ἂν θέλοι ἐγχειρῆσαι ἢ ἐγχειρῶν ἁμαρτήσεται· ὃ δὲ γινώσκων κωλοῦ τὸ ποιηθησόμενον, καὶ πόθεν γένοιτ' ἂν καὶ πῶς, δύναμιν ἢ μηδ' ὅλως ἔχων πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ γινωσκόμενον ἢ μὴ ἀρκοῦσ' ἔχων οὐκ ἂν ἐγχειρήσαι τῷ ἀρχῷ, ἵν' σωφρονοῖν καὶ τῷ ἰδίαν ὑπερκύψῃ δύναμιν, ἐγχειρήσας ἢ ἀφορισκήσας οὐκ ἂν ἐπιτελέσειε τὸ δόξαν, Athenagoras *de Reſurrectione.*

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 impaſſible*; 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 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* Pſ. 139.15,16. *in continuance were faſhioned, when as yet there was none of them.* Thus every particle of our bodies, every duſt and atome 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 numbred*, and *without* whom *one ſparrow ſhall not fall to the ground*. He which numbreth the ſands of the ſea, knoweth all the ſcattered bones, ſeeth into all the graves & tombs, ſearcheth all the repoſitories & 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 wayes and means by which theſe ſcattered parts ſhould be united, by which this ruined fabrick ſhould be recompoſed, he knoweth how every bone ſhould be brought to it's old neighbour bone, how every ſinew may be reimbroydered on it; he underſtandeth what are the proper parts to be conjoyned, 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.

Mat. 10. 29, 30.

And as the Wiſedome is infinite, ſo the Power of this Agent is illimited; 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 onely ſuffer, but doe what he will have them; they are not onely paſſively, but actively obedientiall. There is no atome of the duſt or aſhes but muſt be where it pleaſeth God, and be applyed 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 which is to raiſe us.

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 ſo far from

from a repugnancy, that it rather conteineth a rationall and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust, becoming dust, should become man again. Whatsoever we loose 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 loose 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, then that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they doe. 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 onely an Omnipotent power which could mould that into an humane body, and breathe into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power therefore, which must alwayes be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth, humane bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth: for

* Non sola anima seponitur, habet & cato suos sinus interim, in aquis, in ignibus, in alitibus, in bestiis; cum in hac dissolvi videtur, velut in vasa transfunditur, *Tertull. de Resurrectione carnis*, cap. 68. Tu perire Deo credis si quid oculis nostris hebetibus subtrahitur? Corpus omne sive aresçit in pulverem, sive in humorem solvitur, vel in einerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem tenuatur, subducitur nobis, sed Deo elementorum custodi reservatur, *Minutius Felix* in *Octavio*. Omnia quæ discerpuntur, & in favillas quasdam putrescunt, integra Deo sunt, in illa enim elementa mundi eunt unde primo venerunt, *S. Augustin.* in Psalm. Enarrat. 62.

† Absit autem ut ad resuscitanda corpora vitæque reddenda non possit Omnipotentia Creatoris omnia revocare quæ vel bestia vel ignis absumpsit; vel in pulveré cinerem-que collapsum, vel in humorem solutum, vel in auras est exhalatum. Absit ut sinus ullus, secretumque naturæ ita recipiat aliquid subtractum sensibus nostris, ut omnium Creatoris aut lateat cognitionem, aut effugiat potestatem, *S. Augustin. de Civitate Dei*, lib. 22, cap. 20.

if it

if it be not easier, it is most certainly as easie † to make that to be again which once hath bin, 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. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible, which is our first Conclusion.

† Recogita quid fueris antequam esses, utique nihil. Meminisses enim si quid fuisses. Qui ergo nihil fueras priusquam esses, idem nihil factus cum esse desieris, cur non possis esse rursus de nihilo, ejusdem Authoris voluntate, qui te voluit esse de nihilo? Quid novi tibi eveniet? Qui non eras, factus es, cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde, si potes, rationem qua factus es, & tunc require qua fies. Et tamen facilius utiq; fies quod fuisti aliquando, quia æque non difficile factus es quod nunquam fuisti aliquando, *Tertull. Apolog.* cap. 48. Utique idoneus est reficere qui fecit. Quanto plus est fecisse quam refecisse, initium dedisse quam reddidisse; ita restitutionem carnis faciliorem credas institutione, *Idem de Resur. carnis*, cap. 11. Difficilius est id quod non sit incipere, quam id quod fuerit iterare, *Minutius Felix in Octavio.* Utique plus est facere quod nunquam fuit, quam reparare quod fuit. Quomodo ergo impossibile esse dicis, ut Deus qui hominem formavit ex nihilo reformet? Quomodo nos suscitare non potest conversos in pulverem, qui etiamsi in nihilum rediremus, facere poterat ut essemus, sicut effecit nos esse, cùm antea nunquam fuissemus, *S. August. de Verbis Apost.* Serm. 19. *To the same purpose the* Jewes, דלא דוו דהוו לא כל שכן׃

Secondly, the Resurrection is not onely in it self possible, so that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many generall 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 immateriall, so are they immortall, 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 fouls of the air, severall of the fishes of the sea, many of the beasts of the field, di-

vers

vers of the plants of the earth are of a more durable conſtitution, and out-live the ſons of men. And can we think that ſuch materiall and mortall, that ſuch inunderſtanding ſouls ſhould by God and nature be furniſhed with bodies of ſo long permanſion, and that our ſpirits ſhould be joyned unto fleſh ſo ſubject to corruption, ſo ſuddenly diſſolveable, 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 immortall is forced from it's 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 onely life belonging to the ſonnes of men, and ſo the ſoul may at a ſhorter warning leave the body which it ſhall reſume again.

Again, if we look upon our ſelves as men, we are free agents, and therefore capable of doing good or evil, and conſequently ordinable unto reward or puniſhment. The Angels which are above us, and did ſin, received their puniſhment without a death, becauſe being onely ſpirits they were ſubject to no other diſſolution then annihilation, which cannot conſiſt with longer ſuffering puniſhment; thoſe which continued in their ſtation were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity, and thus all are incapable of a Reſurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedome cannot ſin, or act any thing morally either good or evil, they cannot deſerve after this life either to be puniſhed or rewarded; and therefore when they dye, they continue in the ſtate of death for ever. Thus thoſe which 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 or puniſhment for any thing acted in this life, and therefore though they dye, yet ſhall they never riſe, becauſe

there is no reaſon for their Reſurrection. But man by the nobleneſſe 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 in 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 onely no juſt Retribution rendred in this life to man, but conſidering the ordinary condition of things, it cannot be. For it is poſſible, and often cometh to paſſe, that one man may commit ſuch ſins as all the puniſhments of this life can no way equalize them. What is then more proper conſidering the providence of a moſt juſt God, then 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 undergoe thoſe ſufferings, becauſe the lawes which were given to us are not made in reſpect of that alone, but have moſt frequent reflexion on the body, † without which in this life the ſoul can neither do nor ſuffer any thing. It is therefore highly probable from the generall conſideration of humane actions and divine retributions, that there ſhall be a [a] *Reſurrection of the fleſh, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whither it be good or bad.*

† Quod congruet judicari hoc competet etiam reſuſcitari, *Tertullian. de Reſurrectione carnis*, cap. 14. Negent operarum ſocietatem ut merito poſſint mercedem negare. Non ſit particeps in ſententia caro, ſi n fuerit & in cauſa. Sola anima revocetur, ſi ſola decidit. At enim non magis ſola decidit, quam ſola decucurrit illud unde decidit, vitam hanc dico, *ibid. cap.* 15. Cum omnis vitæ noſtræ uſus in corporis animæque conſortio ſit, reſurrectio autem aut boni actus præmium habeat aut pœnam improbi, neceſſe eſt corpus reſurgere cujus actus expenditur. Quomodo enim in judicium vocabitur ſine corpore, cum de ſuo & corporis conturbernio ratio præſtanda ſit? S. *Ambroſ. de Fide Reſur.*

[a] 2 Cor. 5. 10.

Further-

Furthermore beſide the principles of which we conſiſt, and the actions which flow from us, the conſideration of the things without us, and the naturall courſe of variations in the creature, will render the *Reſurrection* yet more highly probable. Every ſpace of 24. hours teacheth thus much, in which there is alwayes a revolution amounting to a Reſurrection. The * day dyes into a night, and is buried in ſilence and in darkneſſe; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darkneſſe, riſing from the dead of night; this is a diurnall Reſurrection.

* Dies moritur in noctem, & tenebris uſquequaque ſepelitur. Funeſtatur mundi honor, omnis ſubſtantia denigratur, Sordent, ſilent, ſtupent cuncta; ubique juſtitium eſt, quies rerum: ita lux amiſſa lugetur. Et tamen rurſus cum ſuo cultu, cum dote, cum ſole, eadem & integra & tota univerſo orbi reviviſcit, interficiens mortem ſuam noctem, reſcindens ſepulturam ſuam tenebras, hæres ſibimet exiſtens, donec & nox reviviſcat, cum ſuo & illa ſuggeſtu. Redaccenduntur enim & ſtellæ uni radii, quos matutina ſuccenſio extinxerat. Reducuntur & ſiderum abſentiæ, quas temporalis diſtinctio exemerat. Redornantur & ſpecula Lunæ ouæ menſtruus numerus adtriverat, *Tertullian. de Reſurrectione carnis*, cap. 12. Lux quotidie interfecta reſplendet & tenebræ pari vice decedendo ſuccedunt, ſidera defuncta viveſcunt, tempora ubi finiuntur incipiunt, fructus conſummantur & redeunt, *Idem Apol.* cap. 48. Δυσει ἡ ἡμέρα τὴ νυκτὸς ἀναπαύεται τὸν τρόπον κοιμωμένη ἀναπαυομένης, ἀνατέλλει ἡ ἡμέρα ἡμᾶς διϋπνίζουσα τὴ ἀναστάσεως ὑποδεικνύουσα τὸ σημεῖον, Epiphan. *in Anchorato.*

As the day dyes into night, ſo doth the Summer into Winter: the ſap is ſaid to deſcend into the root, and there it lyes buried in the ground; the earth is covered with ſnow, or cruſted with froſt, and becomes a generall 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 annuall 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 a 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 dye and revive for him, ſhould be detained in death as never to live again? Is 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 humane nature, of the liberty and remunerability of humane actions, and of the naturall revolutions and reſurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly ſufficient to render the Reſurrection of our bodies highly probable.

† Omnia perendo ſervantur, omnia deinte itu reformantur. Tu homo, tantum nomen, ſi intelligas te vel de titulo Pythiæ diſcens, dominus omnium morientium & reſurgentium ad hoc morieris ut pereas? *Tertull. Apolog. cap.* 48. Revolvuntur hyemes & æſtates, & verna aut autumna cum ſuis viribus, moribus, fructibus. Quippe et am terræ de cœlo diſciplina eſt arbores veſtire poſt ſpolia, flores denuo colorare, herbas rurſus imponere, exhibere eadem quæ abſumpta ſunt ſemina, nec ſpurius exhibere quam abſumpta. Mira ratio de fraudatrice ſervare, ut reddat intercipit, ut cuſtodiat perdit, ut integret vitiat, ut etiam amplior prius deco quit. Siquidem uberiora & cultiora reſtituit quam exterminavit: revera fœnore interitus, & injuria uſura, & lucro damno: ſemel dixerim, univerſa conditio recidiva eſt. Quodcunque conveneris fuit, quodcunque amiſeris nihil non iterum eſt: omnia in ſtatum redeunt cum abſceſſerint, omnia incipiunt cum deſierint: ideo finiuntur ut fiant, nihil deperit niſi in ſalutem. Totus igitur hic orbo revolubilis rerum teſtatio eſt reſurrectionis mortuorum. Operibus eam præſcripſit Deus ante quam literis; viribus prædicavit antequam vocibus. Præmiſit tibi Naturam magiſtram, ſubmiſſurus & Prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiæ diſcipulus naturæ; quo ſtatim admittas cum audieris, quod ubique jam videris, nec dubites Deum carnis etiam reſuſcitatorem, quem omnium rerum reſtitutorem. Et ut quæ omnia homini reſurgunt cui procurata ſunt, porro non hominis niſi & carni, quale eſt ut ipſa depereat in totum propter quam & cui nihil deperit? *Idem de Reſur. carnis*, cap. 12.

We muſt not reſt in this School of Nature, nor ſettle our perſwaſions upon likelyhoods; but as we paſſed from an apparent poſſibility, unto a high preſumption and probability, ſo muſt we paſſe 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

is known to 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 ſhew that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raiſe the dead, and that he hath not onely delivered that intention in his word, but hath alſo ſeverall wayes confirmed the ſame.

Many of the places produced out of the Old Teſtament to this purpoſe will ſcarce amount to a Revelation of this truth. The *Jewes* inſiſt upon ſuch * weak inferences out of the Law, as ſhew 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, *a 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 ſuddain reſtitution to his former temporall condition; the other more ancient of the *Jewes*, who make him ſpeak of the happineſſe of another life without any reference to a reſurrection. But

* *They produce ſeverall 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* ויצר *with two jods, and in the formation of beaſts* ויצר *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 Maledictio.* Duſt thou art and to duſt thou ſhalt return; תלך לא נאמר אלא תשוב, *it is not* thou ſhalt goe *to the duſt, but* thou ſhalt return. *As he had ſaid, thou art now duſt while thou liveſt, and after death thou ſhalt return in to this duſt, that is, thou ſhalt live again, as now thou doſt. So from theſe words* Exod. 15. 1. אז ישיר משה, *they conclude the reſurrection, upon this ground* שר לא נאמר אלא ישיר, *it is not ſaid he ſang, but he ſhall ſing, viz after the reſurrection that life to come. With theſe and the like Arguments did the Rabins ſatisfie themſelves, which was the reaſon that they gave ſo ſmall ſatisfaction to the Sadduces; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job.*

a Job 19. 25 26.

that *Job* ſpake not concerning any ſuddain reſtitution, or any alteration of his temporall 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!* He deſires that his words may continue as long 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 pleadeth a Redeemer, and for his reſurrection he ſheweth expectation and aſſurance through the ſame Redeemer. It is further confirmed by the expreſſions themſelves, which are no way proper for his temporall reſtitution: the firſt words ואני ידעתי: *I alſo know*, denote a certainty and a 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 whome he depends, the *Redeemer* ſheweth that he underſtands it of Chriſt; the time expreſſed denotes the futurition 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 happineſſe to be conferred by God, fails onely 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

Job 19. 23, 24.

גאלי :

אחרון :

clare 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.* Dan. 12. 2.

The Jewes collect from hence the Reſurrection, as Rabina in Sanhedrin. *and in the* Midraſh Tillim, Pſal. 93. 3. "אר רחמון עשני עפר הם חסתים שני ורבים משנו אדמת עפר יקיצו ונו׳: Rabbi Rachmon *ſaid, that the ſleepers in the duſt are the dead, as it is written*, Dan. 12. 2. Many of them that ſleep in the duſt of the earth ſhall awake, &c. *And this is onely denyed by the Gentiles; for* Porphyrius *referreth it onely and wholly to the times of* Antiochus, *whoſe words are thus left unto us tranſlated by S. Hieſome*, Tunc hi qui quaſi in terræ pulvere dormiebant, & operti erant malorum pondere, & quaſi in ſepulchris miſeriarum reconditi, ad inſperatam victoriam de terræ pulvere reſurrexerunt, & de humo elevaverunt caput, cuſtodes legis reſurgentes in vitam æternam, & prævaricatores in opprobrium ſempiternum, *where it is to be obſerved that he gives a probabl gloſſe 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 eternall life, nor to an everlaſting contempt.*

If theſe and other places of the old Teſtament ſhew 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*, refuted the Sadduces, 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.* Mat. 22. 32. With the force of which Argument the multitude was aſtoniſhed and the Sadduces ſilenced. For under the name of God was underſtood a great benefactor, a God of promiſe, and to be their God was to bleſſe 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 expected, and therefore God after their death deſiring ſtill to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that

he

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 *Jewes* 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 Jehovah was I not known to them. Nevertheleſſe I have eſtabliſhed my Covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were ſtrangers.* It is not ſaid *to give their ſons*, but *to give them the land of Canaan*; and therefore, becauſe while they lived here they enjoy'd 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 S. *Paul* joyn himſelf unto the Phariſees in this particular, for being called before the Council, and *perceiving that the one part were Sadducees and the other Phariſees*, one denying, the other aſſerting the reſurrection [a] *he cryed out 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, [b] *except it be for this one voice that I cryed 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 ſate in *Moſes* chair did collect it from thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into the world, that the Sadducees who denyed 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 *Jewes* preaching it to the Gentiles. Thus the will of God concerning the

Exod. 6. 4. לחת לכם לא נאמר אלא להם מכאן לתחיית המתים מן התורה: *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 Ferek Helek. *And therefore the Jewes took the Reſurrection for one of the foundations of the law of* Moſes, ותחיית המתים קאמרה מן קיאזר שרישה משה: Moſes Mamm. *Expl. cap.* 10. *Tract. Sanedrin.*

a Act. 23. 6.

b Act. 24. 21.

the raiſing the dead was made known unto the Sons of men; and becauſe God can doe whatſoever he will, and will certainly effect whatſoever he hath foretold, therefore we are aſſured of a Reſurrection by virtue of a clear Revelation.

Beſide God hath not onely 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 voyce of *Elsah* 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 onely in the ſame ſpirit, but alſo in the like power, for he raiſed the child of the *Shunamite* from death; nor did that power dye 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 confirmations, under the Law, of a reſurrection to life after death; and we have three to equall them 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 and walked.* When he came *nigh to the gate of the city called Naim, 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 ſate up and began to ſpeak.* Thus Chriſt raiſed the dead in the chamber and 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 bin *dead four dayes*, and ſo buryed that his ſiſter ſaid of him, *by this time he ſtinketh*, Jeſus *cryed with a loud voice; Lazarus come forth, and he that was dead came forth.* Theſe three Evangelicall reſuſcitations are ſo many preambulary proofs of the laſt and generall Reſurrection; but the three former and theſe alſo come far ſhort of

1 King 17. 22.
2 King 4.
2 King 13. 21.
Mar. 5. 41, 42. Luc. 8. 55.
Luc. 7. 12, 14, 15.
Joh. 11. 39, 43, 44.

the Reſurrection of him who raiſed theſe.

Chriſt did of himſelf actually riſe, others which had ſlept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actuall teſtimony of the Reſurrection. For *if Chriſt be preached that he roſe from the dead*, ſaith S. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, *how ſay ſome among you that there is no reſurrection of the dead?* It is 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 confeſſe 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 onely prove by way of example, as the reſt who roſe, but hath a force in it to command belief of a future generall Reſurrection. For God hath a *appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteouſneſſe by that man whom he hath ordeined, 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 b *ſince by man came death, by man came alſo the reſurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all dye, even ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.*

1 Cor. 15. 12.

† *There were not onely certain perſons under the Law & among the Jews who were raiſed to life; but there were alſo Hiſtories amongſt the Gentiles of ſeverall who roſe to life after death. We mentioned before one out of* Plutarch *pag.* 528. *who roſe the third day, and* Plato *mentioneth another who revived the twelfth day after death,* Ἀλλ' ὑμῶν τις ἐστι, φησὶν, ἐγὼ, Ἀλκίνου μὲν ἀπόλογον ἥρῳ, ἀλλ' ἀληθῆ μῦθον ἀνδρὸς, Ἠρὸς τοῦ Ἀρμενίου, τὸ γένος Παμφύλου, ὃς ποτὲ ὢν πολέμῳ τελευτήσας ἀναιρεθέντων δεκαταίων τῶν νεκρῶν ἤδη διεφθαρμένων, ὑγιὴς μὲν ἀνῃρέθη, κομισθεὶς δ' οἴκαδε μέλλων θάπτεσθαι δωδεκαταῖος ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ κείμενος ἀνεβίω, Plato *de Repub. l.* 10. *vide* Plin. *lib.* 7. *cap.* 52. De his qui elati revixerunt.

a Act. 17. 31. b 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22.

his

his reſurrection did obtain. *For to this end Chriſt both dyed and roſe, and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* Now as *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living*, 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 obtained 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*, and there is no deſtruction of death but by a generall Reſurrection. By virtue of this did he declare himſelf after this manner to S. *John*, *I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keyes of hell and of death.* Thus are we aſſured of a generall Reſurrection, in that Chriſt is riſen to become the Lord of the dead, and to deſtroy death.

Rom. 14. 9.

1 Cor. 15. 25, 26.

Rev. 1. 18.

Secondly, Chriſt riſing from the dead aſſureth us of a Generall Reſurrection in reſpect of the Judgement which is to follow. For as *it is appointed for all men once to dye, ſo after death cometh judgement*; 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*, ſo by the ſame act did he alſo give an aſſurance of the reſurrection of the world to judgement.

Now as the Generall Reſurrection is evidenced by the riſing of Chriſt, ſo in a more eſpeciall and peculiar manner the Reſurrection of the choſen Saints and ſervants of God is demonſtrated thereby. For he is riſen not onely 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.* The

Coloſſ. 1. 18.

1 Cor. 15. 20.

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 Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortall bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in us.* Thus God hath determined, and revealed that determination, to raise the dead, and confirmed that revelation by the actuall raising of severall 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 contradiction. Wherefore I conclude that *the Resurrection of the body*, is in it self considered possible, upon generall considerations highly probable, upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

Rom. 8. 11.

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 joyned 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 Saviours testimony not subject to mortality, that it never entred 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 doe, and when the Resurrection should be perform'd, the bodies should be inform'd with other souls; neither they which liv'd before then should revive, and those which live after the resurrection should have never bin 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

but a reunion of ſuch as before were ſeparated, there is no queſtion but the ſame ſoules ſhould live the ſecond life which have lived the firſt. Nor is this onely true of our ſouls, but muſt be alſo made good of our bodies, thoſe houſes of clay, thoſe habitations of fleſh: as our bodies whiſe 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 other man ſhall be vitally reunited unto the ſoul at the Reſurrection.

That the ſame body, not any other, ſhall be raiſed to life which dyed, 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 re-built, 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 wormes deſtroy this body,* Job 19.26,27. ſaith *Job, yet in my fleſh,* (*in fleſh* ſhewing the reality, *in my fleſh* ſhewing the propriety and identity) *ſhall I ſee God, whom I ſhall ſee for my ſelf, and mine eyes ſhall behold, and not another* or a *ſtranger* eye. *He that raiſed up Chriſt* Rom. 8. 11. *from the dead ſhall alſo quicken our mortall bodies*; after the Reſurrection our glorified bodies ſhall become ſpirituall and incorruptible, but in the reſurrection of our mortall bodies, thoſe bodies, by reaſon of whoſe mortality we dyed, ſhall be revived. *For this corruptible muſt put on incorruption, and this mortall muſt put on immortality.* 1 Cor. 15. 53. Ἵνα μὴ ἀκύσας τις ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν

But

Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι, νομίσῃ τὰ σώματα μὴ ἀνίστασθαι, ἐπήγαγεν, ὅτι δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν, φθαρτὸν δὲ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ θνητὸν τὸ σῶμα· ἆρα τὸ αὐτὸ σῶμα μένει, αὐτὸ γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐνδυόμενον· ἢ θνητότης καὶ ἡ φθορὰ ἀφαιρεῖται, ἀθανασίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἐπέσης αὐτῷ, S. Chryſoſt. *ad locum.* Θέλεις πῶς ἀκούσεται, τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσῃ

δείξε δικαίως ἵνα μὴ ἄλλης νομίσῃς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, *Theodoretus* ibid. *Oportet enim corruptivum istud induere incorruptionem, & mortale istud induere immortalitatem.* Quid mortale nisi caro? quid corruptivum nisi sanguis? Ac ne putes aliquid aliud sentire Apostolum providentem tibi, & ut de carne dictum intelligas laborantem, cum dicit *istud corruptivum* & *istud mortale* cutem ipsam tenens dicit. Certe *istud* nisi de subjecto, nisi de comparenti pronuntiasse non potuit: demonstrationis corporalis est verbum, *Tertull. de Resur. carnis*, cap. 51. Sed & Apostolus cum dicit, *Oportet enim corruptibile hoc* (in uno vocabulo) *incorruptionem, & mortale hoc induere immortalitatem:* numquid non corpus suum quodammodo contingentis & digito palpantis est vox? Hoc ergo quod nunc corruptibile corpus est, resurrectionis gratia incorruptibile est, & nunc quod mortale est immortalitatis virtutibus induetur, *Ruff. in Symb.* Quod dicit Apostolus *Corruptibile hoc & mortale*; hoc ipsum corpus, id est, carnem, quæ tunc videbatur ostendit. Quod autem copulat *Induere incorruptionem & immortalitatem*; illud indumentum, id est, vestimentum, non dicit corpus abolere quod ornat in gloria, sed quod ante inglorium fuit efficere gloriosum, *S. Hieron. Epist. 61. ad Pammachium.*

But *this corruptible* and *this mortall* is the same bodie which dyeth, because *mortall*, and is corrupted because *corruptible*; the soul then at the resurrection of that man which is made immortall must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

† Περὶ δὲ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως πῶς ἐγὼ σαρκῶς ἔσαι ἀνάστασις, ὦ ἑλλόσοφε Ἱέραξ, Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ ὀνομασία τῆς φράσεως διδάσκει πλὴν δύναμιν. Ἀνάστασις γὰρ καλεῖται τῶ μὴ πεπτωκότι· πῶν δέ ἐστι τὸ πεσόν; πῶν τὸ ταφέν; πῶν τὸ λυθέν, ἀφ' ἧς τὸ σῶμα; ἡ ψυχή, ψυχὴ τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἡ πεσοῦσα καὶ ἀναστᾶσα, Epiphan. *Hær.* 67. §. 6. Nam & ipsum quod *Mortuorum Resurrectio* dicitur exigit defendi proprietates vocabulorum. *Mortuorum* itaque vocabulo non est nisi quod amisit animam, de cujus facultate vivebat. Corpus est quod amittit animam, & amittendo fit mortuum; ita mortui vocabulum corpori comperit. Porro si resurrectio mortui est, mortuum autem non aliud est quam corpus, corporis erit resurrectio. Sic & *Resurrectionis* vocabulum non aliam rem vendicat quam quæ cecidit. Surgere enim potest dici & quod omnino non cecidit, quod semper

† The identity of the body rais'd 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 & rise again. For at the death of man nothing falleth but his body, 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

retro

retro jacuit. Reſurgere autem non eſt niſi ejus quod cecidit. Iterum enim ſurgendo quia cecidit reſurgere dicitur. *Re* enim ſyllaba iterationi ſemper adhibetur., *Tertull. adverſ.* Marcion. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 9. Sed & ipſum *Reſurrectionis* vocabulum ſignificat non aliud ruere, aliud reſuſcitari; & quod adjicitur *Mortuorum* carnem propriam demonſtrat; quod enim in homine moritur hoc & vivificatur, *S. Hieronym. Epiſt.* 61.

upon it under the notion of Reviviſcency, which is more ordinary in the † *Hebrew* language, it proves as much, for nothing properly dyeth but the body, the ſoul cannot be killed, and nothing can revive but that which dyeth. 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 dyeth not in inference to his ſoul, which is immortall, but his body, and therefore he cannot be ſaid to revive, but in reference to his body before depriv'd of life; and becauſe no other fleſh fell at his death, no other body dyed but his own, therefore he cannot riſe again but in his own fleſh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

† *The Rabbins uſe ſometimes* תקומה *which is properly reſurrection ἀναστασις, according to that of our Saviour* Talitha cumi: *but more often they make uſe of* תחיה, *which is reviviſcentia or ἀναζωωσις. And though they make a diſtinction ſomtimes between them, attributing the firſt to the wicked, the ſecond to the juſt, yet it muſt not ſo be underſtood as if there could be a Reviviſcency without a Reſurrection, a* תחיה *without a* תקומה, *but that there is to the wicked a* תקומה, *which cannot ſo properly be called* תחיה, *becauſe they riſe not to the happineſſe of eternall life.*

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 ariſe: *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 then our own, neither the ſea nor the grave ſhould give up their dead. That ſhall riſe again which the grave gives up; the grave

Dan. 12. 2. Joh. 5. 28. Rev. 20. 13.

grave hath nothing elſe to give up but that body which was laid into it; therefore the ſame body which is buried at the laſt day ſhall be revived.

The immediate conſequent of the Reſurrection proveth the identity of the dying and riſing body, *We muſt all appear before the Judgement ſeat of Chriſt, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whither 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 lyable to the puniſhment, is not onely 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 a *deſtroy both their ſoul and body in hell*: but they which b *glorifie 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 bloud of Chriſt. The bodies of the Saints are the c *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 deſtroy'd they ſhall be rais'd 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, d *he which raiſed up Chriſt from the dead ſhall alſo quicken our mortall bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us.*

2 Cor. 5. 10.

† Quam abſurdum, quam vero & iniquũ, utrumque autem quam Deo indignum, aliam ſubſtantiam operari, aliam mercede diſpungi, ut hæc quidem caro per martyria lanietur, alia vero coronetur: item è contrario hæc quidem caro in ſpurcitiis volutetur, alia vero damnetur?

Nonne præſtat omnem ſemel fidem à ſpe Reſurrectionis abducere, quam de gravitate atque juſtitia Dei ludere, Marcionem pro Valentino reſuſcitari? *Tertull. de Reſurrectione Carnis*, cap 56. a Matth. 10. 28. b 1 Corinth. 6. 20. c 1 Corinth. 6. 15, 19. d Rom. 8. 11.

Furthermore e the identity of the dying and the riſing body will appear by thoſe bodies which ſhall never riſe becauſe they ſhall never dye. Thoſe whom Chriſt ſhall find

find alive at his coming, 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, onely changed into glorified and ſpirituall bodies, that is with the ſame bodyes 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.* 1 Theſ. 4 16, 17.

Laſtly, thoſe examples which God hath bin pleaſed to give us to confirm our faith in the Reſurrection, do at the ſame time perſwade us that the ſame body which dyed 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 layed in. If then they were to us * examples of the Reſurrection to come, as certainly they were, then muſt they reſemble in their ſubſtance after they liv'd again the ſubſtance in which all the Mat. 27. 52, 53.

* Poſt dicta Domini tacta etiam ejus quid ſapere credamus de capu-

lis, de ſepulchris mortuos reſuſcitantis? cui rei iſtud? ſi ad ſimplicem oſtentationem poteſtatis, aut ad præmentem gratiâ redanimationis, non adeo magnum illi denuo morituros ſuſcitare. Enimvero ſi ad fidem potius ſequeſtrandum futuræ reſurrectionis, ergo & illa corporalis præſcribitur de documenti ſui forma *Tertul. de reſ. car. c. 58.* At ergo Deum malo decipere non poſſe, de fallacia ſolummodo infirmo; ne aliter documenta præmiſiſſe quam rem diſponiſſe 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 animæ cum corpore reſuſcitabuntur in documentum ſine corpore reſurgendi, ut tota hominis ſalus dimidiæ patrocinaretur; quando exemplorum conditio iſtud potius experiretur quod minus haberetur, animæ dico ſolius reſurrectionem, velut guſtum carnis reſurrecturæ ſuo in tempore, *Ibidem.*

reſt ſhall riſe. And being Chriſt himſelf did raiſe his own body, according to his prediction *Deſtroy this Temple and in three dayes I will raiſe it up*, and declared it to be his own body, ſaying *Behold my hands and my feet that it is I my ſelf*, 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 my ſelf.*

Joh. 2. 19.

Phil. 3. 21.

Luc. 24. 39.

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 further to enquire 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 further then 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 expreſly of the Reſurrection, but mentioneth no other then his Redeemer and himſelf. The place of *Daniel*, which was alwayes 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 *Jewes* moſt 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*

* *This is recorded in the* Pereſhit Rabba. *Vide* Maimonidis *Expl.* 10. *cap. Tract.* Sanhedrin.

of the juſt alone. Againſt which two Reſtrictions by the light delivered in the Goſpell we ſhall deliver the latitude of this Article in theſe two Propoſitions. Firſt, The Reſurrection of the dead belongeth not unto the juſt alone, but to the unjuſt alſo. Secondly, The Reſurrection of the dead belongeth not onely to ſome of the juſt, but to all the juſt, not to ſome of the unjuſt onely, but to all the unjuſt, even unto all the dead.

For the firſt it is moſt evident not onely 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 everlaſting contempt*; therefore it is moſt evident that ſome ſhall awake and riſe beſide the Juſt. The *Jewes* themſelves did underſtand and believe thus much, as appeareth by S. *Paul*'s Apology to *Felix*, *But this I confeſſe 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 & unjuſt.* 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.* For as there is [a] *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*; 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 Judgement, and at the Judgement 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,*

Act. 24 15.

Joh. 5. 29. Ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, & Ἀνάστασις κρίσεως. The firſt is called ἀνάστασις πρώτων, and therefore the ſecond may as well be called ἀνάστασις ἐσχάτων.

[a] Luc. 14. 14.

Mat. 25. 34. *inherit the kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world*, these that they may receive that sen-
41. tence, *Depart from me ye curſed into everlaſting fire prepared for the devil and his Angels.* 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 dyeth is numbred with the juſt or unjuſt. *Adam* the firſt of men ſhall riſe, and all which
1 Cor. 15. 22. come from him. *For as in Adam all dyed, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.* 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,
21. and comprehendeth them univerſally. *By man came death, by man came the Reſurrection of the dead*, 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
Joh. 5. 28. expreſſe 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.* In the deſcription of the Judgement which follow-
Mat. 25. 32. eth upon the Reſurrection, *when the Son of man ſhall ſit upon the Throne of his glory*, it is ſaid that *before him*
Rom. 14. 10. *ſhall be gathered all nations. We ſhall all ſtand before the Judgement ſeat of Chriſt*, and if ſo, the dead muſt all riſe, for they all are fallen. *We muſt all appear before the*
2 Cor. 5. 10. *Judgement 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.

Now this Reſurrection, as an object of our faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futurition of it.

There

There were Heretick's in the Apoſtles dayes who acknowledged a Reſurrection, but yet deſtroyed this Article by denying the relation of it to the time to come, 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 likeneſſe of Chriſt's Reſurrection; that as he dyed and roſe again, ſo we ſhould dye unto ſin and live again unto righteouſneſſe, attributing all to the renovation of the mind, muſt deny *the reſurrection of the body.* 2 Tim. 2. 18.

Nonnulli attendentes verba quæ aſſidue dicit Apoſtolus, *Quia & mortui ſumus cum Chriſto, & reſurreximus cum eo*; nec intelligentes quatenus dicatur, arbitrati ſunt jam factam eſſe reſurrectionem, nec ullam uſterius in fine temporum eſſe ſperandam. *Ex quibus eſt*, inquit, *Hymenæus & Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt, dicentes reſurrectionem jam factam eſſe* Idem Apoſtolus eos arguens deteſtatur, qui tamen dicit nos reſurrexiſſe cum Chriſto, *S. Aug. Epiſt.* 119. ad Januarium. *This was the Hereſie of the* Seleuciani *or* Hermiani, *as the ſame* Aug. *teſtifieth*, Hær. 59. Reſurrectionem non putant futuram, ſed quotidie fieri in generatione filiorum. *Thus* Tertullian *relates of ſome Heretick's in his time, who made the Reſurrection wholly Allegorical, and yet pretended to believe a Reſurrection in the fleſh, but underſtood it in this life, at the Baptiſmall renovation, and ſo paſt when they profeſſed to believe.* Exinde ergo Reſurrectionem fide conſecutos cum Domino eſſe, cum eum in Baptiſma e induerint. Hoc denique ingenio etiam in colloquiis ſæpe noſtros decipere conſueverunt, quaſi & ipſi reſurrectionem carnis admittant. Væ, inquiunt, qui non in hac carne reſurrexit, ne ſtatim illos percutiant, ſi reſurrectionem ſtatim abnuerint: tacite autem ſecundum conſcientiam ſuam hoc ſentiunt. Væ qui non, dum in hac carne eſt, cognoverit arcana hæretica, hoc enim apud illos reſurrectio, *Tertull. de* Reſurrect. Carnis, *cap.* 19.

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* Joh. 11. 24.

Joh. 6. 39. *Fathers will*, then that *of all which he hath given him, he ſhould looſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up at the laſt day.* The corn is ſown and laid in the ground, and *the harveſt* Mat. 13. 39. *is the end of the world.* We muſt not expect to riſe from 1 Cor. 15. 52. the dead till *the laſt trump. The Lord himſelf ſhall deſcend* 1 Theſſ. 4. 16. *from heaven with a ſhout, with the voice of an Archangel and with the trump of God* before *all that are in the graves* Act. 17. 31. *ſhall hear his voice.* God ſhall *judge the world*, and there- Joh. 5. 28. fore ſhall raiſe the world: but he will not raiſe them to that judgement till the end of the world.

Thus having demonſtrated that the will of God hath bin 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 dye, 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.

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 Wiſdome, Power, Juſtice, and Mercy. God firſt created all things for himſelf, and the Reſurrection is as it were a new Creation. The wiſedome and power of God are manifeſted in this acknowledgement, in as much as without infinite knowledge he could not have an exact and diſtinct comprehenſion of all the particles and individuall duſts of all the bodies of all men, & without an infinite power he could not conjoyn, 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 heart ſhall rejoyce*

rejoyce, 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. Iſai. 66. 14.

Secondly, it is neceſſary to profeſſe the belief of *the Reſurrection of the body*, that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerfull work of our Redemption: confeſſing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have obteined another life had not the Saviour of the world *aboliſhed death and brought life and immortality to light through the Goſpell.* 2 Tim. 1. 10. 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 *that liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore*, had not he *the keyes of hell and of death*, we could never break through the barrs of death, or paſſe the gates of hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquiſh our enemies, and our *laſt enemy* to be *deſtroyed is death*: that the propheſie 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.* Hoſ. 13. 14. 1 Corinth. 15. 54, 57.

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 theſe which are aſleep, that we ſorrow not even as others which have no hope.* 1 Theſſ. 4. 13.

Fourthly, the belief of the Reſurrection hath a neceſſary

fary reflexion upon this life by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from ſinne, as encouraging to holineſſe, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate ſin while he thinks that he muſt riſe and ſtand before the Judgement 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 momentany ſatisfaction to incurre an eternall 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? S. *Paul* who hath 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 my ſelf 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 perſwaſion of a reſurrection; and he which is really poſſeſſed with this hope, cannot chuſe but purifie 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 ſuſteineth all fainting hearts, this ſweeteneth all preſent miſeries, this lighteneth all heavy burdens, this encourageth in all dangers, this ſupporteth in all calamities.

Act. 24. 15, 16.

1 Cor. 15. 58.

Having thus diſcovered the truth of this Article; we may eaſily perceive what every man is obliged to believe, and underſtood to profeſſe, when he confeſſeth a belief of *the Reſurrection of the body*; for thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I am fully perſwaded of this as of a moſt neceſſary and infallible truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to dye, ſo it is alſo determined that all men ſhall riſe from death, that the ſoules ſeparated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live, that the bodies diſſolved into duſt,

duſt, or ſcattered into aſhes, ſhall be recollected in themſelves and reunited to their ſouls, that the ſame fleſh which lived before ſhall be revived, that the ſame numerical bodies which did fall ſhall riſe, that this reſuſcitation ſhall be univerſal, no man excepted, no fleſh left in the grave, that all the juſt ſhall be raiſed to a reſurrection of life, and all the unjuſt to a reſurrection of damnation, that this ſhall be performed at the laſt day when the Trump ſhall ſound; and thus *I believe the reſurrection of the body.*

ARTICLE XII.

And The Life Everlasting.

THis laſt Article though † not to be found in all, yet was expreſs'd in * many ancient Creeds. Some by way of addition, *and the life everlaſting*; others by way of conjunction with the former, *the Reſurrection of the body unto everlaſting life.* Upon this connexion with the former,

† *Not in all, for divers ended with that of the Reſurrection, as appeareth by* Ruffinus, *who not onely 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 & ultimus iſte ſermo, qui reſurrectionem carnis pronunciat, ſummam totius perfectionis ſuccincta brevitate concludit. *And whereas he ſhews the cuſtome of the* Aquileian *Church to make a creſſe upon their forehead at the naming of* hujus carnis, *he tells us elſewhere in his Apology againſt S.* Hie ome, *that it was to conclude the Creed.* Quo ſcilicet frontem, ut mos eſt in fine Symboli, ſignaculo contingentes, & ore carnis hujus, videlicet quam contingimus, reſurrectionem fatentes, omnem venenatæ adverſum nos linguæ calumniandi aditum præſtruamus. *In the ſame manner S.* Hierome *his contemporary*, In Symbolo fidei & ſpei noſtræ, quod ab Apoſtolis traditum non ſcribitur in charta & atramento, ſed in tabulis cordis carnalibus, poſt confeſſionem Trinitatis & Unitatem Eccleſiæ omne Chriſtiani dogmatis ſacramentum carnis reſurrectione concluditur. *S.* Maximus Taurinenſis *after thoſe words* Carnis reſurrectionem, *adds*, Hic Religionis noſtræ finis, hæc ſumma credendi eſt. *And* Venantius Fortunatus *after the ſame words*, ſumma perfectionis concluditur. *And in the* Mſs. *ſet forth by the Archbiſhop of* Armagh Καρκὸς ἀνάστασις *and* carnis reſurrectione *are the laſt words.*

* *As* Petrus Chryſologus *expreſly*, Credimus vitam æternam, quia poſt reſurrectionem, nec bonorum finis eſt nec malorum. Signate vos, *Serm* 60. *and again*, Bene addidit *vitam æternam*, ut ſe reſurrecturum crederet qui reſurget per ipſum qui cum Deo Patre & Spiritu S. vivit & regnat. *So* Etherius Uxamenſis, & Euſebius Gillicanus. *So we find* Serm. de Tempore 131. *&* De Symbolo ad Catech. *lib.* 1. Quomodo carnis Reſurrectionem? Ne forte putet aliquis quomodo Lazari, ut ſcias non ſic eſſe, additum eſt *in vitam æternam*; and *lib.* 2. Hoc ſequitur etiam in S. Symbolo, quod poſt *Reſurrectionem carnis* credamus *& vitam æternam*; *lib.* 3. In vitam æternam; and *lib.* 4. Hoc ſequitur in S. Symbolo quod omnia quæ credimus & ſperamus in Vitam æternam percipiamus. *And* Carolus Magnus *in his repreſentation of* Baſilius *Biſhop of* Ancyra. Non eo modo præjudicat prætermiſſio imaginum adorationis ſacræ fidei puritati, quæ interdicta potius quam inſtituta eſt; ſicut præjudicant Remiſſio peccatorum, carnis Reſurrectio, & Vita futuri ſæculi, ſi in confeſſione prætermittantur; quæ utique & in omni ſcripturarum ſerie prædicantur, & ab Apoſtolis in Symbolo laudabili brevitate connexæ tenentur, Capitul. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 6.

† *As appeareth by thoſe words of* Chryſologus, Credimus vitam æternam, quia poſt Reſurrectionem nec bonorum finis eſt nec malorum.

former will follow the true Interpretation of this concluding Article; for thereby we are perſwaded to look upon it as conteining the ſtate of man after the Reſurrection in the world to come.

As therefore S. *Paul* hath taught us to expreſſe our belief of *a Reſurrection both of the juſt and unjuſt*, ſo after the *Reſurrection* we are to conſider the condition of them both, of the one as riſen to everlaſting life, of the other as riſen to everlaſting puniſhment and contempt. & ſo thoſe which 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 then as a reward promiſed and given to them who fear and ſerve the Lord, yet the ſame words may be uſed to expreſſe the duration of any perſons which live never to dye again, whatſoever their ſtate and condition in that life 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

faith, *If by any means I might attain unto the Reſurrection of the dead*; 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 generall, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expreſsion, *If by any means*, nor that which went before, *the fellowſhip of Chriſts 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 *Iſay*, the *Reſurrection of the dead* is taken in Scripture for everlaſting happineſſe, and yet the ſame language is and may be uſed for the generall reſurrection of all men, even of ſuch as ſhall be everlaſtingly unhappy; ſo *the Life everlaſting* though uſed for a Reward given onely unto the Elect may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the Reprobate alſo, underſtood barely for the duration of perſons living.

Phil. 3. 11. *Though in this place it is not barely* ἀνάστασις *but* ἐξανάστασις, εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τῆς νεκρῶν, *and in the Alexandrian Mſs.* εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, *which is the moſt ancient reading, as appeareth by the Vulgar Tranſlation*, Si modo occurram ad reſurrectionem quæ eſt ex mortuis, *and the reading of* Tertullian,

Si qua concurram in Reſurrectionem quæ eſt à mortuis, *and the* Syriack *Tranſlation*, לקיומא דמן בית מיתא, *yet the* ἐξανάστασις *of it ſelf was taken for no more then* ἀνάστασις *by any of the Tranſlators. And S.* Chryſoſtome *did ſo underſtand it, as appeareth by theſe words upon the place*, Εἶπεν καταλήψω, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*which is the reading of the* Alexandrian Mſ.) τί λέγεις; καὶ μὴ πάντες αὐτῆς τυγχάνουσι, καὶ οὐκ ἀναστάσεως μόνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας πάντες, οἱ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἀφόρητον κολάσεως. Εἰ γὰρ πάντες πάντες τῆς ἀναστάσεως τυγχάνουσι, καὶ οὐ τῆς ἀναστάσεως μόνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας, πῶς οὐκ μᾶλλον ἐξαιρέτου τινὸς τυγχάνειν ἔλεγεν, εἴπερ καταλήψω; *By which it appeareth that S.* Chryſoſtome *took no notice of the word* ἐξανάστασις, *or of the phraſe* ἡ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, *but as the interpretation of the Apoſtles intention addeth*, ποίαν οὖν τιμῶν ἀνάστασιν φησι; πῶς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγωνιᾷ τὸν Χριστόν. *So alſo* Theodorets *paraphraſe*, Ἵνα μετάσχω καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. *It is therefore I conceive a Notion peculiar to* Theophylact *among the* Greeks, Πάντες ἀνίστανται καὶ μέντοι πάντες ἐξανίστανται.

All thoſe then which ſhall riſe from the dead ſhall riſe to life, and after the reſurrection live by a true vital union of their ſoules 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 dye*, and after the reviviſcency never to dye again, it followeth that the life which they ſhall live, muſt be an *everlaſting life.*

To begin then with the Reſurrection to condemnation, the Truth included in this Article in reference unto that, is to this effect, that thoſe which dye in their ſins and ſhall be raiſed to life that they may appear before the Judgement ſeat of Chriſt, and ſhall there receive the ſentence of condemnation, ſhall be continued in that life for ever to undergoe the puniſhment due unto their ſins; in which two particulars are conteined, the duration of their perſons, and of their pains. For two wayes this Eternity may be denyed, one by a deſtruction or annihilation of their perſons, with which the torments 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.

Our firſt Aſſertion therefore is, that the Wicked after the day of Judgement ſhall not be conſumed or annihilated, but ſhall remain alive in ſoul and body to endure the torments to be inflicted upon them by the juſtice of God, for all the ſins committed by them while they were in the body. They which of late oppoſe the eternall ſubſiſtence and miſery of the wicked, ſtrangely maintain their Opinion as a truth delivered in the Scriptures, as if the Word it ſelf 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 looſe that being for ever. Becauſe the Scripture ſpeaks of them as of ſuch as ſhall be deſtroyed, and periſh, and dye; 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 terrour 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.* If this place ſpeak, as thoſe men would have it, of perdition onely, 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 onely 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 disjoyned 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 vitall union of his ſoul and body; and ſo ſubſiſting undergoe 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 dye, ſay alſo that they ſhall be tormented with never dying pains, as they plainly and frequently doe.

Mat. 10. 28. Locus Matthæi 10. 18. perditionem tantum animæ in gehenna, non cruciatum denunciat, *Smalcius* contra *Meiſnerum.*

Depart from me ye curſed, ſhall the Judge eternall ſay to all the Reprobate, *into everlaſting fire*; and leaſt any ſhould imagine that the fire ſhall be eternall, but the torments not; it followeth, *and theſe ſhall goe 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 puniſh-

Mat. 25. 41, 46.

ment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. 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 onely can be what that eternity doth signifie; for because some things are called in the Scriptures eternall which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of hell to be in that sense eternall, as lasting to the time appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the Fire is termed eternall, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, prescinding 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 goe into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched*; and hath further yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition, and undeniable description of the place of torments, *Where the worm dyeth not, and the fire is not quenched.* And that we may be yet further assured that this fire shall be never extinguished, we read that *the smoak 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.* 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 smoak 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 coeternall to the tormenting flames.

Mat. 3. 12. Luc 3. 17.

Mat. 18. 8. Mar. 9. 43, 44.

Rev. 14. 11. 20. 10.

Neither doth this onely prove the eternity of infernall pains,

pains, but clearly refute the onely materiall 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 dye the ſecond death becauſe they endure eternall torments. *He that overcometh ſhall not be hurt by the ſecond death*: it ſeems that they which ſhall dye that death ſhall be hurt by it, whereas if it were annihilation, and ſo a concluſion of their torments, it would be no way hurtfull or injurious, but highly beneficiall to them. But the living torments are the ſecond death. For *death and Hell were caſt into the lake of fire, this 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 *Jewes* 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; & what this puniſhment ſhall be, was in theſe words revealed to S. *John*. *But the fearfull and unbelieving, and the abominable & murtherers and whoremongers and ſorcerers and Idolaters,* Rev. 2. 11.

† *The* Chaldee *Paraphraſe maketh often mention of it, as* Deut. 33. 6. Let Ruben live and not dye, *he expoundeth thus,* יחי ראובן בחיי עלמא ומיתא

: תנינא לא ימות Let Ruben live in life of the World, and not dye the ſecond death. *So the* Targum *of* Onkelos. *The* Jeruſalem Targum *more exactly,* יחי ראובן בעלמא הדין ולא ימות במותא תנינא דבה מיתין רשיעיא לעלמא דאתי : Let Ruben live in this world, and let him not dye the ſecond death wh ch the wicked dye in the world to come. *So* Eſay 22. 14. Surely this iniquity ſhall not be purged from you till ye dye. אם ישתבך חובא הדין לכון עד די תמותון : מיתא תנינא *and* 65. 6. I will not keep ſilence but will recompenſe, even recompenſe into their boſome. לא אחין להון ארכא בחייא אלהן אשלם להון : פורענות חובהון ואמסור למיתא תנינאית גויתון 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* S. John *revealed that this puniſhment ſhall be by everlaſting burnings.*

and

Rev. 21. 8. *and all lyars 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 perpetuall permansion in torment, as before is proved; then to say that the wicked shall dye the second death is not a confutation of their eternall being in misery, but an assertion of it, because it is the same thing delivered in other terms.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or inferre a conclusion of torment, much lesse will the bare phrases of *perdition* and *destruction*; for we may as well conclude that whosoever sayes he is † *undone*, intends thereby that he shall be no more: beside, the eternity of destruction in the language of the Scripture signifies a perpetuall perpession 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.

† Ὀλλυμαι, perii.

2 Thess. 1. 8, 9.

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 ther sins. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing, they shall never come to the dayes of refreshment who are cast into perpetuall burnings. One part of their misery is the horrour of despair, and it were not perfect Hell if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obteined where there is no means left to obtein 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 *Abrahams* bosome,

boſome, that none could paſſe from one to other; what impoſſibility muſt there be when the finall ſentence is paſt 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 Maſters joy. As the tree falleth ſo it lyeth: 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 kingdome to God even the Father*, then ſhall the office of the Mediator ceaſe. So groundleſſe was the Opinion of *Origen*, who conceived that after ſome number of yeares the damned ſhould be releaſed from their torment, and made partakers of the joyes of heaven. For certainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation irreverſible, their torments inevitable, their miſeries eternall. 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.

To conclude this branch of the Article, I conceive theſe certain & 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. That to this end they ſhall be raiſed again to life, and ſhall be judged and condemned by Chriſt, and delivered up 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. That they ſhall be tormented with a pain of loſſe; the loſſe from God from whoſe preſence they are caſt out, the pain from themſelves, in a deſpair of enjoying him, and regret for looſing him. That they further 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 remedileſſe condition, under an everlaſting pain of loſſe, becauſe there is no hope of heaven, under an eternall 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.*

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.

Now this life eternall may be looked upon under three conſiderations; as Initiall, as Partial, and as Perfectional. I call that Eternall Life *Initiall*, which is obteined 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, & ſhall not come into condemnation, but is paſſed from death unto life.* Joh. 5. 24. I call that *Partiall*, which belongeth though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is the ſoul of the juſt ſeparated from the body. I diſpute not whether the joyes be partiall as to the ſoul, I am ſure they are but partiall as to the man. For this life conſiſteth in the happineſſe which is conferred on the Soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the preſence, of God. S. *Paul* had a *deſire to depart and to be with Chriſt*, he was *willing rather to* travail and *be abſent from the body, and to be preſent* and at home *with the Lord*: and certainly where Saint *Paul* deſired to be when he departed, there he then was, and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them Phil. 1. 23. 2 Cor. 5. 8.

which

which ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happinesse which the Saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day, is the *Partiall* life eternall. Thirdly, I call that *Perfectionall* which shall be conferred upon the Elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ, *Come ye blessed children of my Father, Receive the Kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*

This *Eternall 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 *eternall*. Now this life is not onely naturall, that is, the union of the soul to the body, which is the life of the Reprobate; but spirituall, which consisteth in the union of the soul to God, as our Saviour speakes, *He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.* And it is called after an especiall manner Life, because of the happinesse which attendeth it: and therefore to understand that life, is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happinesse doth consist. 1 Joh. 5 12.

To begin with that which is most intelligible; The bodies of the Saints after the Resurrection shall be transformed into spirituall and incorruptible bodies. The flesh *is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption, sown in dishonour, raised in glory, sown in weakenesse, raised in power, sown a naturall body rais'd a spirituall 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 spirituall. 1 Corinth. 15. 42, 43, 44. Phil. 3. 21.

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*

1 Cor. 13. 12. *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*
1 Joh. 3. 2. *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 indefective holineſſe, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all ſervitude of ſin. They ſhall be troubled with no doubtfull choice, but with their radicall and fundamentall freedome 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 internall perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, conſiſting in an abſolute freedome from all pain, miſery, labour, and want; an impoſſibility of ſinning and offending God; 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 it ſelf, 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 happineſſe, by the adjection of Eternity. Now that this life ſhall be eternall we are aſſured who have not yet obtein'd it, and they much more who do enjoy it. He which hath purchaſed it for us and promiſed it unto us, often calleth it *eternall life*; it is deſcribed as a *continuing*
Heb. 13. 14. Luc. 16. 9. 2 Cor. 5. 1. *city*, as *everlaſting habitations*, as an *houſe eternall in the heavens*,

heavens; it is expreſſed by *eternall glory*, *eternall ſalvation*, by an *eternall inheritance*, *incorruptible*, *undefiled*, *and that fadeth not away*, by *the everlaſting kingdome of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*. And leaſt we ſhould be diſcouraged by any ſhort or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in ſuch terms as are lyable to no miſtake. For our Saviour hath ſaid, *If a man keep my ſaying he ſhall never ſee death*. And *whoſoever liveth and believeth in me ſhall not dye*. 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. 1 Pet. 5. 10. Heb. 5. 9. 9. 15. 1 Pet. 1. 4. 2 Pet. 1. 11. Joh. 8. 51. 11. 26. Rev. 21. 4.

The belief of this Article is Neceſſary, as to the eternity of torment, to deterre us from committing ſin, and to quicken us to a ſpeedy repentance for ſin committed. For *the wages of ſin is death*; nothing can bring us to thoſe everlaſting flames but ſin unrepented of; nothing can ſave that man from the never-dying worm who dyeth in his ſinnes.

Secondly, the belief of eternall pains after death is Neceſſary to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God; and to teach us to tremble at his word, to conſider the infinity of his Juſtice, and the fierceneſſe 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.* Luc. 12. 5.

Thirdly, this belief is Neceſſary to teach us to make a fit eſtimate of the price of Chriſt's bloud, 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 ranſome by which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankfull to his Redeemer by whoſe intervention we hath eſcaped them.

Again, as this Article followeth upon the Reſurrection of the juſt, and conteineth in it an eternall duration of infinite felicity belonging to them, it is Neceſſary to ſtir us up to an earneſt deſire of that righteouſneſſe to which ſuch a life is promiſed, to a carefull and conſtant performance of thoſe commands to which ſuch a reward is ſo graciouſly promiſed. For as all our happineſſe proceedeth from the viſion of God ſo we are certain that without holineſſe no man ſhall ſee him.

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 heart be alſo*. Therefore we muſt *forget thoſe things which are behind, and reaching forth unto thoſe things which are before, preſſe toward the mark, for the price of the high calling of God in Chriſt Jeſus*.

Col. 3. 2, 3. Mat. 6. 21. Phil. 3. 13, 14.

Thirdly, an Aſſent unto this Truth is neceſſary to encourage us to take up the Croſſe of Chriſt, and to ſupport us under it; willingly and chearfully 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 eternall 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 temporall, but the things which are not ſeen are eternall*.

Rom. 8. 18. 2 Cor. 4. 17, 18.

And now having thus ſhewed the propriety proved the verity, and declared the neceſſity of this Article, we may fully inſtruct every Chriſtian how to expreſſe his belief in the

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 and ſuffer them: and that the Juſt after their Reſurrection and Abſolution ſhall enter into their Maſters joy, freed from all poſſibility of ſin and ſorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fullneſſe of happineſſe, confirmed in an abſolute ſecurity of an eternall enjoyment, and ſo they ſhall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe *the Life everlaſting*.

FINIS.

D Tied
P 995
91231

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION