

\*common receptacle of theSouls 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 Souls of the Patriarchs and the Prophets , and the people of God.

\* Some of the Ancient Fathers did believe that the word Hell in the Scriptures had the

same signification which it hath among the Greeks, as comprehending all the Souls both of the wicked and the just; and so they took Internus in the same latitude. As therefore the ancient Greeks did assign one Hell for all which died, Πάντες ὁμῶς Ἔντασ αἰδώς δέχονται and Εἰς κοινὸν ἄδην πάντες ἤξουσιν βεβητοί. As they made within that one Hell two several receptacles, one for the good and virtuous, the other for the wicked and unjust; (according to that of Diphilus, Καὶ τὸ κατ' ἄδην δύο τελευταίαι, Μίαν δικαίων, κατέραν ἀσεβῶν ὁδόν and that of Plato, Οὗτοι δὲ δὴ ἐπειδὴν τελευτήσωσι, δικαιοσύνην ἐν τῷ αἰσθητῷ ἐν τῇ τρίτῳ, ὅς ἢ φέρετον τὰ ὁδοί, ἢ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἢ δὲ εἰς τάρταρον and that of Virgil.

Hic locus est partes ubi se via findit in ambas:
Dextera quæ Ditis magni sub moenia tendit;
Hac iter Elysium nobis: at læva malorum
Exercet pœnas, & ad impia Tartara mittit.)

As they did send the best of men to Hell, there to be happy, and taught rewards to be received there as well as punishment: (λέγεται δὲ ὑπὸ τῆ μελικῆ Πινδαροῦ ταυτὶ περὶ τῆ εὐσεβῶν ἐν ἄδῃ, Τοῖσι λάμπη μὲν μέγας ἀελίος τῶν ἐνθάδε νοητῶ κατω, φοινικοεσθίαι τε ληϊστῆες εἰσι περὶ αἴθριον ὠκυπύ, &c. Plut. de consolat. ad Apollon. Ὡ τριστόλβιοι Κεῖνοι φεσὶν, οἱ ταῦ πε διερχόμενοι τῆν Μολῶσ' ἐς ἄδῃ πῖσι δὲ μόνοις ἐκεῖ Ζῆν ὄστ' οἱ δ' ἄλλοισι πένι' ἐκεῖ κατὰ Sophocles.) So did the Jews also before and after our Saviour's time. For Josephus says the Soul of Samuel was brought up ἐξ ἄδῃ and delivers the opinion of the Pharisees after this manner, Antiq. Jud. l. 18. c. 2. Ἀθανάσιον τε ἰσθὺν πῖσι αὐταῖς, εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ χριστῶν δικαιοσύνης τε καὶ πῖσι οἱ ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιήσθησιν ἐν τῷ εἰῶ γέρονε and of the Sadduces after this manner; Ψυχῆς τε δὲ διαμονῆς καὶ τῶν κατ' ἄδῃ πῖσι ἀναίεσσι. Therefore the Jews which thought the Souls immortal did believe that the just were rewarded as well as the unjust punished ὑπὸ χριστῶν, or κατ' ἄδῃ. And so did also most of the ancient Fathers of the Church. There was an ancient Book written de Universi natura which some attributed to Justin Martyr, some to Irenæus others to Origen, or to Calus a Presbyter of the Roman Church in the time of Victor and Zephyrinus, a Fragment of which is set forth by David Hoefchelius in his Annotations upon Photius, delivering the state of Hell at large. Περὶ δὲ ἄδῃ, ἐν ᾗ συνέχονται ψυχῆ δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων, ἀναγκάσιον εἶπέν. Here then were the just and unjust in Hades, but not in the same place: Οἱ δὲ δικαιοὶ ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ ἡμῶ μὲν συνέχονται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ αὐτῷ τόπῳ ᾗ καὶ οἱ ἀδικοί. Μία δὲ εἰς τῶτο τὸ χωρίον κατέδοθ', &c. There was but one passage into the Hades, saith he; but when that gate was passed, the Just went on the right hand to a place of happiness (ἐστὶ δὲ ὄνομα κικλήσκουσαν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ.) and the Unjust on the left to a place of misery. Οὗτο δὲ αὐτὸ κατ' ἄδῃ εἰς τῶν ψυχῶν πῖσι κατέχονται ἀρετῆ κατὰ τὸν ὀ Θεὸς ὤρισεν. Tertullian wrote a Treatise de Paradiso, now not extant, in which he expressed 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 on the third chapter of Ecclesiastes: Ante adventum Christi omnia ad Inferos pariter ducebantur: Unde & Jacob ad inferos pariter descendurum se dicit; & Job pius & impius in Inferno queritur retentari: & Evangelium, Chaos magnum interpositum apud Inferos; & Abraham cum Lazaro, & divitem in suppliciis, esse testatur. And in his 25. Epistle Perfacilis ad ista responsio est; Luxisse Jacob filium, quem putabat occisum, ad quem & ipse erat ad inferos descendurus, dicens, Descendam ad Filium meum lugens in infernum: quia necdum Paradisi januam Christus effregerat, necdum flammeam illam romphæam & vertiginem præsentium Cherubin sanguis ejus extinxerat. Unde & Abraham, licet in loco refrigerii, tamen apud inferos cum Lazaro fuisse scribitur. And again, Nequeo satis Scripturæ laudare mysteria, & divinum sensum in verbis licet simplicibus admirari: quod, Moyses plangitur; & Jesus Nave, vir sanctus, sepultus fertur, & tamen fletus esse non scribitur. Nempe illud, quod in Moyses, id est, in lege veteri, sub peccato Adam omnes tenebantur elogio, & ad inferos descendentes consequenter lacrymæ prosequiebantur.... In Jesu vero, id est, in Evangelio, per quem Paradisus est apertus, mortem gaudia prosequuntur. Τὸ πρότερον ἡ δὲ ἀνάστασις αἰς τὸν ἄδῃ κατὰ τὸν ὀ Θεὸς ὤρισεν. S. Chryl. Panagy. ad Sanctas Mart. And in his Treatise proving that Christ is God, he makes this exposition of Isaiah 45. 2. Πύλας χαλκῆς συνδράσω, καὶ μοχλῆς σιδηρῆς συνείλω καὶ ἀνείξω θύρας σιδηρῆς, ἀποκρυφῆς, ἀφανίσω ἀναδείξω σοι τὸν ἄδῃ ἔγω καλῶν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἄδῃ ἦν, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς ἐκέρπει ἀγίας καὶ σκεδῆ ἡμῶν, τὸ Ἀβραάμ, τὸ Ἰσαάκ, τὸ Ἰακώβ' διὸ καὶ θουραρῆς ἐμάλεσε. This doctrine was maintained by all those who believed that the Soul of Samuel was raised by the Witch of Endor: for though he were so great a Prophet, yet they thought that he was in Hades; and not only so, but under the power of Satan. Thus Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho: Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖσι αἰ ψυχῆ τῶν, ἔπως δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν ὑπὸ δυνάμεων ἐπιπῶν τῶν δυνάμεων, ὅποια δὲ ἐν τῇ ἐργαστηρίῳ ἐκείνῳ ὅς ἡμῶν περὶ γράμματα ὁμολογεῖται. Who was followed in this by Origen, Anastasius, Antiochens, and others.

But others there were who thought Hades or Infernus was never taken in the Scriptures for any place of happiness; and therefore they did not conceive the Souls of the Patriarchs or the Prophets did pass into any such infernal place; and consequently, that the Descent into Hell was not his going to the Prophets or the Patriarchs, which were not there. For as, if it had been only said that Christ had gone unto the bosome of Abraham, or to Paradise, no man would have ever believed that he had descended into Hell; so being it is only written, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, it seems incongruous to think that he went then unto the Patriarchs, who were not there.

|| S. Augustine began to doubt of this general reason ordinarily given of Christ's descent into Hell, to bring the Patriarchs and Prophets thence, upon this ground, that he thought the word Infernus was never

taken in the Scriptures with a good sense; Quamquam illud me nondum invenisse confiteor, inferos appellatos ubi justorum animæ acquiescunt, De Genesi ad litteram, l. 12. c. 33. Proinde, ut dixi, nondum inveni, & adhuc quaero; nec mihi occurrit Inferos alicubi in bono posuisse Scripturam, duntaxat Canonicam. Ibid. Non facile alicubi Scripturarum Inferorum nomen positum invenitur in bono, Epist. 57. Praesertim qui ne ipsos quidem Inferos usquam Scripturarum locis in bono appellatos

atos potui reperire. Quod si nusquam in divinis autoritatibus legitur, non utique sinus ille Abrahæ, id est, secreta-  
eujusdam quietis habitatio, aliqua pars inferorum fuisse credenda est. Quanquam in his ipsis tanti Magistri verbis,  
ubi ait dixisse Abraam. *Intervos & nos chaos magnum firmatum est*, satis, ut opinor, appareat non esse quanda n partem  
& quasi membrum Inferorum tantæ illius felicitatis sinum. *Epist. 99.*

Now this being the diversity of Opinions anciently in respect of the per-  
sons unto whose Souls the Soul of *Christ* descended at his death, the dif-  
ference of the end or efficacy of that Descent is next to be observed. Of  
those which did believe the name of *Hades* to belong unto that general place  
which comprehended all the Souls of men, (as well those which died in the  
favour of God, as those which departed in their sins) \* some of them  
thought that *Christ* descended to that place of *Hades*, where the Souls of  
all the faithful, from the death of the righteous *Abel* to the death of *Christ*,  
were detained, and there dissolving all the power by which they were de-  
tained below, translated them into a far more glorious place, and elevated  
them in a condition far more happy in the Heavens above.

\* This is the O-  
pinion gene-  
rally received  
in the Schools,  
and delivered  
as the sense of  
the Church of  
God in all  
Ages: but

though it were not so general as the School-men would persuade us, yet it is certain that many of the Fathers did so understand it.  
*O' μ' ἐπὶ σωτηρία τ' ἐν ἄδ' ψυχῶν παρῆει, ἐν μακρῶν αἰώνων πλὴ ἀριζίν αὐτῶ περιμυροσῶν.* Euseb. de Demost.  
Evang. l. 10. Κατῆλθεν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ἵνα κἀκεῖθεν λύσῃται τοὺς δίκαιους. Cyril. Catech. 4. Ἡμελλε γ' ἡ Σόφια  
πλεῖστον τὰ πάντα τὰ κτ' μυστήριον τῶ πάθους, καὶ σὺν τῇ ψυχῇ κατελθεῖν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ὅτι τὸ ἐργασίαι τὸ  
ἐκεῖ τῶ προκεκοιμημένων σωτηρίαν, φημι τῶ ἁγίων πατέρα ἔχων. Translated erat Enoch, raptus Elias; sed non est ser-  
vus 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 eò descen-  
dit, Inferorum claustra perfodit, diripuit, vastavit, spoliavit, vincas inde animas liberando. *S. Hier. in Ecclesiasten.*

Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of  
condition there, conceiving that the Souls of all men are || detained below  
still, and shall not enter into Heaven until the general Resurrection. They  
made no such distinction at the death of *Christ*, as if those which believed in  
a Saviour to come should be kept out from Heaven till he came, and those  
which now believe in the same Saviour already come should be admitted  
thither immediately upon their expiration.

|| Just. Martyr.  
in his Dialogue  
with Trypho  
first begins:  
Ἀλλὰ μ' εἰδὲ  
ἐπορεύσκειν  
φημι πάσις  
τὰς ψυχὰς  
ἐγὼ (ἐρμαιον

γ' ἢ ὡς ἀλλοθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς) ἀλλὰ τί; τὰς μὲν εὐσεβῶν ἐν κρείττονι ποι χῶρῳ μένειν, τὰς ὃ ἀδίκους καὶ πικροῖς ἐν  
χείρῳ, τ' τ' κείρας ἐμδεχομένας χερόνον τότε. After him Irenæus, l. 5. 26. Cum Dominus in medio umbra mortis  
abierit ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, & post resurrectionem assumptus est; mani-  
festum 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 Ma-  
gister noster non statim evolans abiit, sed sustinens definitum à Patre resurrectionis suæ tempus, (quod & per Jonam  
manifestum est) post triduum resurgens assumptus est; sic & nos sustinere debemus definitum à Deo resurrectionis  
nostræ tempus prænunciatum à Prophetis, & sic resurgentes assumi, quotquot Dominus hoc dignos habuerit. Tertul-  
lian followeth Irenæus in this particular: Habes & regionem Inferum subterraneam credere & illos cubito pellere qui sa-  
tis 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 c. 55.* Nulli patet cœlum terrâ adhuc  
salvâ, ne dixerim clausâ. Cum transactione enim mundi referabuntur regna cœlorum. *Ib.* Eam itaque regionem si-  
num 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 er-  
go animæ penes Inferos? inquis. Velis & nolis, & supplicia jam illic & refrigeria habes, pauperem & divitem. Cur  
eam non putes animam & puniri & foveri in Inferis, interim sub expectatione utriusque judicii in quadam usurpa-  
tione & candida eius? *De Anima cap. 48.* S. Hilary in his Commentary upon these words of the Psalm. *Dominus custodiet &  
introitum tuum & exitum tuum ex hoc & usque in seculum:* Non enim temporis hujus & seculi est ista custodia, non ad-  
uri sole atque luna, & ab omni malo conservari; sed futuri boni expectatio est, cum exeuntes de corpore ad introi-  
tum illum regni cœlestis per custodiam Domini fideles omnes reservabuntur, in sinu scilicet interim Abrahæ collocati,  
quo adire impios interjectum Chaos inhibet, quousque introeundi rursus 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 second Psalm,* Judicii enim dies vel beatitu-  
dinis retributio est æterna, vel poenæ: tempus vero mortis habet unumquemque suis legibus, dum ad judicium unum-  
quemque aut Abraham reservat aut poena. Thus Gregory Nyssen still leaves the Patriarchs in Abraham's bosom, in expectation  
of admittance into Heaven: Καὶ γ' οἱ πρὸ τ' Ἀβραάμ πατριάρχαι τῶ μ' εἶδέν τὰ ἀγαθὰ πλὴ ὀπιθυρίαν ἔχον, καὶ  
κα ἀπίστον ὅτι ἠγῶντες τὴν ἐπεκρίνεν πατείδα καθὼς φησιν ὁ Ἀπόστολος· ἀλλὰ ὁμῶς ἐν τῶ ἐλπίζον ἐπὶ τὴν χάριν εἰσι-  
τῶ Θεὸς κρείττον τι πρὸ ἡμῶν περιελαμένε, καὶ τὴν τῶ Παύλε φωνῆν, ἵνα μὴ, φησὶ, χρεῖς ἡμῶν τελευτῶσιν  
*De Hominis Opificio, cap. 22.* These therefore which conceived that the Souls of the Godly now after Christ's ascension

do go unto the bosom of Abraham, where the Patriarchs and Prophets were and are, and that both remain together till the general 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 Souls of the Patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called *Hell*, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures, conceived, that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper Hell, or place of torment, so the end of his Descent was to deliver Souls from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of Happiness and a glorious condition. They which did think that Hell was wholly emptied, that every Soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the names of *Heretick*: but to believe that many were delivered, was both by them and many others counted *Orthodox*.

|| S. August. in his Book de Heresibus, reckons this as the seventy

*ninth Heresie*. Alia, descendente ad Inferos Christo credidisse incredulos, & omnes inde existimat liberatos. *And though he gives the heresie 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, omnemque à tenebris & poenis per gratiam liberavit, ut à tempore resurrectionis Domini iudicium expectetur exinaniti inferis. And in his answer to that question he looks not upon the affirmative part as an Heresie, but as a doubtful Proposition the 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, Abraham, Isaac, & Jacob, aliisque Patriarchis & Prophetis, ut cum Dominus in infernum venisset, illis doloribus solverentur. Sed quonam modo intelligatur Abraam, in cujus sinu pius etiam pauper ille susceptus est, in illis fuisse doloribus, ego quidem non video: explicant fertasse qui possunt. Epist. 99. ad Euolium. Et paulo post: Unde illis iustis 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 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 Civitate Dei, l. 20. c. 15. His second Resolution was, That Christ did by his descent relieve some out of the pains of Hell, taking Hell in the worst sense. Quia evidentiæ testimonia & Infernum commemorant & dolores, nulla causa occurrit cur illic credatur venisse Salvator, nisi ut ab ejus doloribus salvos faceret. Epist. 99. Quamobrem teneamus firmissimè quod fides habet fundatissimam autoritate 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 eum erat impossibile teneri; à quibus etiam rectè intelligitur solvissè & liberassè quos voluit. Ibid. His third Resolution was, That how many these were which were delivered out of Hell was uncertain, and therefore temerarious to define. Sed utrum omnes quos in eis inveniit, an quosdam quos illo beneficio dignos iudicavit, adhuc requiro, Ibid. Hoc scilicet quod scriptum est, Solutis doloribus Inferni non in omnibus, sed in quibusdam, accipi potest, quos ille dignos ista liberatione iudicabat: ut neque frustra illic descendisse existimetur, nulli eorum profuturus qui ibi tenebantur inclusi; nec tamen sit consequens, ut quod Divina quibusdam misericordia iusticiæque concessit, omnibus concessum esse putandum sit. Ibid. Potest & sic, ut eos dolores eum solvissè credamus quibus teneri ipse non poterat, sed quibus alii tenebantur quos ille noverat liberandos. Verum quoniam 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 no translation 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 Christ's descent into Hell. Thus Capreolus: Ipse in homine est visitare Inferorum dignatus abstrusa, & præpositos mortis præsentia invictæ majestatis exterruit, & propter liberandos quos voluit, Inferorum portas referari præcipit. Epist. ad Hispanos, S. Ambrose: Ipse autem inter mortuos liber remissionem in Inferno positus soluta mortis lege donabat. De Incarn. c. 5. Οταν ἰδῆ εὐδοῦς σπουδαίως ὁ ἄδην, καὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις τοῖς ὄψι κεκοιμημένων πνέμασιν ἀναπέλαστος πύλας, ἐκινῶν τε καὶ μένον ἀείδει δακρύων ἢ δακρῶν ἀνέστη, S. Cyril. Homil. Pasch. 7. Ἦνδ speaks full as high as those words of Euodius, or that Heretick, whosoever it was, which is mentioned, though not named, by Philastrius. For ἕνεκεν καὶ μόνον δακρῶν is as much as inferi exinaniti; and κενώσας τὸ δακρῶν μόνον (which he useth in another Homily) is the same.*

The means by which they did conceive that *Christ* did free the Souls of men from Hell was the application of his death unto them, which was propounded to those Souls by || preaching of the Gospel there: That as he revealed here on earth the will of God unto the sons of men, and propounded himself as the object of their Faith, to the end that whosoever believed in him should never die; so after his death he shewed himself unto the Souls departed, that whosoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him should pass from death to life.

|| This preaching of the Gospel to the dead, was the general Opinion of the Fathers, as the end of his Descent or means, by which that

end was wrought for the Souls below, which was effected by his death. Ea proper Dominum in ea que sub terra descendit, evangelizantem & illis adventum suum, remissionem peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum. Crediderunt autem in eum omnes qui sperabant in eum, id est, qui adventum ejus prænunciaverunt, & dispositionibus ejus servierunt, iusti, & Prophetæ, & Patriarchæ, quibus similiter ut nobis remisit peccata. Irenæus, l. 4. c. 45. Ἐνεκεν ἰδῆ, ἀναπέλαστος πύλας, ἐκινῶν τε καὶ μένον ἀείδει δακρῶν ἢ δακρῶν ἀνέστη

ἐπὶ τὸ σώζειν ἔργον αὐτῶ ὅσοι ἔν κ' πεποιήκεν, τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πνεῦσαι βεβηλημένους διὰ τὸ κηρύγματι, ὅσοι πρὶν ἔπυρον γερονότες, ἐλκύσας εἰς σωτηρίαν. Εἰ γ' ἔν ὁ Κύριος δι' ἑδὲν ἕτερον εἰς ἄδ'ε κατήλθεν, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελισαῶν, ὡς αὐτὸν κατήλθεν, ἢ πρὶ πάντας εὐαγγελισαῶν, ἢ μόνους Ἑβραίους. Εἰ μὲν ἔν πάντας, σαθρήσονται πάντες οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καὶ ἔξ ἑβραίων ὄντες πύχρον, ἕξομολογησάμενοι ἡδὴ ἐκεῖ: Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 6. Τριήμερον γὰρ ἀνεβίω κηρύξας κ' τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πινόμενοι. Πληρῆσται γὰρ ἔπος τῆ φιλανθρωπίας ὁπίδειξις ὡς, τὸ μὴ μόνον ἀνασῶσαι φημί, τὸ ἐπ ζώνας ὅτι τ' γῆς, ἀλλὰ κ' τοῖς ἡδὴ κατηχομένοις, κ' ἐν τοῖς τ' ἀβύσσου μυρίαις κηδεμένοις ἐν σκότῳ, κ' τὸ γεγραμμένον, διακηρύξαι τὴν ἀσπίδα. Cyril. in Joan. l. 12. Πολλαχῶ διαμαρτύρεται ἡ γραφή, ὅν τρόπον τοῖς τλωιχάδε ζῶσι τ' αὐτὸν κ' τοῖς ἐν ἄδ'ε διὰ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἀσπύτρωσιν παροχουέας. Λέγει γὰρ ὁ τῆ μαθητῶν κορυφαῖος. Εἰς τὸτο γὰρ ἀπέδανε κ' ἀνέστη, ἵνα κ' νεκρῶν κ' ζώντων κηρύξῃ. κ' πάλιν, τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ ποροθῆεις ἐκήρυξε πνόμενοι, ἵνα κηρύξῃ μὲν σαρκί, ζῶσι δ' πνόμενοι. τὸτεστιν, ἕως εἰ μὲν ἀπίστι κ' διὰ τὸτο ἀμαρτωλοὶ, μαρτυρηκότες κατηκομῶσιν, ἄτε δὴ ὁλοκλήρως σαθρὸν γερονότες, κ' διχοκομηθέντες τὸ πνεῦματι, ὅσοι δ' καὶ ἐν ἄδ'ε Χριστῶ τῆ δικαιοσύνη πεπιστεύησι, τῆς πνόμενικῆς ἐυφροσύνης ἀπολαύσῃ. Fobius apud Ehoitum, lib. 2. cap. 38.

Thus did they think the Soul of Christ descended into Hell to preach the Gospel to the spirits there, that they might receive him who before believed in him, or that they might believe in him who before rejected him. But this cannot be received as the end, or way to effect the end, of Christ's Descent; nor can I look upon it as any illustration of this Article, for many reasons. For first, I have already shewed 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 Apocryphal writings led them to that interpretation, upon the authority whereof this Opinion only can rely. A place of the Prophet Jeremy was first produced, that the Lord God of Israel remembered his dead, which slept in the land of the grave, and descended unto them, to preach unto them his salvation. 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 Jews: which as it can scarce be conceived true, so, if it were, it would be yet of doubtful Authority, as being never yet found in the Hebrew Text. And Hermes in his Book, called the Pastor, was \* thought to give sufficient strength to this Opinion; whereas the Book it self is of no good authority, and in this particular is most extravagant: for he taught that not only the Soul of Christ, but also the Souls of the Apostles, preached to the spirits below; that as they followed his steps here, so did they also after their death, and therefore descended to preach in Hell.

Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τῶ αὐτῶ Ἱερεμίου ὁμοίως τῶ τὸ ἀπέκρινεν, Ἡμετέριον δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τ' κηρύξων αὐτῶ, ὅτι κηκοιμημένων εἰς τὴν γῆν κηρύματι, κ' κατέβη πρὸς αὐτῶς εὐαγγελισαῶν αὐτῶς

τὸ σωτήριον αὐτῶ. This place is first brought by Irenæus, to prove that he which died for us was not only man but God: Et quoniam non solum homo erat qui moriebatur pro nobis, ait Esaias, Et commemoratus est Dominus Sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum, quia (leg. qui) dormierant in terra sepultionis, & descendit ad eos, evangelizare salutem qua est ab eo, ut salvaret eos. Adv. Hæres. l. 3. 23. Only he names Esaias instead of Jeremias, whom he rightly names again, l. 4. c. 39. Sicut Hieronimus ait, Recommemoratus est Dominus Sanctus Israel mortuorum, &c. And as \* here, so more plainly l. 5. c. 26. applies it to the soul of Christ while it was absent from his body: Nunc autem tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui, que modo modum 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, extrahere eos, & salvare eos. Thus did Irenæus make use of this verse, to shew Christ preached unto the dead, rather than that of S. Peter; and yet there is no authority in it. It is not to be found in the Hebrew Text, and Justin Martyr charges the Jews only of rasing it out of the LXX: which how they could do out of those Copies which were in the Christians hands is scarce intelligible; and yet it's not now to be found there. Clemens Alexandrinus first brings a strange place of Scripture to prove Christ's preaching in Hell, Strom. l. 6. Διότι ὁ Κύριος εὐαγγελισαῶν κ' τοῖς ἐν ἄδ'ε. Φησὶ γ' ἔν ἡ γραφῇ. Λέγει δ' ἄδ'ε τῆ ἀπολεία, Εἶδ' ὁ αὐτῶ ἐκ εἰδομένη, φωνῶν δ' αὐτῶ ἐκείστων, which he thus interprets: ἔξ ὁ τῶπος δὴ πε φωνῶ λαβῶν εἶπεν τὰ πρῶτα κηρύματα, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐν ἄδ'ε κατηκομῶντες εἰς ὑπόλειαν αὐτῶς ἐκείστων, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶ ἐκ τῶ νέως εἰς θάλασσαν ἐκόντες ἀπορρίψαντες αὐτῶ τῶν τῶν οἱ ἐπακούσαντες τ' θεῖος δὲ ἀμείως κ' 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: Δεδοικίαι δ' καὶ τῶ δ' ἀδ'ερω Στραμαίει, τῶ Ἀποστόλος, ἀκολούθως τῶ Κυρίου, κ' τῶ ἐν ἄδ'ε εὐαγγελισαῶν which he there proved by the authority of the Book called Pastor, and attributed to Hermes: Ὁ Ἡμετέριος δὲ τῶ Ἀποστόλος κ' τῶς εἰσασηλάς, τῶς κηρύξας τὸ ὄνομα τῶ ἡδ' ὁ Θεὸς, κ' κηκοιμηθέντας, τῆ δυνάμει κ' τῆ πίσει κηρύξαι τῶ τῶ κηκοιμημένοις, Strom. l. 2. which words are thus in the old Latine Translation of Hermes, lib. 3. Similit. 9. Quoniam hi Apostoli & doctores qui predicaverunt nomen Filii Dei, cum habentes fidem ejus & potestatem defuncti essent, predicaverunt his qui ante obierunt. And then Clemens supplies that authority with a reason of his own, that as the Apostles were imitate Christ while they lived, so did they also imitate him after death: Ἐχέτω γ' οἶμαι, ὡς αὐτῶ κηρύξας, ἕως δ' ἀπέστει, τῶς θεῖος ὁ μαθητῶν μιμητῶς ἡμετέριος τῶ διδασκαλίας. 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 Apocryphal Authorities.

Nor is this only to be suspected in reference to those pretended Authorities which first induced men to believe it, and to make forced interpretation

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 only which are in this life ) and as incongruous to the state and condition of those Souls to whom *Christ* is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all Saints before departed, 'tis certain they were never *disobedient in the days of Noah* ; nor could they need the publication of the Gospel after the death of *Christ*, who by virtue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptation had received a reward long before. If we look upon them which died in disobedience, and were in torments for their sins, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the Gospel preached. The rich man, whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his Brethren then alive, lest they also should come unto that place : but we find no hopes he had that any should come from them which were alive to preach to him. For if the living, who *heard not Moses and the Prophets, would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead* ; surely those which had been disobedient unto the Prophets, should never be persuaded after they were dead.

Luc. 16. 31.

Whether therefore we consider the Authorities first introducing this Opinion, which were Apocryphal ; or the testimonies of Scripture, forced and improbable ; or the nature of this Preaching inconsistent with the Gospel ; or the persons to whom *Christ* should be thought to preach, ( which, if dead in the Faith and Fear of God, wanted no such instruction ; if departed in infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such a dispensation : ) this Preaching of *Christ* to the Spirits in prison cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper to effect the end, of his Descent into Hell.

Nor is this Preaching only to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of *Christ's* Descent ; but the effect 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 shewn before, that *Christ* did therefore descend into Hell, that he might deliver the Souls of some which were tormented in those flames, and translate them to a place of Happiness : yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance, neither in respect of the Ground or Foundation on which it is built, nor in respect of the Action or Effect 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 pains of Hell*, for so they read it : from whence the Argument is thus deduced. God did loose the pains of Hell when *Christ* was raised. But those pains did not take hold of *Christ* himself, who was not to suffer any thing after death ; and consequently he could not be loosed from or taken out of those pains in which he never was : in the same manner the Patriarchs and the Prophets and the Saints of old, if they should be granted to have been in a place sometimes called Hell, yet were they there in happiness, and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the loosing of the pains of Hell : It followeth then, that those alone which died in their sins were involved in those pains, and when those pains were loosed then were they released ; and being they were loosed when *Christ* was raised, the consequence will be, that he descending into Hell, delivered some of the damned Souls from their Torments there.

¶ The Vulgar Latine renders it thus, Quem Deus suscitavit, solutis doloribus inferni: So also the Syriack,   
ܩܘܡ ܕܥܘܣܘܨܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ  
ܕܥܘܠܡܐ  
ܕܥܘܠܡܐ  
So some of the ancient Fathers

But first, though the || *Latine* Translation render it so, *the pains 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 pains in which he was detained any time, much less that the *Soul of Christ* delivered the Souls of any other; but \* only that he was preserved from enduring them.

read it: as Irenæus, l. 3. c. 12. or rather his Interpreter, Quem Deus excitavit, solutis doloribus inferorum: Capreolus Bishop of Carthage, Resolvere, sicut scriptum est, inferorum parturitiones: And before these Polycarpus, ὁ ἐκ τῆς θανάτου ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντων, Quem resuscitavit Deus, dissolvens dolores inferni. Epist. ad Phil. whom I suppose Grotius understood, when he cited Barnabas: and thus S. Augustine read it, and laid the stress of his Interpretation upon this reading. Quia evidentiæ, testimonia & infernum commemorant & dolores, &c. But in the Original Greek it is generally written ὁ ἀποθανόντων, and in all these many Copies of it, only that of Petrus Eraxardus, and two of the sixteen Copies which Robertus Stephanus made use of, read it ἀποθανόντων. And this mistake was very easie: for in the eightieth Psalm, verse the fifth, there is חָבְלֵי מוֹתָי, ὁ ἀποθανόντων, and verse the sixth, חָבְלֵי מוֹתָי, ὁ ἀποθανόντων. And we find twice in the Proverbs, 14. 12. and 16. 25. מוֹתָי מוֹרֵי translated πνεύματα ἀποθανόντων, and 2 Sam. 22. 6 חָבְלֵי מוֹתָי, ὁ ἀποθανόντων. \* Quod si movet aliquem, quemadmodum accipiendum sit, Inferni ab illo solutos dolores: (neque enim coeperat 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.

Math. 25. 41, 46.  
Mark 9. 44.

Again, as the Authority is most uncertain, so is the Doctrine most incongruous. The Souls of men were never cast into infernal torments, to be delivered from them. The days which follow after death were never made for opportunities to a better life. The Angels had one instant either to stand or fall eternally; and what that instant was to them, that this life is unto us. We may as well believe the Devils were saved, as those Souls which were once tormented with them. For it is an *everlasting fire*, an *everlasting punishment*, a worm that *dieth not*. Nor does this only belong to us who live after the death of *Christ*, as if the damnation of all sinners now were ineluctable and eternal, but before that death it were not so; as if Faith and Repentance were now indispensibly necessary to Salvation, but then were not. For thus the condition of mankind before the fulness of time, in which our Saviour came into the world, should have been far more || happy and advantageous than it hath been since. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternal flames, except we obtain the favour of God before we be swallowed by the jaws of death. <sup>a</sup> *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body:* But if they be in the state of Salvation now by virtue of *Christ's* Descent into Hell, which were numbred amongst the damned before his death, at the day of the general Judgment they must be returned into Hell again; or if they be received then into eternal Happiness, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to those flames at first, according to the general dispensations of God, or else they did not receive the things done in their body at the last; which all shall as certainly receive, as all appear. This life is given unto men to work out their Salvation with fear and trembling, but after death cometh judgment, reflecting on the life that is past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. He that liveth and believeth in *Christ* shall never die; he that believeth, though he die, yet shall he live; but he that dieth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which went before, as of those which came after our Saviour, because he was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the World. I therefore conclude, That the end for which the *Soul of Christ* descended into Hell, was not to deliver any damned Souls, or to translate them from the torments of Hell unto the joys of Heaven.

¶ 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: memor illorum? Ius fuit qui incarnationem Domini minime viderunt, quam heretici post incarnationis eius mysterium natum. Quod quantum incertitatis sit dicere, ipse Dominus referatur. discipulis dicens, Multi Reges & Prophete voluerunt videre qua vos videtis, & non viderunt. 1.6. Epist. 179. <sup>a</sup> 2 Cor. 5. 10  
The

The next consideration is, whether by virtue of his Descent the Souls of those which before believed in him, the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before; and whether *Christ descended into Hell* to that end, that he might translate them into a place and state far more glorious and happy. This hath been in the later Ages of the Church the vulgar Opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the denial of the former; He delivered not the Souls of the damned, || therefore he delivered the Souls of them which believed, and of them alone: Till at last the Schools have followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of \* Faith and infallible certainty, that the Soul of *Christ* descending into Hell, did deliver from thence all the Souls of the Saints which were in the bosom of *Abraham*, and did confer upon them actual and essential Beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds: first, that the Souls of Saints departed saw not God; and secondly, that *Christ* by his death opened the gate of the Kingdom of Heaven.

|| So Gregory the Great says: he had proved that none of the damned were released by *Christ's* descent, thus infers and concludes: Itaque omnia pertractantes nihil aliud tenent, 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 *Sidore Hispalensis* by way of opposition; Ideo Dominus in Inferno descendit, ut his qui ab eo non pœnaliter detinebantur viam aperiret revertendi ad coelos. 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 demonstrat. \* These are the words of *Suarez* in 3 *Thomæ Disputat.* 43. Sect. 3. Primo ergo, certum est Christum 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. Deinde 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.

But even this opinion, as general as it hath been, hath neither that consent of Antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretendeth, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The || most ancient of all the Fathers, whose Writings are extant, were so far from believing that the end of *Christ's* descent into Hell was to translate the Saints of old into Heaven, that they thought them not to be in Heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before *Christ's* death, until the general resurrection. Others, as we have also shewn, thought the bosom of *Abraham* was not in any place, which could be termed Hell; and consequently could not think that *Christ* should therefore descend into Hell to deliver them which were not there. And others yet which thought that *Christ* delivered the Patriarchs from their infernal mansions, did not think so exclusively or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be saved as well as the Patriarchs were, and \* doubted whether all were not so saved or no. Indeed I think there were very few (if any) for above 500 years after *Christ*, which did so believe *Christ* delivered the Saints out of Hell, as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime Antiquity, when so many of the Ancients believed not that they were removed at all, and so few acknowledged that they were removed alone.

|| We have shewed this before to have been the opinion of the most ancient: producing the express testimonies of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Hilary*, *Gregory Nyssen*. So also *Novatian* l. de *Trinitate*, Quæ infra terram jacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis & ordinatis potestibus vacua. Locus enim est quo piorum animæ impiorumque ducantur futuri judicii præjudicia sentientes.

\* We have already shewn that many did believe all the damned souls were saved then; and *S. Augustine* had his adhuc requiro, when he wrote unto *Euodius* concerning that opinion. Beside, the doubt of that great *Divine*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, is very observable, who in his Oration de *Paschate* hath these words, "Ανεῖς ἅδ' αὖ κατὰ συνέσταλθε γινώσκει καὶ τὸ ἐκείσε τῶ Χριστῆ μυστή; τῆς ἡ εὐκομιῆς ἢ διπλῆς κατεβάσεως; τίς ὁ λόγος; ἀπλῶς σώζει πάντας ὀπίθ' αὖ, ἢ καὶ τῶς πειθ' ὄντας; Where his question is clearly this, whether *Christ* appearing in hell did save all without exception, or did save there as he does here, only such as believed. To this it is answered by *Suarez* two ways, that it is the ordinary and universal Law; that none of the damned should be saved: An vero ex speciali privilegio sua voluntate & arbitrio aliquem damnatum ex *Gehenna* *Christus* eduxerit, dubitari quoquo modo potest. ---Et juxta hæc possent intelligi *Nazianzenus* & *Augustinus*. But this will by no means save their authorities;

rities ; for neither of them did doubt or question whether some of the damned were released, but whether all were released or some only : which Suarez did very well perceive, and therefore was ready in the same sentence with another answer, *Quaquam Nazianzenus non videatur illa scripsisse verba, quoniam de hac veritate dubitaret, sed solum ut proponeret quid de hoc mysterio inquirere ac scire oporteat. Which is as much as to say, that He was satisfied of the truth, but desired to satisfy no man else. Whereas 'tis clear that it was a doubt in his age, as we have before shewn, 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, unless 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 its Antiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will be less. For first, if it be not certain that the Souls of the Patriarchs were in some place called *Hell* after their own death, and until the death of *Christ*; if the bosom of *Abraham* were not some infernal mansion; then can it not be certain that *Christ* descended into *Hell* to deliver them. But there is no certainty that the Souls of the just, the Patriarchs and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was, or may be called *Hell*: the bosom of *Abraham* might well be in the heavens above, far from any region where the Devil and his Angels were; the Scriptures 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 Angels 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 God should be sent down from Heaven to convey the Souls of the just into that place where the face of God cannot be seen. When God translated *Enoch*, and *Elias* was carried up in a Chariot to Heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable, that *Moses* was with *Elias* as well before as upon the Mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that *Abraham* should be in any worse place or condition than *Enoch* was, having as great a testimony that he pleased God, as *Enoch* had.

Secondly, It cannot be certain that the Soul of *Christ* delivered the Souls of the Saints of old from *Hell*, and imparted to them the beatifical vision, except it were certain that the Souls are in another place and a better condition now than they were before. But there is no certainty that the Patriarchs and the Prophets are now in another place and a better condition than they were before our blessed Saviour died; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the Scriptures: there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actual accession of happiness and glory already past. *Many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of heaven;* there then did the Gentiles which came in to *Christ* find the Patriarchs, even in the Kingdom of Heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else than *Lazarus* did. For the description is the same, *There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets in the Kingdom of God, and you your selves thrust out.* For as the rich man in hell lift up his eyes being in torments, and seeth *Abraham* afar 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.

Thirdly, Though it were certain that the Souls of the Saints had been in a place called *Hell*, as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition than they were before *Christ's* death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that *Christ* descended into *Hell* to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his Resurrection, it might not be effected till his Ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his Passion, it might have no dependance on his Descension. I conclude therefore  
that



that there is no certainty of truth in that Proposition which the Schoolmen take for a matter of Faith, That *Christ* delivered the Souls of the Saints from that place of Hell which they call *Limbus of the Fathers*, into Heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into Hell.

Wherefore being it is most infallibly certain that the death of *Christ* was as powerfull and effectual for the Redemption of the Saints before him, as for those which follow him; being *they did all eat the same spiritual meat*, and *did all drink the same spiritual drink*; being *Abraham* is the *Father of us all*, and we now after *Christ's* Ascension are called but *to walk in the steps of the faith of that Father*; being the bosom of *Abraham* is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the blessed Angels before the death of *Christ* conveyed the Souls of those which departed in the favour of God, and is also promised to them which should believe in *Christ* after his death; being we can find no difference or translation of the bosom of *Abraham*, and yet it is a comfort still \* to us that we shall go to him, and while we hope so never fear that we shall go to Hell; I cannot admit this as the end of *Christ's* descent into Hell, to convey the Souls of *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob*, and those which were with them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell.*

1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

Rom. 4. 12, 16

|| *Abraham's Bosom of Abraham* in express and formal terms be spoken only of Lazarus whom *Christ* being yet alive in the flesh supposed dead; yet the same bosom is virtually, and

in terms equivalent promised to those which afterwards should believe. For the joys of the life to come are likened to a Feast, in which, according to the custom then in use they lay down with the head of one toward the breast of the other, who is therefore said to lye in his bosom, as we read of S. John, ἦν ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἰησοῦ thus in that heavenly Feast in the Kingdom of God, Lazarus is ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἀβραάμ. And in the same Chapter *Christ* saith, that Many shall come from the East and from the West, καὶ ἀνακειθήσονται μετ' Ἀβραάμ, discurrent cum Abrahamo, sit down with Abraham, as we translate it after our custom, at the same Feast, that is, ἀνακειθήσονται ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, &c. as Luthymias, Quia Deus Abraham, cœli conditor, Pater Christi est; idcirco in regno cœlorum est & Abraham, cum quo accubitur: sunt nationes quæ crediderunt in Christum filium creatoris. \* S. Augustine often shews the comfort which he had in going to the bosom 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 seats that place (as uncertain as before) where it was before. Post vitam istam parvam nondum eris ubi erunt Sancti, quibus dicetur, Venite benedicti Patris, 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 quietentem. Concio 1. in Psalm. 36. And this he must necessarily take for a sufficient comfort to a dying Christian, who seats that place in conspectu Domini, de Civit. Dei, lib. 1. cap. 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 spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them*: And, *when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men*. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth. By the conjunction of these two they conceive the triumph of *Christ's* descent clearly described in this manner. Ye were buried with *Christ* in baptism, with whom ye were also raised; and when ye were dead in sins, he quickned you together with him, forgiving your sins, and cancelling the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, and spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open shew of them, triumphing over them in himself. That is, say they, ye died and were buried with *Christ*, who fastned the hand-writing of ordinances to the Cross, that he might abolish it, from having any right to tie or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickned, and raised together with *Christ*, who spoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, *spoiling principalities and powers*, are not referred to the Cross, but to *Christ's* resurrection. This Triumph over Satan

Col. 2. 15.

Epist. 4. 8. 9.  
B. Bill. p. 244.  
Col. 2. 12, 13.  
14, 15.



*Prudentius*. Dic trophæum passionis, Dic triumphalem crucem, *Cathem. Hymn. 10.* S. Hilary most expressly, *Manus ejus edocte ad bellum sunt cum vicit seculum. 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 *traduxit cum fiducia triumphans in semetipso*, in Psal. 143. *Where it is observable 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 plaustrimanubias de mortali hoste quæsitâ, sed patibulo triumphali captiva de seculo spolia suspendit, *S. Amb. l. 10. in c. 23. S. Lucae*; and amongst the rest of the captives he reckons afterwards, captivum principem mundi, & spiritualia nequitie quæ sunt in cœlestibus. *To this alludes Fulgentius, l. 3. ad Thrasim.* Sic oportuit peccatorum nostrorum chirographum deleri, ut dum vetus homo noster simul cruci affigitur, tanquam in trophæo triumphatoris victoria panderetur, *Whether therefore we read it εν αυτω with the Greeks, that is, εν σωτηρω, or, εν αυτω with the Latines in seipso, it is the same: for he triumphed over the Devil by himself upon the Cross, as in the same case it is written Eph. 2. 16. η αποκαταλαβει τους αμφοτερος εν ενι σωτηρι τω Θεω δια τε σωτηρι, αποκλεινας την εχθραν εν εαυτω.*

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 effectual by the addition of that other to the *Ephesians*. For, first, we have already shewn, 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 it not follow from that Scripture, that *Christ* triumphed over Satan while his Soul was in Hell; for the consequence would be only this, That the same *Christ* who led captivity captive, *descended first into Hell.* In that he ascended (and ascending led captivity captive) what is it but that he descended first? the Descent then, if it were to Hell, did precede the triumphant Ascent of the same person, and that is all which the 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 forty days after his Resurrection. It is not an Ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an *ascending up on high*, even far above all *Heavens*. Now the *leading captivity captive* 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 been led before: but it is \* expressly said, *ascending up on high he led captivity captive*; and consequently that triumphant act was the immediate effect of his Ascension. So that by these two Scriptures no more can be proved than this, That *Christ* triumphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the Cross, and led captivity captive at his Ascension into Heaven. Which is so far from proving that *Christ* descended into Hell to triumph there, that it is more proper to persuade the contrary. For why should he go to Hell to triumph over them, over whom he had triumphed on the Cross? why should he go to captive that captivity then, which he was to captivate when he ascended into Heaven?

\* The Original words do manifestly shew that this triumphant act did not precede this Ascension. For had it been αιχμαλωτισας αιχμαλωσιαν ανεβη εις υψιστους, we might well have expounded it thus, Christ did lead

him and death and Satan captive; and when he had done so, ascended up on high: but being it is written ανεβας εις υψιστους, that is, having ascended up on high, ηχημαλωτισεν αιχμαλωσιαν, he captivated a captivity, the Ascension 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 express it thus, by ascending he led captive a captivity.

As for the testimonies of the Fathers, they will appear of small validity to confirm this triumphant Descent as it is distinguished from the two former effects, the removal of the Saints to Heaven, and the delivering the damned from the torments of Hell. In vain shall we pretend that *Christ descended into Hell* to lead captivity captive, if we withal maintain, that when he descended

\*So S Hierom on that place of the Ephesians, Inferiora autem terra infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus nos-ter Salvator-que descendit, ut Sanctorum animas quæ ibi tenebantur includere, se-cum ad cœlos Victor abdu-deret. An on Matth. 12. 29. Alligatus est fortis, & reli-gatus in Tar-tarum, & Do-

ded thither he brought none away which were captive there. This was the very notion which those \* Fathers had, that the Souls of men were conquered by Satan, and after death actually brought into captivity; and that the Soul of *Christ* descending to the place where they were, did actually release them from that bondage, and bring them out of the possession of the Devil by force. Thus did he conquer Satan, spoil Hell and lead Captivity captive, according to their apprehension. But if he had taken no Souls from thence, he had not spoiled Hell, he had not led Captivity captive, he had not so triumphed in the Fathers sense. Wherefore, being the Scriptures teach us not that *Christ* triumphed in Hell; being the triumph which the Fathers mention, was either in relation to the damned Souls which *Christ* took out of those tormenting flames as some imagined, or in reference to the spirits of the just, which he took out of those infernal habitations, as others did conceive; 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 acknow-ledge this, as the proper end of the Article.

mini contritus pede; & direptis sedibus Tyranni, captiva ducta est captivitas. So Arnoldus Carnotensis is to be understood, De Unctione Chris-matis, Passus est rex illudi, & vita occidi, descendensque ad inferos captivam ab antiquo captivitate reduxit; Applying it to the Custom of the Church, Omnino convenit, ut eo tempore quo Christus captivos eduxit ab inferis, reconciliati peccatores ad Ecclesiam reducantur, Ibid. Thus Athanasius when he speaks of *Christ's* triumphing over Satan in Hell, he mentions τὸ ἄδω σκωλῶθέντα, Hell spoiled, to wit, of those Souls which before it kept in hold. Otherwise in the same Oration. in Passionem & crucem, he acknowledgeth the Triumph on the Cross, Ἐδεῖ γὰρ τὸ νικῆσαι τὸ θάνατον, ἔδιδον τε (not θρῆνον βῶσοντα) καὶ τὸ διαβόλου, μὴ ἄλλω συλχεῖν ἀλλ' ἑαυτῷ βασιλεῖν τὸ τρέπαιον. Thus Leo the Emperor, Χειρὸς ἀνέστη τὸ ἄδω αἰχμαλωσίας, καὶ τοῖς αἰχμαλώτοις ἐλάθησαν κηρύξας. Hom. de Resurr. And thus Mar-carius supposeth *Christ* victoriously speaking unto hell and death, Κελεύω σὲ ἄδω καὶ σκότῳ, καὶ θανάτῳ, ἔκβαλε τὰς ἐσκελευσ-σάσας ψυχὰς Author libelli de Paschate, under the name of S. Ambrose, Expers peccati Christus cum ad Tartari ima descenderet, feras inferni januâque confringens, vincas peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, è diaboli fau-cibus 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. Secundam animam descendit ad inferna & spoliavit principes tenebrarum ab animabus electorum. Echbert. Serm. 9. contra Catharos. Thus still the Fathers which speak of spoiling hell, of leading Captivity captive, of triumphing over Satan in his own quarters, are to be under-stood in respect to those Souls which they thought were taken out of the custody, possession, or dominion of Satan, whether just or unjust.

Nor can we see how the Prophet *David* could intend so much, as if when he spake those words in the person of our Saviour, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, he should have intended this, Thou shalt not leave my Soul separated from my Body, and conveyed into the regions of the damned Spi-rits, amongst all the principalities and powers of Hell; I say, thou shalt not leave me there, battering all the infernal strength, redeeming the Priso-ners, leading captivity captive, and victoriously triumphing over death, and Hell, and Satan. In summ, 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 shewn the substance of the Article to consist in this, That the Soul of *Christ*, really separated from his Body by death, did truly pass unto the places below, where the Souls of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did so, was, That he might undergo the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the similitude of sinful flesh, and went into the other world in the similitude of a sin-ner. His body was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men

are;

are ; his Soul was conveyed into such receptacles as the Souls of other persons use to be. All, which was necessary for our redemption by way of satisfaction and merit, was already performed on the Cross ; and all, which was necessary for the actual collation and exhibition of what was merited there, was to be effected upon and after his Resurrection : in the interim therefore there is nothing left , at least known to us, but to satisfy the law of death. This he undertook to do, and did : and though the Ancient Fathers by the several additions of other ends have something obscured this, yet it may be sufficiently observed in their \* Writings, and is certainly most conformable to that prophetic 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.*

\* Irenæus so calls his descent, legem mortuorum servare, l. 5. c. 26. 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 corporisq; subiecit, & ad infernas sedes, id quod homini debitum videtur esse, penetravit, Enar. in Psal. 53. And before him Tertullian, Christus Deus, quia & homo mortuus secundum Scripturas, & sepultus secus easdem, huic quoq; legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus. De Anima c. 55. Ἡλθεν αὐτὸς ὁ ἦν πάντων σωτὴρ, καὶ πῶς ἡμῶν ῥεωσαμένας πτωχίας εἰς τὸ ἕξ ἡμῶν, ἀνθ' ἡμῶν, ἕως ἡμῶν ἀναμάρτητον αὐτῷ παρέδεδεξατο σάρκα. Καταφερόμεθα μὲν τὸ θάνατον εἰς τὸ ἄδλω ἀναδεδεξατο καὶ ἄπο, καὶ κατήλθεν ἐκκοίτης εἰς αὐτὸν. Gelas. Act. Conc. Nic. l. 2. c. 32. This S. Austin calls proprietatem carnis, Cont. Felician. 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 atque eodem tempore ipse totus etiam in inferno, totus in cœlo, illic patiens injuriam carnis hic non relinquens gloriam Deitatis, c. 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. Verè enim reputatus est inter peccatores & iniquos ut descenderet ad Infernum, S. Hierome in Isaiæ c. 53. v. 12. Ruffinus in his Exposition of the Creed, descanting upon that place in 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 usque homo sine peccato à Deo susceptus descenderet ; quousq; homo separatus à Deo peccati merito cecidisset, id est, ad infernum, ubi solebat peccatoris anima torqueri, & ad sepulchrum ubi consueverat peccatoris caro corrumpi, Ad Thrasim. c. 30. Εἰ ἐν καὶ αὐτὸς εἴλετο, κύριον ὡν τῶ παντός, καὶ δεσπότης, καὶ φῶς ἦν ἐν σκότει, καὶ ζωὴ ἦν ἀπάντων, θανάτου γλώσσατος, καὶ τὴν εἰς ἄδλω κατάβασιν ἐπιδέξασθαι, ὡς ἀν καὶ πάντων ἡμῶν ὁμοιωθῆ ῥεὶς ἀμαρτίας, &c. Andreas Cret. Serm. in vitam humanam. I conclude this with that Exposition of S. Hilary upon the words of the Psalmist, If I go down into Hell, thou art there also ; Humanæ ista lex necessitatis est, ut conspultis corporibus ad inferos animæ descendant: Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit, Psal. 138.**

Secondly, By the Descent of *Christ* into Hell, all those which believe in him are secured from descending thither ; he went unto those regions of darkness that our souls might never come into those torments which are there. By his Descent he freed us from our fears, as by his Ascension he secured us of our hopes. He passed to those habitations where Satan hath taken up possession, and exerciseth his dominion ; that having no power over him, we might be assured that he should never exercise any over our souls departed, as belonging unto him. *Through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil,* and by his actual descent into the dominions of him so destroyed, secured all which have an interest in him of the same freedom which he had. Which truth is also still preserved ( though among many other strange conceptions ) \* in the writings of the Fathers. Having thus examined the several Interpretations of this part of the Article, we may now give a brief and safe account thereof, and teach every one how they may express their Faith without any danger of mistake, saying, I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of *Christ* were finished on the Cross, and his Soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his Soul died not, and though it died not, yet it underwent the Condition of the Souls of such as die, and being he died in the similitude of a Sinner,

Heb. 2. 14.

\* As we read of the Opinion in Tertullian's time, though not of him ; Sed in hoc, inquit, Christus inferos adiit ne nos adiremus. Cæterum quod discrimen Ethnicorum & Christiano-

rum, si carcer mortuis idem ? De Anima cap. 55. Aut ipsius vox est hic, *Et eruisi animam meam ab inferno inferiori,* aut nostra vox per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum ; quia ideo ille pervenit usq; ad infernum, ne nos remaneremus in inferno, S. August. in Psal. 85. Πάσων γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνέλαβε, καὶ πεινῶν αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἔτρεφε, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄδλω κατὰβαίνων, ἡμᾶς ἀνέφερε, Athan. in Omnia mihi trad. &c.

his Soul went to the place where the Souls of men are kept who die for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore as God suffered not his Holy one to see corruption, so he left not his Soul in Hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to *Christ*, of never coming under the power of Satan or suffering in the flames prepared for the Devil and his Angels. And thus, and for these purposes may every Christian say, I believe that *Christ descended into Hell*.

### He Rose again.

WHATSOEVER variations have appeared in any of the other Articles, this part of *Christ's* Resurrection hath been constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or \* diminution. The whole matter of it is so necessary and essential to the Christian Faith, that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered, that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are presented with three Particulars: First, The Action it 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, *rose from the dead the third day*.

\* For though Eusebius Gallicanus and Venantius Fortunatus leave out the last Word, à mortuis, and some Copies in Rufinus have it not; yet is it generally expressed in all the rest which

are more ancient, than Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the Author or the Scribe, than to the usage of the Church in their age. Quod die tertio resurrexit à mortuis Dominus Christus, nullus ambigit Christianus, S. Aug. Serm. in Vigiliis Paschæ.

Psal. 2. 2.

Acts. 4. 27, 28.

Psal. 2. 6, 7.

For the illustration of the first Particular, and the justification of our belief in *Christ's* 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 only *Messias*, did so rise as it was promised and foretold. As the *Messias* was to be the Son of *David*, so was he particularly typified by him and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which *David* suffered both by his own People and by the Nations round about him; which he expressed of himself, and foretold of the *Messias* in those words, *The Kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, that is, his Christ*. From whence it came to pass, That against the holy child *Jesus*, whom God had anointed, both *Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to do whatsoever the hand and the counsel of God determined before to be done*, which was to 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 only to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a setting in the Kingdom; so being the conspiracy against the *Messias* amounted to a real Crucifixion and Death, therefore the Exaltation must include a Resurrection. And being he which rises from the dead, begins as it were to live another life, and the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore when God said of his anointed, *Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*, he did foretel and promise that he would raise the *Messias* from death to life.

But

But because this prediction was something obscured in the figurative expression, therefore the Spirit of God hath cleared it farther by the same Prophet, speaking by the mouth of *David*, but such words as are agreeable not to the person, but the Son of *David*, *My flesh shall rest in hope; for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy One to see corruption.* Psal. 16. 10.  
 As for the Patriarch *David*, he is both dead and buried, and his flesh consumed in his sepulchre; but being a Prophet, and knowing that God hath sworn with *an oath to him*, that of the fruit of his loyns 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. Acts 2. 31.

Again, Lest any might imagine that the *Messias* dying once might rise from death, and living after death yet die again, there was a further Prophecy to assure us of the excellency of that resurrection and the perpetuity of that life to which the *Messias* was to be raised. For God giving this promise to his people, *I will make an everlasting covenant with you* (of which the *Messias* was to be the Mediator, and to ratifie it by his death) and adding this expression, *even the sure mercies of David*, could signifie no less than that the *Christ*, who was given first unto us in a frail and mortal condition, in which he was to die, should afterwards be given in an immutable state, and consequently that he being dead should rise unto eternal life. And thus by virtue of these three predictions we are assured that the *Messias* was to rise again, as also by those Types which did represent and 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 *Christ's* death; \* his being taken out from thence represented his resurrection, as his ejection 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 die, and truly live again. And *Abraham* offered him up, <sup>a</sup> *accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead from whence also he received him in a figure.* In *Abraham's* intention *Isaac* died, in his expectation he was to rise from the dead, in his acceptation being spared he was received from the dead, and all this acted to \* presignifie, that the only Son of God was really and truly to be sacrificed and die; and after death was really to be raised to life. What was the intention of our Father *Abraham* not performed, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfilled. And thus the Resurrection of the *Messias* was represented by Types, and foretold by Prophecies; and therefore the *Christ* was to rise from the dead.

Isa. 55. 3.

\* Post duos annos dierum, tertio incipiente, de carcere educitur Joseph. Et post Joseph Christus Dominus die tertio a 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 cælo & in terra, Proſper. de Promiſ. & Prædict. p. 1. c. 29. <sup>a</sup> Heb. 11. 19. \* Ideo Iſaac immolatus non eſt, quia reſurrectio Filio Dei ſervata eſt, Proſper. de Prom. & Præd. p. 1. c. 17. Οὕτως γὰρ τὸ ἀγίον πνεῦμα ἡμᾶς τὸ μέγα μυστήριον πικρῶς ἀφοπτεροῖς ἀπυμείλιχον, τὸ τε ἠγαπημένον υἱὸν καὶ τὸ συμπαραδειχθέντι περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἰς δειχθῆναι ἐν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ τὸ δανάτω μυστήριον, ἐν ᾧ τὸ μόνολογεῖν τὸ ζῶν, ἢ μὴ διακοημένῳ τῷ δανάτῳ. Greg. Nyſſ. Orat. 1 in Reſur.

That *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the true and only *Messias*, did rise from the dead according to the Scriptures, is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us and confirmed by testimonies Humane, Angelical and Divine. Those pious Women which thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, *held him by the feet, and worshipped him*, and as the first Preachers of his

Refur-

Resurrection, *with fear and great joy ran to bring his Disciples word.* The blef-  
 fed Apostles follow them, *to whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion*  
 by many infallible proofs; who with great power gave witness of the resurrection  
 of the Lord Jesus, the principal part of whose office consisted in this testimony,  
 as appeareth upon the election of Matthias into the place of Judas, ground-  
 ed upon this necessity. *Wherefore of these men which have companied with us*  
*all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained*  
*to be a witness with us of his resurrection.* The rest of the Disciples testified the  
 same, to whom he also appeared, even to five hundred brethren at once. These  
 were the witnesses of his own family, of such as worshipped him, such as  
 believed in him. And because the testimony of an adversary is in such cases  
 thought of greatest validity, we have not only his disciples, but even his  
 enemies to confirm it. Those Souldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and  
 pretended to keep his body from the hands of his Apostles; they which felt  
 the earth trembling under them, and saw the countenance of an Angel like  
 lightning, and his raiment white as snow; they who upon that sight did shake  
 and became as dead men, while he whom they kept became alive: even some  
 of these came into the city and 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, of his followers and revilers.

But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more  
 firm and higher testimony than that of man: and therefore an Angel from  
 Heaven, who was ministerial in it, gave a present and infallible witness to  
 it. He descended down, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and  
 sat upon it. Nay, two Angels in white, sitting the one at the head, the other at  
 the feet where the body of Jesus had lain, said unto the Women, *Why seek ye*  
*the living among the dead? he is not here but is risen.* These were the wit-  
 nesses sent from Heaven, this the Angelical testimony of the Resurrection.

And if we receive the witness of men, or Angels, the witness of God is greater,  
 who did sufficiently attest this Resurrection; not only 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 testi-*  
*fy of me; adding these words to his Apostles, and ye shall bear witness, be-*  
*cause ye have been with me from the beginning.* The Spirit of God sent down  
 upon the Apostles did thereby testify that Christ was risen, because he sent  
 that Spirit from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with  
 that Spirit, because they were enlightned, comforted, confirmed and  
 strengthened 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 be-  
 fore 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 Christ's Resurre-  
 ction, expressed in that term *from the dead*, it will be necessary first to confi-  
 der what are the essential characters and proprieties of a true resurrection,  
 and secondly, to shew how those proprieties do belong and are agreeable  
 to the raising of Christ. The proper Notion of the Resurrection consists in  
 this, that it is a substantial change by which that which was before, and was  
 corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that  
 it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should  
 annihilate a man or Angel, and make the same man or Angel out of nothing,  
 though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a  
 resurrection, because it is not a change or proper mutation, but a pure and  
 total



total production. This change is called a substantial change to distinguish it from all accidental alterations: he which awaketh from his sleep, ariseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sickness to health, but neither of these is a Resurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath been corrupted, because things immaterial and incorruptible, cannot be said to rise again: Resurrection implying a reproduction, and that which after it was, never was not, cannot be reproduced. Again, of those things which are material and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational Souls, when they are corrupted, cease to be; and therefore if they should be produced out of the same matter, yet were not this a proper Resurrection, because thereby there would not be the same individual which was before, but only a restitution of the *species* by another individual. But when a rational Soul is separated from its body, which is the corruption of a man, that Soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and re-union with the body; and if the two be again united by an essential and vital union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live which lived before; and consequently this re-union is a perfect and proper Resurrection from death to life, because the same individual person, consisting of the same Soul and Body, which was dead is now alive again.

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 vital actions as we do. Secondly, He suffered a true and proper dissolution at his death; his Soul being really separated, and his body left without the least vitality, as our dead bodies are. Thirdly, The same Soul was re-united to the same body, and so he lived again the same man. For the truth of which, two things are necessary to be shewn upon his appearing after death, the one concerning the verity, the other concerning the identity of his body. All the Apostles doubted of the first, for when *Christ* stood in the midst of them, *they were* Luke 24. 37. *affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit.* But he sufficiently assured them of the verity of his corporeity, saying, \* *Handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.* He convinced them all of the identity of his body, saying, *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; especially unbelieving Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing.* The body then in which he rose, must be the same in which he lived before, because it was the same with which he died.

Luke 24. 37. 39.

\* Thus Ignatius disputes against the denied in his days, ἵνα γὰρ μὴ ἴδωμεν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τὸν πῶλε

Πέτρον ἠλάθεν, ἔφην αὐτοῖς, λάβετε, φιλαφίσειέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι ἐκ εἰρᾶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἤλαυτο καὶ ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ σαρκὸς αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα. -- Μετὰ ἧ ἴδωμεν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν καὶ συνέπεν ὡς σαρκικός, καὶ εἰς πνευματικὸς ἠνωμῆθη τῷ Πατρὶ. Epist. ad Smyrn. Palpandum 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, exhibit illam vivam qui vivebat in illa, 158. De Tempore.

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 broiled fish, and of an honeycomb, 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 rational and intellectual Soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the Scriptures, concerning those things which he spake *unto them*

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 lived before, he gave a full testimony of his divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the Apostles the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into Heaven in the sight of his Disciples. For being *no man ascended into heaven but he which came from heaven, the Son of man which was in heaven*, being the divinity was never so united to any humane Soul but only in that person, it appeared to be the same Soul with which he lived and wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being *Christ* appeared after his death with the same body in which he died, and with the same Soul united to it, it followeth that *he rose from the dead* by a true and proper Resurrection.

\* 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 proprietates divini humanæque naturæ individuæ permanere, Leo Serm. 1. de Resurrectione. Illi 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.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of *Christ's* Resurrection may further appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effected. And if we look upon the meritorious cause, we shall find it to be *Christ* himself. For he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly || deserve to be raised unto life again. Because he drunk of the Brook in the way, because he humbled himself unto death, even to the death of the Cross, therefore was it necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his Resurrection. Now being *Christ* humbled himself to the sufferings both of Soul and Body; being whatsoever suffered, the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; being all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the Resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that *Christ* did truly rise from the dead with the same Soul and the same body, with which he lived united, and died separated.

The Efficient cause of the Resurrection of *Christ* is to be considered either as Principal or Instrumental. The Principal cause was God himself; for no other power but that which is omnipotent can raise the dead. It is an act beyond the activity of any creature, and unproportionate to the power of any finite Agent. *This Jesus hath God raised up*, saith the Apostle, *whereof we all are witnesses*. And generally in the Scriptures as our, so *Christ's* Resurrection is attributed unto God; and as we cannot hope after death to rise to life again without the activity of an infinite and irresistible power, no more did *Christ* himself, who was no otherwise raised than by an eminent act of God's omnipotency; which is excellently set forth by the Apostle, in so high an exaggeration of expressions, as I think is scarce to be parallell'd in any Author, *That we may know what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of the might of his power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him up from the dead*. Being then Omnipotency is a divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone: being no less power than infinite could raise our Saviour from the dead; it followeth, That whatsoever instrumental action might concur, God must be acknowledged the principal Agent.

Acts 2. 32.

\* Eph. 1. 10. Κατὰ τὸ ἰσχύον μέγας τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κρείττους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἐνέργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ.

Which words our Translation comes far short of, and I doubt our Language can scarce reach it. For first, here are δύναμις, and ἰσχύς two words to express the power of God and the validity and force of it, but not sufficient; wherefore there is an addition to each of them, μέγας τῆς δυνάμεως, and κρείττος τῆς ἰσχύος, two words more to express the eminent greatness of this power and force but not sufficient yet; and therefore there is another addition to each addition, τὸ ἰσχύον μέγας, and ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ κρείττους, to set forth the eminence and activity of that greatness; and all yet as it were but flat and dull, till it be quickned with an active verb, ἣν ἐνέργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. All which he set on work, all which he actuated in Christ, when he raised him from the dead

And

And therefore in the Scriptures the Raising of *Christ* is attributed to God the Father ( according to those words of the Apostle, *Paul an Apostle not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead* ) but it is not attributed to the Father alone. For to whomsoever that infinite power doth belong, by which *Christ* was raised, that person must be acknowledged to have raised him. And because we have already proved that the eternal Son of God is of the same essence, and consequently of the same power with the Father, and shall hereafter 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 only true by virtue of this ratiocination, but it is also delivered expressly of the Son, and that by himself. It is a weak fallacy used by the *Socinians*, who maintain That God the Father only raised *Christ*, and then say, they teach as much as the Apostles did, who attribute it always either generally unto God, or particularly to the Father. For if the Apostles taught it only so, yet if he which taught the Apostles, taught us something more, we must make that also part of our belief. They believe the Father raised *Christ*, because *S. Paul* hath taught them so, and we believe the same; they will not believe that *Christ* did raise himself, but we must also believe that, because he hath said so. These were his words unto the *Jews*, *a Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up*, and this is the explication of the Apostle, *But he spake of the temple of his body, which he might very properly call a Temple, because the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily. And when he was risen from the dead, his disciples 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* raised himself; for in those words there is a person mentioned which raised *Christ*, and no other person mentioned but himself.

|| Quis nisi solus Filius resurrexit, quia solus mori potuit qui carnem habuit? & tamen ab hoc opere quo solus Filius resurrexit non erat Pater alienus de quo scriptum est, Qui suscitavit a mortuis Jesum. An forte se ipse non suscitavit? Et ubi est quod ait, Solvite templum hoc, & tri dies suscitabo illud; & quod potentiam habere se dicit ponendi & iterum sumendi animam

suam? Quis autem ita desipiat, ut Spiritum Sanctum resurrectionem hominis Christi dicat non co-operatum, cum ipsum hominem Christum fuerit operatus. *S. August. contra Serm. Arian. cap. 15. a John 2. 19, 21. b Coloss. 2. 9.*

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 Palsie raised himself from the bed, or as we shall raise our selves out of the graves when the Trump shall sound: and this was all which *Christ* could do. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, *a Destroy this temple, and in three days any one of you may raise it up.* For when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and raised it out of the grave, and have shewn it alive.

|| Aliter Deus Christum suscitavit, aliter Christus corpus suum: Deus Christo vitam restituendo, Christus vitam recuperata corpus suum levando, & e sepulchro produrendo, seque post mortem vivum sistendo præbendoque. Sic & Paralyticus ille crexerat corpus suum, accepta à Christo sanitate: sic & omnes mortui surgent,

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 mortal body. *b\* For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickneth them, even so the Son quickneth whom he will.* He then which quickneth 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 *Christ's* body was dissolved when his Soul was separated, nor was it any

& ex monumentis prodibunt, recepta ab eodem Christo vita, *Confessionis Sociniane Vindices. a John 2. 19. b John 5. 21.*  
*\* Ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς and ζωοποιεῖν is the same thing; and therefore one in the Apodosis answereth to both in the Protasis, and answereth that Christ raiseth and quickneth whom he will, which demonstrateth his infinite and absolute Power. Καὶ τὸ τὰ, ἔδδεν*

δυναμίαι ἀφ' ἑαυτῶ ποιεῖν, πῶς ἂν θέλει ἐναυτίον ὅτιν. Εἰ γὰρ ἂν θέλει, δύναμιαι ἀφ' ἑαυτῶ ποιεῖν τὸ γὰρ θέλειν ἔξουσίας. εἰ δ' ἔ  
 δύναμιαι ἀφ' ἑαυτῶ, ἐκέπ' ἂν θέλει. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὡς πατὴρ ἐγείρει, τῆς δυνάμεως δεικνυσι, τῶ ἀπεραλλαξίαν τὸ δ' ἂν  
 θέλει, τ' ἔξουσίας τῶ ἰσότητι. S. Chryf. Hom. 38. in Joh. *Where it is very observable, that though ἐγείρειν τὸ νεκρῶν and*  
*ζωοποιεῖν be the same in the language of the Scriptures, yet ἐγείρειν and ζωοποιεῖν are not the same. By which observation the*  
*late Learned Bishop of Ely hath most evidently detected that Socinian Cavil. Si quis obstinatè vocem Excitabo [ἐγερῶ] urgere*  
*vult, is animadvertet quid D. Jēsus alibi dicat, Eum qui perdidit animam, vivificaturum eam. Ubi si quis insillere*  
*vellet ipsis verbis, eum colligere oporteret, Credentes etiam ipsos sese vivificaturos, & à mortuis excitaturos. Cat. Rai.*  
*pag. 278. For ἐγερῶ hath manifest relation to the dead, but ζωοποιεῖν unto the living. And therefore our Translation hath very well*  
*rendred these words, Luc. 17. 33. ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ αὐτῶ, ζωοποιήσει αὐτῶ, Whofoever shall lose his life shall perferve it,*  
*so that ζωοποιεῖν ψυχῶ is to perferve life; which interpretation is most evident out of the Antithesis of the same place, "Ὁς ἐὰν*  
*ζῆτισῇ τῶ ψυχῶ αὐτῶ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτῶ. For σῶσαι and ἀπολέσει in the former part are the same with ἀπολέσῃ and ζω-*  
*οποιήσει in the latter. And beside, this is the language of S. Luke, who, Acts 7. 19. says that the Egyptians ill intreated the*  
*Israelites, τὲ ποιεῖν ἐκθετα τὰ βρέφῃ αὐτῶ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωοποιεῖσθαι. So that they cast out their young children, to the end they*  
*might not live, that is, remain alive. Syr. [ܢܘܢ ܕܠܘܢܐ], ne servarentur, ne viverent, as the Arabick. In which words there is*  
*a manifest reference to that place in Exodus, where thrice this word is used in that sense by the LXX. as 1. 17. [אֶתְּחַיֶּה אֶתְּךָ],*  
*καὶ ἐζωοποιήσω τὰ ἄρσενα, V. T. sed conservabant mares, Chald. [ܐܘܢܝܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ] so verse 18. ἐζωοποιεῖτε τὰ ἄρσενα,*  
*and 22. καὶ πᾶν θήλυ ζωοποιεῖτε αὐτό. And indeed [חַי] in Piel, is often used for keeping or preserving alive, and is so several*  
*times translate, ζωοποιεῖν as well as ζωεῖν, as Jud. 8. 19. [חַיֵּם אֶתְּכֶם], εἰ ἐζωοποιήσετε αὐτῶ, ἕκ' ἀν' ἀπέκλεινα ὑμῶς.*  
*V. T. Si servassetis eos, non vos occiderem. If ye had saved them alive, I would not slay you. 1 Sam. 27. 9. [חַיֵּם יְהוָה],*  
*καὶ ἕκ' ἐζωοποιεῖ ἀνδρα, ἢ γυναῖκα. V. T. Nec relinquebat viventem virum aut mulierem. And lest neither man nor*  
*woman alive. And which is yet nearer to our purpose, 1 King 20. 31. [חַיֵּם אֶתְּךָ יְהוָה], LXX. εἰ πως ζωοποιήσει τὴς*  
*ψυχῆς ἡμῶν. V. T. forsitan salvabit animas nostras. Peradventure he will save thy life. So that ζωοποιεῖν in the language*  
*of the LXX. is to save alive, and ζωοποιεῖν τῶ ψυχῶ, is to preserve ones life. So that S. Luke in the Text cited by the Soci-*  
*nians, could intend no more than, that he which was ready to lose his life for Christ should thereby preserve it, and consequently he*  
*speaks nothing of the raising of the dead.*

other way dissolved than by that separation. God suffered not his holy One to see corruption, and therefore the parts of his body, in respect of each to other, suffered no dissolution. Thus as the Apostle *desired to be dissolved and to be with Christ*, so the temple of *Christ's* body was dissolved here, by the separation of his Soul: for the temple standing was the body living; and therefore the raising of the dissolved temple was the quickning of the body. If the body of *Christ* had been laid down in the sepulchre alive, the temple had not been dissolved; therefore to lift it up out of the sepulchre, when it was before quickned, was not to raise a dissolved temple, which our Saviour promised he would do, and the Apostles believed he did.

Again, it is most certainly false that our Saviour had power only to lift up his body when it was revived, but had no power of himself to re-unite his Soul unto his body, and thereby to revive it. For *Christ* speaketh expressly of himself, *I lay down my life (or soul) that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of my self. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* The laying down of *Christ's* life was to die, and the taking of it again was to revive, and by this taking of his life again he 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 holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. But if *Christ* had done no more in the Resurrection, than lifted up his body when it was revived, he had done that which any other person might have done, and so had not declared himself to be the Son of God with power. It remaineth therefore, that *Christ* by that power which he had within himself did take his life again which he had laid down, did re-unite his Soul unto his body, from which he separated it when he gave up the Ghost, and so did quicken and revive himself: and so it is a certain truth, || not only that God the Father raised the Son, but also that God the Son raised himself.

John 10. 17,  
18.

|| Καὶ ἀληθῶς  
 ἔπαθεν, αἰς καὶ  
 ἀληθῶς ἀνέ-  
 σισεν ἑαυτόν. Ign. ad Smyrn. 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 fuerat. Ille se suscitavit qui vivebat in se, in carne autem suscitanda mortuus erat. Non enim Pater solus Filium suscitavit, de quo dictum 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 Verb. Domin. Sermon. 8.

From this consideration of the efficient cause of *Christ's* Resurrection, we are yet farther assured, That *Christ* did truly and properly rise from the dead.

in

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 arise in Soul and body by that Divinity which was never separated either from the body or from the Soul. And thus we have sufficiently proved our second particular, the Verity, Reality, and Propriety of *Christ's* Resurrection, contained in those words, *He rose from the dead*.

The third Particular concerns the time of *Christ's* Resurrection; which is expressed by *the third day*; and those words afford a double consideration: one in respect of the distance of time, as it was after three days; the other in respect of the day, which was 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 die and to rise again, was not to rise before, and was to rise upon, the third day after his death; and that in correspondence to these predictions, our *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, did not rise from the dead until, and did rise from the dead upon, the third day.

The typical predictions of this truth were two, answering to our two considerations, one in reference to the distance, the other in respect of the day it self. The first is that of the Prophet *Jonas*, who was in the belly of the great fish three days and three nights, and then by the special command of God he was rendred safe upon the dry land, and sent a Preacher of repentance to the great City of *Nineveh*. This was an expresse type of the *Messias* then to come, who was to preach repentance and remission of sins to all Nations; that as *Jonas* was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth: and as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the *Messias*, after three days, be taken out of the jaws of death: and restored unto the land of the living.

The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first-fruits, concerning which this was the law of God by *Moses*, *When ye come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the Priest, and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you, on the morrow after the sabbath the Priest shall wave it, and ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he-lamb without blemish of the first year for a burnt-offering unto the Lord*. For under the Levitical Law all the fruits of the earth in the land of *Canaan* were prophane; none might eat of them till they were consecrated, and that they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the Priest, who lifted it up as it were in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them, so that all the sheafs in the field were holy by the acceptation of that. *For if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy*. And this was always done the day after the Sabbath, that is, the Paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of the harvest followed: by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the Priest to God, so the promised *Messias*, that immaculate Lamb which was to die, that Priest which dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the dead, or rather to shake and lift up and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity.

Thus was the Resurrection of the *Messias* after death, typically represented both in the distance and the day.

And now in reference to both resemblances, we shall clearly shew that our *Jesus*, whom we believe, and have already proved to be the true *Messias*, was so long and no longer dead, as to rise *the third day*; and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the 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 days. *Christ* did not, would not, suddenly arise; lest any should doubt that he ever died. It was as necessary for us that he should die, as that he should live, and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did sometime continue it. || He might have descended from the Cross before he died, but he would not, because he had undertaken to die for us. \* He might have revived himself upon the Cross after he had given up the ghost, and before *Joseph* came to take him down, but he would not, lest as *Pilate* questioned whether he were already dead, so he might doubt whether he ever died. The reward of his Resurrection was immediately due upon his Passion, but he deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being questioned, they both might lose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intercede between them.

De cruce descendere poterat, sed differbat ut de sepulchro resurgeret. S. Aug. in Joh. Tract. 22.

\* Ἡ δύνατο καὶ παρ' αὐτὰ τὸ θανάτου τὸ σῶμα διεξίρει καὶ πάλιν δεῖξαι ζῶν.

ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ καλῶς περιδῶν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐπεποίηκε. εἶπε γὰρ ἂν τις μὴδ' ὅπως αὐτὸ τεθνηκέναι, ἢ μὴδὲ τέλος αὐτῆς τὸν θάνατον ἐφαυκέναι, εἰ παρ' αὐτὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἠὲ ὀπίδειξας. Τάχα ὅ καὶ ἐν ἰσῷ τῆς διασημασίᾳ ὄντι τὸ τε θανάτου τε καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀδύηλον ἐγένετο τὸ αἰετὶ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας κλέει. Ὅθεν ἵνα δειχθῆναι νεκρὸν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μίαν ἐπέμεινε μέσῳ ὁ Λόγος, καὶ τριῶν τῶν πᾶσι ἐδείξεν ἀφθαρτον, S. Athanas. de Incarnat. Verbi. Καὶ τρεῖς ὅ ἡμέρας διὰ τὸ τῶν συνεχώρησεν, ἵνα πᾶσι δειθῆναι ὅτι ἀπέθανεν, καὶ γὰρ τὸ σαυρῶν αὐτῶν μόνον βεβαίηται, καὶ τῆ πάντων ὄψει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ χρονον τῆς ἡμερῶν, S. Chrysof. Homil. 43. in Matt.

Again, because *Christ's* exaltation was due unto his humiliation, and the first step of that was his Resurrection; because the Apostles after his death were to preach repentance and remission of sins through his blood, who were no way qualified to preach any such doctrine till he rose again; because the Spirit could not be sent till he ascended, and he could not ascend into Heaven till he rose from the Grave; therefore the space between his Resurrection and Passion could not be long; nor can there be any reason assigned why it should any longer be deferred, when the verity of his death was once sufficiently proved. Lest therefore his Disciples should be long held in suspense, or any person after many days should doubt whether he rose with the same body with which he died, or no; that he might shew himself alive while the Soldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouths of the people, he would not stay || many days before he rose. Some distance then of time there was, but not great, between his Crucifixion and his Resurrection.

Ἐνεκα τῆς ἐν τῷ δειχθῆναι τὸ θάνατον ἐν τῷ σώματι τριῶν ἀνέ-

πισσε τῶν ἵνα ὅ μὴ ὅτι πλὴν διαμείναν καὶ φθαρὲν τέλος ὕστερον ἀναστήσει ἀπιστηθῆναι, ὡς ἐκ αὐτῶ ἀλλ' ἕτερον σῶμα φέρων (ἐμαρτε γὰρ ἂν τις καὶ δι' αὐτὸν χρόνον ἀπιστεῖν τῷ φαινομένῳ καὶ ὀπίλανθάνειν τῆς γλυκομύρου) διὰ τῶν ἐπὶ πλείω τῶν τριῶν ἠνέχετο καὶ ὅτι πολὺ τὸ ἀκέραιον αὐτῶ αἰετὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως παρείληκτο ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκοῶν αὐτῶ ἑναυλον ἐχρόνῳ τὸ λόγον, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶ ἐκδεχόμενον, καὶ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶ ἠρημώσεως, καὶ ζώντων ὅτι γῆς ἐπὶ καὶ ὅτι τόπον ὄντων τῶν θανάτων καὶ μαρτυρήτων αἰετὶ τῆς θανάτου τῆς Κυριακῆς σώματι, αὐτὸς ὁ τῆς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἐν τριῶν διασημασι τὸ γλυκομύρον νεκρὸν σῶμα ἐδείξεν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀφθαρτον. 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 conclu-

concluded how long our Saviour was dead or buried before he revived or rose again. It is written expressly in S. *Matthew*, that *as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whales belly, so should the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.* From whence it seemeth to follow, that *Christ's* body was for the space of three whole days and three whole nights in the grave, and after that space of time rose from thence. And hence some have conceived, that being our Saviour rose on the morning of the first day of the week, therefore it must necessarily follow that he died and was buried on the fifth day of the week before, that is on Thursday; otherwise it cannot be true that he was in the grave three nights.

Matt. 12. 40.

But this place, as express as it seems to be, must be considered with the rest in which the same truth is delivered; as when our Saviour said, *After three days I will rise again*: and again, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up, or, within three days I will build another made without hands.* But that which is most used, both in our Saviour's prediction before his death, and in the Apostles Language after the Resurrection, is, that <sup>a</sup> || he *rose from the dead the third day.* Now according to the Language of the Scriptures, if *Christ* were slain and rose the third day, the day in which he died is one, and the day on which he arose is 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 Child eight days old was to be circumcised, in which the day on which the Child was born was one, and the day on which he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six compleat days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision. The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth day from the day of the wave-offering; but in the number of the fifty days was both the day of the wave-offering and of Pentecost included; as now among the Christians still it is. Whitsunday is now the day of Pentecost, and Easter-day the day of the Resurrection, answering to that of the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to make the number of fifty days, *Christ* then who rose upon the first day of the week (as is confessed by all) died upon the sixth day of the week before: for if he had died upon the fifth, he had risen not upon the third, but the fourth day, as  $\therefore$  *Lazarus* did. Being then it is most certain that our Saviour rose on <sup>\*</sup> *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 died upon any other day between which and the day of his Resurrection there intervened any more than one day: therefore those other forms of speech which are far less frequent, must be so interpreted as to be reduced to this expression of the *third day* so often reiterated.

Matt. 27. 63.  
Mark 8. 32.  
John 2. 19.  
Mark 14. 58.

<sup>a</sup> Matt. 16. 21.  
17. 23.  
20. 19.  
Mark 9. 31.  
10. 34.  
Luke 9. 22.  
18. 33.  
24. 7, 46.

Acts 10. 40.  
1. Cor. 15. 4.  
|| These several phrases are used; first that *Christ* was in the heart of the earth τρεῖς ἡμέρας, & τρεῖς νύκτας; secondly, that he was to rise ὑπὸ τρεῖς ἡμέρας; thirdly, that he would rebuild this Temple ἐν τριτημέραις, and διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν; and lastly, that he rose τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, which is the most general and constant form of speech.

$\therefore$  *Lazarus* is said to be τε-

τραπλάσιον, four days dead, that is counting the day on which he died, and the day on which his Sister spoke so to our Saviour at his sepulchre. And being he was raised then, he rose τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, the fourth day. Our Saviour rose τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, and therefore he was τετραπλάσιον 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*, Σολῶντος ὁ Θεωρεσιον \* Ἰξέδαντος, & τριπλάσιον ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς τὰς ταχέως αὐτὸς ἀνέστη. De his qui ferro pun. And of that Spirit in a Boy possessed, who hated all Women ὅτι ἡ γυνὴ αὐτῷ ἐν νύκτι ὕβρισε τριπλάσιον κειμήλιον γαμνηθεῖσαι ἐπέεω, *Philostrot.* l. 3 c. 12. What this τετραπλάσιον is, the Greek Grammarians will teach us. Πρὸς μὲν τὸ πόσον ἀπαντᾷ τὸ τριπλάσιον ἢ τετραπλάσιον, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πόσον τὸ τετάρτον ἢ τετραπλάσιον ἢ τετραπλάσιον, ὅτι τάξως, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πόσον τὸ τετάρτον ἢ τετραπλάσιον, ὅτι πρὸς τὸ πενήντος ἀπ' ἑαυτῆς πάρεσι; ἀπαντᾷσι τὸ, τριπλάσιον πρὸς ἢ τετραπλάσιον, ἢ γὰρ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔχοντες ἢ πάρεσι ἢ τετάρτῃ. Schol. *Eurip.* *Hecuba.* τριπλάσιον 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, than in the expression of a Tertian Fever, called so because the second accession is upon the third day from the first, and the third from the second, &c. in which case there is but one day between, in which the Patient is wholly free from his disease: from whence πρὸς μίαν, and τριπλάσιον is the same in the Language of the Physicians. This is excellently expressed by *Alexander Aphrodisius* in that problematical Question, διὰ τὸ ὅτι μὲν τριπλάσιον ἐν δερμὶ χυμὸς γιγνώσκου, & ἔχον μασίγιστον καὶ κατελαύνουσαν χολῶν, πρὸς μίαν κινεῖται ὁ δὲ ἀμφημερινός, ἔχον πένδισαν τὸ εὐεργμα τῇ βραδυπνί καὶ ψυχρόπνι καθ' ἡμέραν ὁ δὲ τετραπλάσιον, διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων, *Probl.* 10. l. 2. The Quotidian Ague hath its accessions καθ' ἡμέραν the Tertian πρὸς μίαν (sub. ἡμέραν) after one day of perfect intermission; the Quotidian διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων. In the same manner he mentions the πεμπλάσιον, the ἑβδομάσιον, and ἑνατάσιον in all which this is constantly observable, that the days of perfect intermission are fewer by two, than the number in the name of the Fever: for if the Fever

Never be a *τελειά* the day of intermission is but one, if *τεσσαρά* two, if *πενήναι* three, if *έξδομαί* five, if *ένναί* seven. Thus if our Saviour were one whole day in the grave, and died the day before, and rose the day after, he did rise *τεταί* if he were two whole days in the grave, he rose *τεταρταί*. So Aristotle, *Διά τι ό νυκτερινός βορέας τριταί* λήγει; πότερον όπ άπό μινέας ή άδενός άρχής; ή τείτη ή κείσημ, *Probl. 14. Sect. 26. τή τείτη* therefore and *τριταί* is the same. For from *τείτη* comes *τριταί*, and from *τετάρτη*, *τεταρταί*, &c. in which *ήμερα* is always understood. *Τεταρταί*, *τεταρτήμας*, Suidas, *Τριταί* then is *τριήμερος* *πυρετός τριταί*, *διά τείτης* and *τεταρταί*, *διά τετάρτης*. Thus being Christ did certainly rise *τή τείτη* *ήμερα*, he did rise according to the Greeks *τριταί* and according to the same then he must also rise *παρά μίαν*, that is, one day only interceding between the day of his death, and the day of his resurrection.

Luke 2. 46.

|| A night and a day in the Hebrew Language, not used to compositions, is the same with the Greek *νύξ ήμέρας* or *ήμερας*

*יהי ערב*  
*יהי בקר*

*יום אחד*  
The evening and the morning were the first day. For though God called the light Day, and the darkness 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 natural and artificial day.

And the evening

When therefore we read that *after three days* he would raise the Temple of his Body, we must not imagine that he would continue the space of three whole days dead, and then revive himself; but upon the third day he would rise again: as *Joseph* and his mother, *after three days found him in the temple*, that is, the third day after he tarried behind in *Jerusalem*. And when we read, that he was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, we must not look upon those nights as || distinct from the days, but as *Moses* spake, *the evening and the morning*, that is, the night and the day, were the first day; and as the Saint spake unto *Daniel*, *Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings*, intending thereby so many days: nor must we imagine that those three days were compleated after our Saviour's death, and before he rose; but that upon the first of those three days he died, and upon the last of those three days he rose. As we find that *eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child*; and yet *Christ* was born upon the first and circumcised upon the last of those *eight days*: nor were there any more than six whole days between the day of his birth and the day of his circumcision; the one upon the five and twentieth of *December*, the other upon the first of *January*. And as the *Jews* were wont to speak, the Priests in their courses by the appointment of *David* were to minister before the Lord eight days, whereas every week a new course succeeded, and there were but seven days service for each course, (the Sabbath on which they began, and the Sabbath on which they went off being both reckoned in the eight days;) so the day on which the Son of God was crucified, dead, and buried, and the day on which he revived and rose again, were included in the number of three days. And thus did our Saviour rise from the dead upon the third day properly, and was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth ∴ *synecdochically*.

and the morning are sometimes put instead of the day; as Dan. 8. 14. *ערב בקר אלפים ושלש מאות* Unto two thousand and three hundred days, and verse 26. *מראה 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 days, viz. the 2300 days before spoken of. Now though a Day be thus diversly taken, yet in the measuring of any time which containeth in it both days and nights, a day is always taken in that sence in which it comprehendeth both day and night. Thus Galen, who is very punctual and exact in all his Language, and full of expositions of the words he uses, to prevent mistakes, being to speak of the Critical days, 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, *Ημέραν διλονόπι παρ' όλον ή λόρον ειρησομύοις εν εκ ή ημέρας άπ' της μόνης συνεσώσαν, αλλά ή ή νυκτός χρόνος καδάπ' εν ή ή μίωα τριάνονηα ήμερών ή) λέρομυ, ή μόνον τήτον ή χρόνον όν άπ' ή γής ό ήλιος φαίνεσθαι προσαγορόντες ήμέραν, αλλά ή ή της νυκτός άπ' άπ' προσιδέντες, ήτως δέ πως ή ή ενιαυτόν πέντε ή ήξήκοντα ή τριακοσίων ήμερών ή) φιλώμ. De Crisibus, l. 2. This is observed by S. Basil. to be also the custom of the Scriptures, upon those words in Genesis, *Ερχέσθω εν ήπείρω, έρχέσθω πρώι, τδ ήμερονόκτιον λέγει εκ ήπ' προσηγορόσεν, ήμέρα ή νύξ, αλλά τδ όπικρατόντη τήν πώσαν προσηγορίαν άπένειμε. Ταύτλω άν ή εν πάτη γραφή τήν συνήθειαν ευρεσι εν τή τδ χρόνε μετρήσει, ήμέρας ήριθμωμύομας ήξ ή ή νύκτας άπ' ή ή ήμερών, In Hexam. Hom. 2. Now being generally in all computations of time, as S. Basil obserueth εν τή τδ χρόνε 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 than so many days; and so three days and three nights in the computation of time signifie no more than three days. (For God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night, and the evening and the morning were the first day, and the evening and the morning were the second day, &c.) Being three days in the Language of the Scripture are said to be fulfilled when the third day is come, though it be not wholly passed over; it followeth that to be three days dead, or to be three days and three nights dead, in the Hebrew Language, cannot necessarily infer any more, than that the person spoken of did continue dead till the third day. <sup>a</sup> Dan. 8. 14. <sup>b</sup> Luke 2. 21. \* As we read of the circumcision of our Saviour, *επλήθυναν ήμέρας όκτώ* so of Zachary, *ώς επλήθυναν αή ήμέρας* της λειτουργίας αυ' τδ' and though the number *όκτώ* were not expressed, yet it is to be understood, according to the Language of the Scripture in other cases, and of Josephus particularly in this, *Διέταξε ή μίαν παρσιών διακομείσθ τδ Θεώ όπ' ήμέρας όκτώ άπό σαββάτου όπ' σαββάτων. ∴ So S. Hierome on Jonas 2. 1. Et erat Jonas in ventre piscis tribus diebus & tribus noctibus: Hujus loci mysterium in Evangelio Dominus exponit, &c. υπερfluum est vel idipsum vel aliud dicere. Hoc solum quærimus, quomodo tres dies & tres noctes fuerit in corde terre,***



terræ. Quidam παρασκευῶν, 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 verò συνεβόησαν totum intelligamus à parte; ut ex eo quod ἐν παρασκευῇ mortuus est, unam diem supputemus & noctem, & Sabbati alteram ; tertiam verò noctem, quæ diei Dominicæ nuncupatur, referamus ad exordium diei alterius : nam & in Genesi nox præcedentis diei ( add non) est sed sequentis, id est, principium futuri, non finis præteriti. To the same purpose S. Augustine, Ipsum autem triduum non totum & plenum fuisse Scriptura testis est ; sed primus dies à parte extrema totus annumeratus est; dies verò tertius à parte prima & ipse totus ; medius autem inter eos, i. e. 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. And after him Leo the Great.* Ne turbatos Discipulorum animos longa mœstitudo cruciaret, denunciata tridui moram tam mira celeritate breviavit, ut dum ad integrum secundum diem pars primi novissima & pars tertii prima concurrat, & aliquantum temporis spacio decideret, & nihil dierum numero deperiret. *De Resur. Domini, Serm. 1. Isidor. Pelus. Epist. 114. l. 1.*

This is sufficient for the clearing the precise distance of *Christ's* Resurrection from his Crucifixion, expressed in the determinate number of three days : the next consideration is, what day of the week that *third day* was, on which *Christ* did actually rise, and what belongeth to that day in relation to his Resurrection. Two characters there are which will evidently prove the particularity of this third day : the first is the description of that day in respect of which this is called the *third*, after the manner already delivered and confirmed; the second is the Evangelists expression of the time on which *Christ* rose.

The character of the day in which our Saviour died is undeniable, for it is often expressly called the *preparation* ; as we read, they therefore laid *Jesus* in the garden, <sup>a</sup> because of the Jews preparation day, for the sepulchre was nigh at hand. And <sup>b</sup> the next day that followed the preparation, the chief Priests and Pharisees asked a guard. Now this day of preparation was the day immediately before the Sabbath or some other great feast of the Jews called by them the Eve of the Sabbath or the Feast: and therefore called the preparation, because on that day they did prepare whatsoever was necessary for the celebration of the following Festival ; according to that command in the case of Manna, <sup>c</sup> It shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily. This preparation being used both before the Sabbath and other Festivals, at this time it had both relations : for first, it was the preparation to a Sabbath, as appeareth by those words of *S. Mark*, <sup>d</sup> Now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath ; and those of *S. Luke*, <sup>e</sup> That day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. Secondly, It was also the Eve of a Festival, even of the great day of the Paschal solemnity, as appeareth by *S. John*, who saith, when *Pilate* sat down in the Judgment-seat, <sup>f</sup> it was the preparation of the Passover. And that the great Paschal Festivity did then fall upon the Sabbath, so that the same day was then the preparation or Eve of both, appeareth yet farther by the same Evangelist, saying, *The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the Cross on the Sabbath day, for that Sabbath day was an high day* ; that is, not only an ordinary or weekly Sabbath, but also a great Festival, even a Paschal Sabbath. Now being the Sabbath of the Jews was constant and fixed to the seventh day of the week, it followeth that the Preparation or Eve thereof must necessarily be the sixth day of the week, which from the day and the infinite benefit accruing to us by the Passion upon that day, we call *Good Friday*. And from that day being the sixth of one, the third must consequently be the \* eighth or the first of the next week.

¶ Παρασκευῶν, Paraceteve 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 Luke 23. 54. Καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτῶν παρασκευῶν and that preparation among the Jews for the Sabbath ; as S. Mark 15. 42. Ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευῶν ὁ ὄσι πρὸς ἑβδωατον and in the Edit of Augustus Cæsar, εἰρήνας τε μὴ ὁμολογεῖν ἐν σαββασι, ἢ τῇ προλαύτης παρασκευῶν ἀπὸ ὄρας ἐναντίας, *Jud. Ant. l. 6. c. 10.* which is well expressed by Synelius, Ep. 4. Ἡμεῖς α

ἢ ἐν ἡν, αὐτῶν πᾶσι ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι παρασκευῶν ἢ ἡ νύκτα τῇ μὲν αὐτῆν ἡμέρα λογίζονται καὶ ἢ ἐν ἑβδωατον ὄσι πρὸς ἑβδωατον ἢ ἡμεῖς α, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον διαφερόντως αὐτῆν ἀγνοοῦν ἀπραξίαν. This παρασκευῶν of the Hebrews was answerable to the

the coena pura of the Gentiles, as the old Glossary, Coena pura, παροσβεστων, & in Gloss. Latino-Arabico, Parasceue coena pura, id est, preparatio quæ fit pro sabbato. From whence some of the Fathers so interpret the Eves of the Jewish Sabbaths, as Tertullian, Dies observatis & menses & tempora & annos & sabbata, ut opinor, & cœnas puras, & jejunia & dies magnos. *Alto. Marcio. l. 5. c. 4.* Acceleratam vult intelligi sepulturam ne advesperasceret, quando jam propter parasceuen, quam coenam puram Judæi Latine usitatus 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 Latin coena pura, for the Greek παρασκευη. As the Interpreter of S. Chrysostom, *Serm. in Natalem Joh. Bapt.* Quâ enim die conceptus est Dominus, eadem die & passus est; eadem ipsa die coena pura fuit, in qua & luna quartadecima occurrit. So likewise the old Interpreter of Irenæus, Parasceue quæ dicitur coena 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 coena pura. As therefore the coena pura among the Gentiles was that time in which they prepared and sanctified themselves for their sacred Solemnities, so the Jews did make use of that word to signify their sanctification, and of the Greek παρασκευη to testifie the preparation of all things used on their holy days, upon the Eve thereof, or day before. Parasceue Latine preparatio est, sed isto verbo Græco libentius utuntur Judæi in hujusmodi observationibus, etiam qui magis Latine quam Græce loquuntur, *sai. b. S. Aug. Tract. 117. in Joh.* So that the same Father testifieth that the Jews speaking Latin in his time, did sometimes use parasceue, sometimes coena pura, for their Eve of preparation. Otherwise in their own Language they called it יוֹבֵיב or יוֹבֵיבָה; by which generally, they understood the sixth day of the week, the day before the Sabbath. For so they reckoned the days of the week in Breshit Rabba, יוֹבֵיבָה the first of the week; יוֹבֵיב the second, יוֹבֵיבָה the third, יוֹבֵיבָה the fourth, יוֹבֵיבָה the fifth, יוֹבֵיבָה the Eve, יוֹבֵיבָה the Sabbath. Thus in Hebrew יוֹבֵיבָה in Greek παρασκευη, in Latin Coena pura, were used by the Jews for the same day, the Friday or sixth of the week; but not for that alone, but for the Eve of any great Festival which answered to a Sabbath, so that they had their יוֹבֵיבָה, and יוֹבֵיבָה, as παρασκευη τῆς σαββάτου, and παρασκευη τῆς Πάσχα. And when a great Festival fell upon the Sabbath, then as the Fiftivities were both one day, so the Eve to both was the same Friday. And such was the day of preparation on which our Saviour was crucified. a Joh. 19. 42. b Matt. 27. 62. c Exod. 16. 5. d Mark 15. 42. e Luke 23. 54. f John 19. 14. \* Οὐδὲ πῶς λέγει, ὅτι τὴν σαββάτου ἐμοὶ δεκάτῃ, ἀλλὰ ἃ πεποίηκα, ἐν ᾧ κατὰ πάσαις τὰ πάντα ἀρχὴν ἡμέρας ὄγδοῦς ποιήσω, ὅ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κόσμῳ ἀρχὴν διὰ καὶ ἀρχὴν τῶν ἡμερῶν τῶν ὄγδω εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς. Barnabæ Epist. c. 11. Ἡ μὲν ἐν τῷ πνευματικῶν ἀειπαύσις ἐν κωριακῇ ἐν ὁσδοῦ ἢ κωριακῇ ὀνομάζεται. Theodorus Epist. 1. Ἡ δὲ ἐν πολλῇ ἀειτομίῃς κελύουσα τῇ ὄγδω ἡμέρα ἐν παντὸς ἀειτέμεναι τὰ ἡμετέρα, πῶς ὡς ἡ ἀληθινῆς ἀειτομίῃς ὡς ἀειτομίῃς ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ πορνείας, διὰ τῆς ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος ἐν μία τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέρα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς κωριακῆς ἡμῶν. Μία γὰρ τῶν σαββάτων πρώτη κελύουσα τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ τῆς ἀριθμῶν πάλιν τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς κωλοφρείας, ὄγδω καλεῖται, καὶ πρώτη ἔσα μῦρε. Justinus Dial. cum Tryphone. Cùm in septimo die Sabbati nomen fit & observantia constituta, tamen nos in octava die quæ & ipsa prima est, perfecti Sabbati festivitate lætamur. *S. Hilar. Comm. in Psal. Prol.* Hæc octava sententia quæ ad caput redit, perfectumque hominem declarat, significatur fortasse & circumcissione octava die in veteri Testamento, & Domini resurrectione post Sabbatum, quod est utique octavus idemque primus dies. *S. August. de Serm. Dom. in monte, l. 1. c. 11.* Καὶ τὸ εἶδος καὶ τὸ ἀρέπον ἡμῶς ἀπαίσει πᾶσαν κωριακὴν πᾶσαν καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ πανηγυρίζον, ἐπαθήσει ἐν ταύτῃ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῆς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ἡμῶν ἐπευτάνδουσε διὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἰεραῖς γραφαῖς καὶ πρώτῃ κελύουται, ὡς ἀρχὴ ζωῆς ἡμῶν ἰσαρχεσα, καὶ ὄγδω, ἅτε ἰσοβελήκη· ἢ τῆς Ἰεραίων σαββάτισμῶν. Theophilus Alexand.

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. Matth. 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 Eve of the Sabbath, and continuing there the whole Sabbath following, which was the conclusion of that week, and farther resting there still and remaining dead the night which followed that Sabbath, but belonged to the first day of the next week, about the end of that night early in the morning, was revived by the accession and union of his Soul, and rose again out of the sepulchre.

Whereby it came to pass, that the obligation of the day, which was then the Sabbath, died and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnal transmutation revived again at his Resurrection. Well might that day which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the Egyptian servitude resign all the Sanctity or Solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appeared upon which a far greater Redemption was confirmed. One day of seven was set apart by God in imitation of his rest upon the Creation of the world, and that seventh day which was sanctified to the Jews was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from Egypt. At the second delivery of the Law we find this particular cause assigned, Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm, therefore the Lord thy God,

Deut. 5. 15.

com-

commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day. Now this could not be any special reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day; first, because in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation than any other number; secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendered in the body of the commandment it self. There was therefore a double reason rendered by God why the Jews should keep that Sabbath which they did, one Special, as to a seventh day, to shew they worshipped that God who was the Creator of the World; the other Individual, as to that seventh day, to signify their deliverance from the *Ægyptian* bondage, from which that seventh day was dated.

Being then upon the Resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought than that of *Ægypt*, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it than to that, the individual determination of the day did pass upon a stronger reason to another day, always to be repeated by a seventh return upon the reference to the Creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of *Ægypt*, 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 Hebdomadal or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified. The first day because on that *Christ* rose from the dead, and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day; *For by him all things were created that are in heaven and that are in the earth, all things were created by him and for him.*

Exod. 12. 2.

Coloss. 1. 16.

This day did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes and to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God than any such inclination or intention of their own: *For the same day, saith the Evangelist, that is the day on which Christ rose from the dead, at evening, being the first day of the week, the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews.* The second observation was performed voluntarily, *for after eight days 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 were all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and *Thomas* with them. Again, *when the day of Pentecost was fully come, which was also the first day of the week, they were all with one accord in one place, and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost they spake with tongues, preached the Gospel, and the same day were added unto them above three thousand souls.* The same practice of convening we find continued in the following years. *For upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them:* and the same Apostle gave express command concerning the collection for the Saints both to the Churches of *Galatia* and of *Corinth*, *Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him.*

John 20. 19.

John. 20. 26.

Acts. 2. 1.

Acts 2. 41.

Acts 20. 7.

From this Resurrection of our Saviour, and the constant practice of the Apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the *Lord's day*, and is so called by *S. John*, who says of himself in the *Revelation*, *a I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.* And thus the observance of that day, which the Jews did sanctify, ceased, and was buried with our Saviour, and in the stead of it, the religious observance of that day on which the Son of God rose from the dead, by the constant practice of the blessed Apostles was transmitted to the Church of God, and so continued in all Ages.

a Rev. 1. 10.

|| Τῇ τῆς ἡλίου  
λεγεμένη ἡμέ-  
ρα πάντων τῶν  
πόλεων ἢ ἀρχῶν  
μενόντων ὅτι  
τὸ αὐτὸ συν-  
έλευσεν γίνεσθαι,  
Justin. Mart.

ὁ Θεὸς τὸ στό-  
μα

Act. 2. paulo post, Τὴν δὲ τῆς ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τῶν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴν πρώτη ἦν ἡμέραν ἢ

τῷ καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ τρέφας, κόσμον ἐποίησε καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος Σωτὴρ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. Τῆς γὰρ πρὸς τὴν Κερνικὴν ἐσαύρωσαν αὐτὸν, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς Κερνικῆς, ἥτις ὄντιν Ἑλίε φανεί τις Ἀποστόλοις αὐτῶ καὶ μαθηταῖς, ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα εἰς ὅτι σκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδώκευ. *This I take to be, without question, that status dies which is mentioned by Pliny in his Epist. to Trajan.* Affirmabant hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenq; Christo quasi Deo canere. Nobis quibus Sabbata extranea sunt & neomenia & feriæ à Deo aliquando comitant, strenuæ consonant, lusus, convivia constrepunt. O melior fides nationum in suam sectam, quæ nullam solennitatem Christianorum sibi vindicat, non Dominicum Diem, non Pentecostem, *Tertull. de Idol. c. 14.* Nam quod in Judaica circumcissione carnali octavus dies observabatur, sacramentum est in umbra atque imagine ante præmissum, sed veniente Christo in veritate completum. Nam quia octavus dies idem post Sabbatum primus dies futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret & nos vivificaret, & circumcissionem nobis spiritualem daret, hic dies octavus, id est, post sabbatum primus & Dominicus præcessit in imagine, *S. Cyr. l. 3. Epist. 8.* Eusebius reports how Constantine taught his Soldiers to observe the Lord's day, *Καὶ τῆς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐυχῶν ἡγείων κατὰλληλον τῷ κλειαν ἀληθῶς καὶ πρώτῳ ὄντως κλειανῶς καὶ σωτήριον, τῷ δὲ καὶ φωτὸς καὶ ζωῆς ἀθανάσιος τε καὶ ἀγαθῆ παντὸς ἐπινομιον.* *Orat. de Laudib. Constant. c. 9.* Quid est secunda sabbati nisi Dominica dies quæ Sabbatum sequebatur? Dies autem Sabbati erat dierum ordine posterior, sanctificatione legis anterior. Sed ubi finis legis advenit, & resurrectione sua octavum sanctificavit, coepit eadem prima esse quæ octava est, & octava quæ prima, habens ex numeri ordine prærogativum, & ex resurrectione Domini sanctitatem *S. Ambros. Enar. in Psal. 47.* Dicat aliquis, Si dies observari non licet, & menses & tempora & annos, nos quoq; simile crimen incurrimus, quartam Sabbati observantes, & parasceuen, & diem Dominicam, *S. Hier. in Epist. ad Gal. c. 4. v. 10. Anl. S. Aug. in answer to the same objection,* Nam nos quoq; & Dominicum diem & Pascha solenniter celebramus & quaslibet alias Christianas dierum festivitates, *cont. Adimant. c. 16.* Dies Dominicus non Judæis sed Christianis resurrectione Domini declaratus est, & ex illo habere coepit 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 Civit. Dei, l. 22. c. 30.* Dominicum diem Apostoli & Apostolici viri ideo religiosa solennitate habendum sanxerunt, quia in eodem Redemptor noster à mortuis resurrexit. Quiq; 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 Jesus 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 Sabbatissimi in illam transferre, ut quod ipsi in figura, nos celebraremus in veritate. *Max. Taurin. de Pentecost. Hom. 3.* Dominica nobis ideo venerabilis est atq; solennis, quia in ea Salvator venit sol oriens discussis infernorum tenebris, luce resurrectionis emicuit, ac propterea ipsa dies ab hominibus sæculi Dies solis vocatur, quod ortus eum sol justitiæ Christus illuminet. *Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἡμῶν παρασκευῆς, τὸ σάββατον τῆς ταφῆς, ἢ Κυριακῆς τῆς ἀνάστασις, Author. Clem. Constit. l. 5. c. 13.* Ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς Ἰουδαίους καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ δουλάζου, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ αὐτῆς ἡμέρῃ, τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν περιμῶντας· εἴγε δύναιτο, δουλάζει, ὡς Ἰουδαῖοι· εἰ δὲ εὐρησάμεν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ ἡμῶν. *Concil. Laodic. Can. 29.*

This day thus consecrated by the Resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetual badge and cognizance of his Church. As God spake by Moses to the *Exod. 31. 13.* *Israelites, Verily my Sabbath shall ye keep, for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that do 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 this day a sign between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God Jehovah, who did not only create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternal Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the Jews do still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought than that of Ægypt: as the Mahometans religiously observe the sixth day of the week in memory of Mahomet's flight from Mecca, whom they esteem a greater Prophet than our Saviour: as these are known and distinguished in the world by these several celebrations of distinct days in the worship of God; so all which profess the Christian Religion are known 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 hæc die felicius in qua Dominus

Judæis mortuus est, nobis resurrexit? in qua Synagogæ cultus occubuit, & est ortus Ecclesiæ; in qua nos homines fecit tecum 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 profess, to the meditation whereof the Apostle hath given a particular injunction, *Remember that Jesus*

2 Tim. 2. 8.

*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 died was the Lord of life, and though he were crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. By this Resurrection from the dead, he was declared to be the Son of God, and upon the morning of the third day did those words of the Father manifest a most important truth, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. In his death he assured us of his humanity, by his Resurrection he demonstrated his Divinity.*

2 Cor. 13. 4.

Rom. 1. 4.

Acts 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 righteousness: 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 sins for which he suffered were not his own: had no man been a sinner he had not died; had he been a sinner he had not risen again: but dying for those sins which we committed, he rose from the dead to shew that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtain remission of our sins, and justification of our persons, <sup>a</sup> God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful 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. <sup>b</sup> Who then shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again.

Rom. 4. 24, 25.

\* S. Chryso-  
stom excellent-  
ly upon that  
place, Οεγ πωρ  
την αι'ιαν ει-  
πων οτι θανά-  
τω, την αυτην  
κ' αποδειξιν ο  
αναστασεως  
πειται. Δια  
τι γδ εσαυρω-  
θη, φισιν; ε  
δι οικειαν α-  
μαρτιαν κ' θη-  
λον ει ο ανασ-  
τασεως ει γδ  
ην αμαρτωλος,  
δι' ετερης

πωρ ανεση, ει ο ανεση, ευσηλον οπ αμαρτωλος εκ ην; ει ο αμαρτωλος εκ ην, πωρ εσαυρωθη; ει ο δι' ετερης, παντως ανεση. a Rom. 8. 3. b Rom. 8. 33, 34.

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 been 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 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 first-born from the dead, and we the sons of the Resurrection. The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us the members Christ, and by the same spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our Head. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in us. 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 all the dead; For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. As an exemplary cause, in regard that all the Saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the Resurrection of Christ; For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. He shall change our vile bodies that they may be like unto his glorious body: That as we have born the image of the earthy, we may also bear

1 Pet. 1. 3.

Rom. 1. 10.

Col. 1. 18.

Rom. 8. 11.

1 Cor. 15. 22.

Rom. 6. 5.

Phil. 3. 21.

1 Cor. 15. 42.

*the image of the heavenly.* This is the great hope of a Christian, That *Christ* rising from the dead hath obtained the power, and is become the pattern, of his Resurrection. *The breaker is come up before them; they have broken up and have passed through the gate, their King shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.*

Fourthly, it is necessary to profess our Faith in *Christ* risen from the dead, that his Resurrection may effectually work its proper operation in our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our Bodies, so it is also to our Souls. *When we were dead in sins, God quickned us together with Christ. And, as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life.* To continue among the graves of sin while *Christ* is risen, is to incur that reprehension of the Angel, *why seek ye the living among the dead?* To walk in any habitual sin, is either to deny that sin is death, or *Christ* is risen from the dead. Let then *the dead bury the dead*, but let not any Christian bury him who rose from death that he might live. *Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.* There must be a spiritual Resurrection of the Soul before there can be a comfortable Resurrection of the Body. *Blessed and holy is he that hath part in this first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power.*

Having thus explained the manner of *Christ's* Resurrection, and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the dead, we may easily give such a brief account as any Christian may understand what it is he should intend when he makes profession of this part of the Creed; for he is conceived to acknowledge thus much, I freely and fully assent unto this as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute necessity, That the eternal Son of God, who was crucified and died for our sins, did not long continue in the state of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise himself by re-uniting the same Soul which was separated to the same body which was buried, and so rose the same man: and this he did the third day from his death; so that dying on *Friday* the sixth day of the week, the day of the preparation of the *Sabbath*, and resting in the grave the *Sabbath-day*, on the morning of the first day of the week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious observation until his coming again. And thus I believe *the third day he rose again from the dead.*

ARTICLE VI.

He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the Right Hand of God the Father Almighty.

THIS Article hath received no variation, but only in the addition of the name of God, and the attribute Almighty; the \* Ancients using it briefly thus, He ascended into Heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father: It containeth two distinct parts: one transient, the other permanent: one as the way, the other as the end: the first is Christ's Ascension, the second is his Session.

\* Ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dextram Patris. Rufinus in Symb. S. Aug. in Enchirid. Maximus Taurin.

brysol. Author Expos. Symb. ad Catechumenos, Venantius Fortunatus, the Latin and Greek MSS. set forth by the Arch-bishop of Armagh. S. August. de Fide & Symb. hath it, Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris; to which was afterwards added Omnipotentis. Sedet ad dextram Patris omnipotentis. Euseb. Gallican. Sedet ad dextram Dei Patris omnipotentis, Etherius Hexam. & Author Sermonum de Tempore, the Greek and Latin MSS. in Bennet College Library.

In the Ascension of Christ these words of the Creed propound to us three considerations and no more: the first of the Person, He; the second of the Action, ascended; the third of the Termination into heaven. Now the Person being perfectly the same which we have considered in the precedent Articles, he will afford no different speculation but only in conjunction with this particular Action. Wherefore I conceive these three things necessary and sufficient for the illustration of Christ's Ascension: First, to 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 been represented typically, and declared 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 sins of the world: for the making this atonement, the High-priest was appointed once every year to enter into the Holy of Holies, and no 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 Veil before the Mercy-seat, which is upon the Ark, that he die not. None entered into that Holy Place but the High-priest alone; and he himself could enter thither but once in the year; and thereby 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 eternal 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 blood thereof did pass through the rest of the Tabernacle, and with that blood enter into the Holy of Holies; so was the Messias here to offer up himself, and being slain to pass through all the Courts of this world below, and with his blood to enter into the highest Heavens, the most glorious feat of the Majesty of God. Thus Christ's Ascension was represented typically.

Lev. 16. 2.

Heb. 9. 11, 12.

\* Εἰ τις τῆς σκηνῆς κατανοήσῃ τὴν πύξιν, καὶ τὴν ἱερῶς ἰσθμῶν πύξιν, καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν οὗς ἀεὶ τὴν ἱερουργίαν χροῦμεθα τὸν τε νομοθέτην ἀρήσει θεῖον ἀνδρα καὶ ματαίως ἡμᾶς

καὶ ἄλλων τὰς κλασσημίας ἀκόντας ἕκαστα γὰρ τέπων εἰς ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶ ὅλων, εἰς ἀφθόνως ἐδέλει καὶ μὴ συέσεως σκοπεῖν, ἀρήσει γὰρ ὅτι τὴν τε γὰρ σκηνὴν περὶ ἀκούσια πύξων ἔσαν νεύμας εἰς τεία, καὶ δύο μέρη τῶσιν αἰεὶ τὴν ἱερῶσιν, ὡς ἀφῆρ βέβηλον πνα. καὶ κρινδὶ τόπων, τὴν γὰρ καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἀποσημαίνει καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα πᾶσιν ἔσιν ἐπιβάται τὴν ὅ τείτλω μὴ εἰν μὴ ὡς πείργεται τὸ θεῶ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸ ἕανδὸν ἀνεπίσταπν ἔδ ἀνθρώποις. Joseph Antiq.

*antiq. l. 5. c. 8. Where it is to be observed, that the place which S. Paul calls the first Tabernacle, Josephus terms βέβαιον πνεύματος κοινὸν τόπον, a common and prophane place, as representing this world in which we live, and our life and conversation here: as the Apostle seems to speak, Heb. 9. 1. Εἴτε ἢ ἐν ἡμῶν ἢ ἐν πρώτῃ σακκῶν διακονίᾳ λατρείᾳ τὸ τε ἄγιον κοσμητικόν. For ἄγιον κοσμητικόν sanctum seculare, or as the Syriack בית קודשא עלמניא domus sancta mundana, may well be that part of the Tabernacle which represented this world, and therefore termed common and prophane in respect of that more holy part which represented heaven.*

*a Psal. 68. 18. This place must necessarily be understood of the Messias, by reason of that high place to which no other conqueror 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*

The same Ascension was also declared prophetically, as we read in the Prophet David, *Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men*: which phrase *on high* in the Language of David signifying Heaven, could be applied properly to no other conquerour but the *Messias*, not to *Moses*, not to *David*, not to *Joshua*, not to any but the *Christ*; who was to conquer sin, and death, and hell, and triumphing over them to ascend unto the highest Heavens, and thence to send the precious and glorious gifts of the Spirit unto the sons of men. The Prophecy of *Micah* did foretel as much, even in the opinion and confession of the *Jews* themselves, by those words, *The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gates and are gone out by it; and their Kings shall pass before them, and the Lord at the head of them*. And thus *Christ's* Ascension was declared prophetically as well as typically; which was our first Consideration.

*language of the Chaldee Paraphrase, לבי שנתחד חוב, return to the house of thy majesty; and Psal. 93. 4. אדניי במרום יהיה, the Lord on high is mighty, Chald. כשמי מרומה, in the upper heavens Psal. 71. 19. Thy righteousness, O Lord, is עדמרום, usque ad excellum; the Chald. again, ען שמי מרומה. In the same manner in this place, thou hast ascended the firmament: and he addeth immediately משה נביא O thou Prophet Moses: yet there is a plain contradiction in that interpretation; for if it were meant of Moses it cannot be the firmament; if it were the firmament, it cannot be understood of Moses, for he never ascended thither. \* This breaker up is by the confession of the Jews the title of the Messias. So the Author of Sepher Abchath Ruchal in his description of the coming of the Messias maketh use of this place. And the same appeareth farther by that saying of Moses Haddarshan in Bereshit Rabba, נטעה מל מעלה אברהם נטעה מל מעלה זה משה זה אברהם נטעה מל מעלה The plantation from below, is Abraham, the plantation from above is Messias, as it is written, the breaker is come up before them, &c So he on Gen. 40. 9. Again the same Bereshit Rabba, Gen. 44. 18. אמיתו כשיעלו הגליות מניהם זה השכינה על הר הזיתים When shall we rejoyce? when the feet of the Shecinah shall stand upon the Mount of Olives; and again, אמיתו כשיעלו הגליות מניהם זה השכינה על הר הזיתים When? when the captives shall ascend from Hell, and Shecinah in the head, as it is written (Mic. 2. 13.) Their King shall pass before them, and the Lord in the head of them.*

Secondly, whatsoever was thus represented and foretold of the promised *Messias*, was truly and really performed by our *Jesus*. That only begotten and eternal Son of God who by his divinity was present in the Heavens while he was on earth, did by a local translation of his 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 lived and died and rose again.

*John 20. 17.*

*John 3. 13.*

The Ascent of *Christ* into Heaven was not metaphorical or figurative, as if there were no more to be understood by it, but only that he obtained a more heavenly and glorious state or condition after his Resurrection. For whatsoever alteration was made in the body of *Christ* when he rose, whatsoever glorious qualities it was invested with thereby, that was not his Ascension, as appeareth by those words which he spake to *Mary*, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father*. Although he had said before to *Nicodemus*, *No man ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven*; which words imply that he had then ascended: yet even those concern not this Ascension. For that was therefore only 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 hypostatical union was in Heaven; from whence speaking after the manner of men, he might well say, that he had ascended into Heaven; because whatsoever was first on Earth and then in Heaven, we say ascended into Heaven. Wherefore beside that



that grounded upon the hypostatical union, beside that glorious condition upon his Resurrection, there was yet another and that more proper Ascension : for after he had both those ways ascended, it was still true that he had not yet ascended to his Father.

Now this kind of Ascension, by which Christ had not yet ascended when he spake to *Mary* after his Resurrection, was not after to be performed ; for at the same time he said unto *Mary*, *Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father.* And when this Ascension was performed, it appeared manifestly to be a true local translation of the Son of man as man from these parts of the world below into the heavens above, by which that body which was before locally present here on earth, and was not so then present in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, and no longer locally present in earth. For *when he had spoken unto the Disciples, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them, and so was corporally present with them, even while he blessed them he parted from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight, and so he was carried up into heaven, while they looked stedfastly towards heaven as he went up.* This was a visible departure, as it is described, a real removing of that body of *Christ* which was before present with the Apostles ; and that body living after the Resurrection, by virtue of that soul which was united to it : and therefore the Son of God according to his humanity was really and truly translated from these parts below unto the heavens above, which is a proper local ascension.

Luc. 24. 50,  
51.  
Acts I. 9, 10.

Thus was Christ's Ascension visibly performed in the presence and sight of the Apostles, for the confirmation of the reality and the certainty thereof. \* They did not see him when he rose, but they saw him when he ascended ; because an eye-witness was not necessary unto the act of his Resurrection, but it was necessary unto the act of his Ascension. It was sufficient that *Christ 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 heaven, being the Session was not to be visible to them on earth, therefore it was necessary they should be eye-witnesses of the act who were not with the same eyes to behold the effect.

\* Βλεπόντων  
μὲν ἐκ ἀνάστη,  
βλεπόντων ὃ  
ἐπήρθη ἐπι-  
δων ἐν ταῦτα  
ἢ ὄψις τὸ πᾶν  
ἔργου καὶ γὰρ τὸ  
ἀναστάσεως τὸ  
μὲν τέλος εἶδον,  
τὸ ὃ ἀρχὴν  
ἔκεῖ καὶ τῆς  
ἀναλήψεως τὸ  
μὲν ἀρχὴν εἶδον,  
τὸ ὃ τέλος

ἔκεῖ παρεῖλκε γὰρ εἰπεῖν τὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶδεν, αὐτὰ τὰ ταῦτα φθραγομένη παρόντων, καὶ τὰ μνήματα, διὰ τὸ ὅτι ἐκ εἶπεν  
ἐκεῖ ἄλλα τὸ μὲν τὸτο λόγῳ εἶδει μαθεῖν, S. Chr. Hom. 2. in Act. Apost.

Beside the eye-witnesses of the Apostles, there was added the testimony of the Angels ; 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 testify of his reception, For *a behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven ? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.* We must therefore acknowledge and confess against all the wild || Heresies of old, that the eternal Son of God who died and rose again, did with the same Body and Soul, with which he died and rose, ascend up to heaven ; which was the second Particular considerable in the Article.

\* Ἐπειδὴν ἐκ  
ἀρχῆσιν οἱ ἄγγε-  
λοι δὲ εἶδον  
τὸ ὄψιν, εἰδὲ  
παιδεῦσαι πό-  
τερον εἰς τὸν  
ἔρανδον ἀνῆλ-  
θεν ἢ ὡς εἰς τὸ  
ἔρανδον, ὅρα τί  
γίνεσθαι ὅτι μὲν  
αὐτὸς ὄσιν Ἰη-  
σοῦς ἠδεσαν εἶ-  
δὲν διελόμετο  
πρὸς αὐτοῦ  
(πρόβωθεν γὰρ

ἐκ ἐνῆν εἰδὼτας γινώσκαι) ὅτι ὃ εἰς τὸ ἔρανδον ἀναλαμβάνεται, αὐτοὶ λοιπὸν εἰδόμενον οἱ ἄγγελοι. S. Chrys. Hom. 2. in Acta  
Apost. a Acts I. 10, 11. || The various Heresies in the Primitive time concerning the humanity of Christ ascended into  
heaven

heaven are briefly touched by Tertullian; Ut & illi erubescant, qui adfirmant carnem in coelis vacuum sensu ut vaginam exempto Christo federe, aut qui carnem & animam tantundem, aut tantummodo animam, carnem vero non jam, De carne Christi, c. 24. Of which Gregory Nazianzen, Εἰ τις ἀποθεθεῖσθαι νῦν τὸ σῶμα λέγει, καὶ γυμνῶ εἶναι τὴν θεότητα σώμα. Ἰ. ἀλλὰ μὴ καὶ τὸ περὶ σῶμα καὶ εἶναι καὶ ἦξεν, καὶ ἴδω τὴν δόξαν τῆς παρυσίας, Epist. i. ad Cledonium. The Apellitæ taught that Christ left his body dissolved in the air, and so ascended into heaven without it; Hunc Apellem dicunt quidam etiam de Christo tam falsa sensisse, ut diceret eum non quidem carnem duxisse de coelo, sed ex elementis mundi accepisse, quæ mundo reddidit cum sine carne resurgens in coelum ascendit, S. Aug. Hæres. 23. This opinion of Apelles is thus delivered by Epiphanius in his own words, Ἐν τῷ ἔρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπερανίων ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν γλῶσσο καὶ συνήγαγεν ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων σώμα. — Ἐδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν παθεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι, καὶ ἐσαυρώθη ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἔκκειν αὐτῷ τὴν σάρκα πῶς ἑαυτὸς μαθηταῖς, καὶ ἀναλύσας αὐτῷ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἑαυτὸς ἀπεμέρισε πάλιν ἐκάστω τῶν σωματικῶν τὸ ἴδιον μέρος, τὸ δερμὸν τῷ δερμῶ, τὸ ψυχρὸν τῷ ψυχρῶ, τὸ ξηρὸν τῷ ξηρῶ, τὸ ὑγρὸν τῷ ὑγρῶ καὶ ἔπος διαλύσας ἀπ' αὐτῶ πάλιν τὸ ἑνσαρῶν σῶμα ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ἕρανόν, ὅθεν καὶ ἦκε. Hæres. 44. Of whom Gregory Nazianzene is to be understood in that Epistle before cited, ἢ εἰς τὸ ἀέρα ἐχέθη καὶ διεκώθη, ὡς φωνῆς φύσις, καὶ ὁδμῆς φύσις, καὶ ἀσραπῆς δόξου. ἢ καὶ ἰσαμῶνις.

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 is the proper termination of Christ's 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 called 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 pass through the heavens, because he was *a made higher than 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 c into that within the veil*, there is his passage through the heavens: *d 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 you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before*? Had he been there before in body, it had been no such wonder that he should have ascended thither again: but that his body should ascend unto that place where the Majesty of God was most resplendent; that the flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone should be seated far above all Angels and Archangels, all principalities and powers, even at the right hand of God; this was that which Christ propounded as worthy of their greatest admiration. Whatsoever heaven then is higher than all the rest which are called heavens; whatsoever sanctuary is holier than all which are called holies, whatsoever place is of greatest dignity in all those Courts above, into that place did he ascend, where in the splendor of his Deity he was before he took upon him our humanity.

As therefore when we say Christ ascended, we understand a literal and local ascent, not of his Divinity, (which possesseth all places, and therefore being 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 above all those celestial bodies which we see, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the || Sun.

Heb. 4. 14.  
\* We read it indeed into the heavens, but the Original imports as much as through; διελθὼν τὰ ἕρανα, Vul. qui penetravit coelos  
a Heb. 7. 26.  
b Eph. 4. 10.  
c Heb. 6. 19.  
d Heb. 9. 12, 26.

The Seleucia- ni and Hermi- ani taught that the body of Christ ascended no farther than the Sun, in which it was deposited; of whom Philastrius, and out of him S. Austin thus, Negant Salvatorem in carne federe ad dextram Patris, sed ea se exuisse perhibent, eamque in Sole posuisse, accipientes occasio- nem de Psalmo, In Sole posuit Tabernaculum suum, Hæres. 59. The same opinion Gregory Nazianzene attributeth to the Manicheans.

Πᾶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα νῶν, εἰ μὴ μὲν τῶν προσλαβόντων; ἔ γὰρ δὴ καὶ τῶν Μανιχαίων λίβε τῶν ἡλίου ἐπατάθηται ἵνα τιμῆν δὲ τῆς ἀτιμίας. Epist. 1. ad Cledonium. And S. Austin says they taught the Sun to be the Christ, Manichæi Solem istum oculis carneis visibilem, expositum & publicum, non tantum hominibus, sed etiam pecoribus ad videndum, Christum Dominum esse putarunt. Traët. 34. in Job. This opinion is more clearly set down, but without a name, in the Citena Patrum on the 18. Psalm, Οὐ γὰρ προσεκήριον τοῖς ἁγίοις Αἰρετικῶν φλυαφοῖς οἱ φασιν μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν τῇ ἡλιακῇ Σφαίρᾳ ἀπέθετο ὃ ἐρόρησε σῶμα φυλάττειν μέχρι τῆς δευτέρας παρασίας. This was the old Heresie of Hermogenes, as is related by Theodoret, Οὗτος (ὁ Ἐρμογόνης) τῶν Κυρίων τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔπεν ἀποθεῖσθαι, τὸν δὲ διάβολον καὶ τὸν δαίμονα εἰς τὴν ἄλλω ἀναχέειν εἶναι. Hæret. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 19.

It was necessary to profess this Article of Christ's Ascension, first for the confirmation and augmentation of our Faith. Our Faith is thereby confirmed, in that we believe in him who is received unto the Father, and therefore certainly came from the Father; his Father sent him and we have received the Message from him, and are assured that it is the same message which he was sent to deliver, because he is so highly rewarded by him that sent him for delivering it. Our Faith is thereby exalted and augmented, as being the evidence of things not seen. The further the object is removed from us, the more of Faith hath that act which embraceth it, Christ said unto Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed: and that blessedness by his Ascension he hath left to the whole Church. Thus Christ ascended is the ground and glory of our Faith; and by virtue of his being in heaven our belief is both encouraged and commended; for his ascent is the cause, and his absence the crown of our Faith; because he ascended we the more believe, and because we believe in him who hath ascended, our Faith is the more accepted.

Heb. 11. 1. || Magnarum hic vigor est mentium, & valde fidelium lumen est animarum incuntemer 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 in 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. August. Traët. 68. in Job. 1 John 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 exclusion. There are many mansions in his Father's house. And when he spake of ascending thither, he said expressly to his Disciples, I go to prepare a place for you, and will come again and receive you unto my self, that where I am, there ye may be also. The first fruits of our nature are ascended, and the rest is sanctified. This is the new and living way which he consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh. And hence we have our hope as an anchor of the soul both sure and stedfast, which entred into that within the veil, 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 only so, but they which follow are to go on 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 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.

\* Christi ascensio nostra proventus est, & quo præcessit gloria capitis, eo spes vocatur & corporis. Leo de Ascen Ser. 1. John 14. 3. || Διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἁγίου ὁφείλουσαν ἐπιειδῶν σήμερον τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῆς ἡμετέρας σαρκαλιότητος, τῆς ἐναντίας Χριστοῦ ἀνήγαγε S. Chrys. Orat. 1. de Ascens. Διὸ λοιπὸν χρῆσθαι ἐχόμεναι τὰς ἐπιειδῶν πειδῶν πρὸς τὴν

ἡμετέραν ἀπαρχὴν ἀφορῶντες. Ibid. Orat. 2. Heb. 10. 20. Heb. 6. 19, 20. \* There is a double notion of προδρομος, in this purpose, one of a man sent before to make preparations for others which follow; in which it is well observed by S. Chrysostome. Ὁ δὲ πρόδρομος τινῶν ἐστὶ πρόδρομος, ὡπερ Ἰωάννης τῆς Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐκ εἶπεν ἀπλῶς εἰσῆλθεν. ἀλλ' ὁ ἀπαρχοδρομος ἑστὶν ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν. ὡς καὶ ἡμῶν ὁφειλόντων καταλαβεῖν. Οὐ πολὺ γὰρ τῶν προδρομῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπομῶν ὁφείλει εἶναι τὸ μέγεθος. ἐπεὶ ἐστὶν εἰς πρόδρομος τῶν γὰρ πρόδρομον καὶ τὰς ἐπομῶνας ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ χριστῶ ὁδῶ καὶ τὸν ἑὸν ὁδῶν, τὴν

διεσπασαλιν βόειν. 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 ἔσται τὸ ἀνήθη τὸ ἐπιπέσον ἢ ἐλπίδῃ ἢ δόξῃ ἐπ' ἀκρὰ τῶν ἔργων ὡς πρῶτον ἔσται, ἢ τὰ προακμαζόντα σῦκα. Itege Πρῶτον ἔσται; for they indeed are properly τὰ προακμαζόντα σῦκα, præcoces ficus: For so Theophrastus, speaking particularly of Ἰουκῆς, hath these words, ὑπολειπομένης γὰρ πλείονος τῆς τοιαύτης ὑγρότητος, ὅταν ἀπὸ ὀπίσθενται μαλακῆς καὶ ὑγρῆς καὶ θερμῆς, ἐξεκαλέσεται τὴν βλάστησιν ὅτι ἢ τὸτο συμβαίνει φανερόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ τῶν μέρους ὁ καρπὸς ἀνίσταται, ὅθεν καὶ οἱ πρῶτον ἔσται. De causis Plant. lib. 5. cap. 1. Ὁ paulo post, Πάλιν ἢ τῶν πρῶτον ἔσται αἰὲν ἔσται, ὅσον ἢ τε Λακωνικὴ καὶ Λυκομαρτικὴ καὶ ἕτεροι πλείους, αἰὲν ἔσται. The first fruits of the early figs were called πρῶτον ἔσται, and the tree which bare them προτεεινή. Now as this early fruit doth fore-run the latter fruit of the same tree, and comes to ripeness and perfection in its 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.

<sup>1</sup> Ephes. 2. 6. As therefore <sup>1</sup> God hath quickned us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together by virtue of his resurrection; so hath he also made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, by virtue of his ascension. We are already seated there || in him, and hereafter shall be seated by him; in him already as in our head, which is the ground of our hope; by him hereafter, as by the cause conferring, when hope shall be swallowed up in fruition.

|| τῆς κεφαλῆς καθεζομένης καὶ τὸ σῶμα συγκαθήμεν. Διὰ τὸτο ἐπιγὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ. In locum.

<sup>2</sup> Matth. 6. 21. <sup>3</sup> John 12. 32. <sup>4</sup> 2 Kings 2. 2.

Thirdly, the profession of Faith in Christ ascended, is necessary for the exaltation of our affections. <sup>2</sup> For where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also. <sup>3</sup> 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 powerful ought they to be in reference to his ascension? <sup>4</sup> 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. <sup>5</sup> If we be risen with Christ, we must seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. If we be dead, and our life hid in Christ with God, we must set our affection on things above, not on things on earth. Christ is ascended into heaven to teach us, that we are strangers and pilgrims here, as all our fathers were, and that another country belongs unto us: from whence we <sup>6</sup> as strangers and pilgrims should learn to abstain from fleshly lusts, and not mind earthly things; as knowing that we are <sup>7</sup> Citizens of heaven, from whence we look for our Saviour, the Lord Jesus, yea <sup>8</sup> fellow Citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God. We should trample upon our sins, and subdue the lusts of the flesh, that our conversation may be correspondent to our Saviour's condition; that where the eyes of the Apostles were forced to leave him, thither our thoughts may follow him.

<sup>5</sup> Col. 3. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Pet. 2. 11. <sup>7</sup> Phil. 3. 19, 20. <sup>8</sup> Ephes. 2. 19.

John 16. 7.

Fourthly, the Ascension of Christ is a necessary Article of the Creed in respect of those great effects which immediately were to follow it, and did absolutely depend upon it. The blessed Apostles had never preached the Gospel, had they not been indued with power from above; but none of that power had they received, if the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner had not descended: And the Holy Ghost had not come Down, except our Saviour had ascended first. For he himself, when he was to depart from his Disciples, grounded the necessity of his departure upon the certainty of this truth, saying, *If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you.* 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, until the Son of God had ascended into heaven; being it was not fit that the second Advocate should officiate on earth, till the first Advocate had entred upon his Office in heaven; therefore in respect of this great work the Son of God must necessa-

necessarily ascend, and in reference to that necessity we may well be obliged to confess that Ascension.

Upon these considerations we may easily conclude what every Christian is obliged to confess in those words of our Creed, *He ascended into Heaven*: for thereby he is understood to express thus much, I am fully persuaded, that the only-begotten and eternal Son of God, after he rose from the dead, did with the same Soul and body with which he rose, by a true and local translation convey himself from the earth on which he lived, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestial Orbs, until he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the Majesty of God. And thus I believe in *Jesus Christ who ascended into heaven,*

### And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty

THE second part of the Article containeth two Particulars; the Session of the Son, and the Description of the Father: the first sheweth that *Christ* upon his ascension is set down *at the right hand of God*: the second assureth us that the God, at whose right hand *Christ* is set down, is the *Father Almighty*.

For the Explication of *Christ's* Session, three things will be necessary; First, to prove that the promised *Messias* was to sit at the right hand of God; Secondly, to 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 pre-typified and foretold. *Joseph* who was betrayed and sold by his brethren, was an express type of *Christ*, and though in many things he represented the *Messias*, yet in none more than in this, that being taken out of the prison he was exalted to the Supreme power of *Egypt*. For thus *Pharaoh* spake to *Joseph*, *Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. And Pharaoh took off the ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt.* Thus *Joseph* had the execution of all the Regal power committed unto him, all Edicts and Commands were given out by him, the managing of all affairs was through his hands, only the authority by which he moved remained in *Pharaoh* still. This was a clear representation of the Son of man, who by his sitting on the right hand of God, obtained power to rule and govern all things both in heaven and earth, (especially as the ruler of his house, that is, the Church,) with express command that all things, both in heaven, and earth, and under the Earth, should bow down before him: but all this in the name of the Father; to whom the throne is still reserved, in whom the original authority still remains. And thus the Session of the *Messias* was pre-typified.

The same was also expressly foretold, not only in the sense, but in the phrase. *The Lord said unto my Lord, saith the Prophet David, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.* The Jews have endeavoured to avoid this Prophecy, but with no success: some make the person to

Gen. 41. 40;  
42, 43.

Psal. 110. 1.

Justin Martyr testifies of the Jews in his age, καὶ τὸν ἄλλοι ἔτερον, ὅτι ἐστὶν Ἐζεχίαν τὸν βασιλέα ἐξηγήσασθαι τοιαῦτα ἔκ.

whom God speaks to be || Ezechias, some \* Abraham, some Zorobabel, others † David, others: the people of Israel; and because the Prophecy cannot belong to him who made the Psalm, therefore they which attribute the prediction to Abraham, tell us the Psalm was penned by his \* Steward Eliezer: they which expound it of David, say that one of his Musicians was Author of it.

Justin Martyr, Dialoz. cum Tryphone. And out of him Tertullian, citing this Psalm. Sed necesse est ad meam sententiam pertinere defendam eas Scripturas, quas & Judæi nobis avocare conantur. Dicunt demque hunc Psalmum in Ezechiam ceptinisse, quia is sederit ad dexteram templi, & hostes ejus averterit Deus & absumpserit. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. c. 9. \* So S. Chrystome speaking of the Jews, Τίνα ἂν ἐνενοίη τὸν λέγοντά φασιν; τὸν Θεόν. ἢ τὸν ἀκούοντα; ἢ Ἀβραάμ. ἢ Ἐζεχίαν τὸν βασιλέα; ἢ ἄλλοι ἔτερον, ad locum. Ita Catena Græca, Οἱ ἰσραηλῖται, τὸ γελοϊότερον, εἰς τὸν Ἀβραάμ ἠρῶντες λέγουσι καὶ τὸν Θεόν. And this Exposition is now followed by Solomon Jarchi and Lipmannus, Jarchi acknowledging it to be the ancient, **וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ כִּדְבָרְךָ אֲמַרְנוּ** † This is the Exposition of the later Rabbins, as of Aben Ezra and David Kimchi, who attribute the subject of the Psalm to David. And not only they, but the ancienter Rabbins since our Saviour's time, as appeareth by those words of S. Chrystome, καὶ τὰ ἐπιόρτα ἢ δὲ νομοιοῦσι ὅτι ἐδὲν ἔπειτα τὸν Ζωροβὰβηλ εἰσαῦθα εἰρηται, ἐδὲν ἔπειτα τὸν Δαβίδ. ἐδὲν ἔπειτα αὐτὸν ἱερωσύνην τετίμηται. Ἄλλα καὶ ἕτερά τινά λέγουσι τῶν ἐπιόρτων ἔπειτα τὸν λαὸν λέγοντες ταῦτα εἰρηδοῦναι, ὅπως ἢ ἢ τὸν Δαβίδ, ἢ τὸν Ζωροβὰβηλ, ἢ τὸν λαὸν ταῦτα ἀρμόσιον; S. Chrystome. \* To which purpose saith S. Chrystome, concerning the Jews of his time, Τί γὰρ φασιν ἄλλοι πόλιν; ὅτι ὁ παῖς τὸν Ἀβραάμ ταῦτα λέγει ἔπειτα τὸν Κυεῖν τὸ ἑαυτὸ.

As for that objection which is made by Aben Ezra, that it is not the Psalm of David, but penned for him in the honour of David, because the title is **לַדָּוִד** as if it were a Psalm for David, not of David: it is by no means to be admitted, because it may not only very well signify a Psalm made by David, but if it do not, there is no title which shews any Psalm to be his, and some of them we are sure are his, Luke 20. 42. **τί ἐν, ἐπέμοι, Ζωροβὰβελ, Κυεῖος τὸν Δαβίδ;** ἢ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι λόγον, ὅς ἢ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ μεγάλης τιμῆς Δαβίδ κέκληται; S. Chrystost. Justin Martyr, in opposition to their pretence of Ezechias, ἱερὸς ἢ ὅτι ἔτε γέγονεν Ἐζεχίας, ἕτε δὲν ἀλόνιθ ἱερωσύνη Θεοῦ, ἐδὲ ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆν τοιοῦτων. Dial. cum Tryphone; and from him Tertullian. Quod & in ipso hic accedit, Tu es Sacerdos in ævum. Nec sacerdos autem Ezechias, nec in ævum, est fuisse. Secundum Ordinem, inquit, Melchisedech. Quid Ezechias ad Melchisedech Altissimi sacerdotem, & quidem non circumcisum? Adv. Marcion l. 5. c. 9. and so S. Chrystome in the words before mentioned. As in the Midrash Tillim, **פְּסַלְמֵי מִשׁוּב מִלֵּךְ** 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 at my right hand. So Moses Haddarshan on Gen. 18. Hereafter God holy and blessed shall set the King Messias **לְיָמֵינוּ** on his right hand, as it is written (Psal. 110.) The Lord said, &c.

But first it is most certain that David was the Pen-man 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 less the people of Israel (to whom some of the Jews referred it) who were not the Lords but the subjects of that David. Beside, he which is said to sit at the right hand of God, is also said to be a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech: but neither Abraham, nor Ezechias, nor any which the Jews have mentioned was ever any \* Priest of God. Again, our Saviour urged this Scripture against the Pharisees, saying, *What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he?* they say unto him, *The Son of David.* He saith unto them, *How then doth David in Spirit, call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son? And no man was able to answer him a word.* From whence 'tis evident that the Jews of old, even the Pharisees, the most accurate and skilful amongst them, did interpret the Psalm of the Messias; for if they had conceived the Prophecy belonged either to Abraham, or David, or any of the rest since mentioned by the Jews, they might very well, and questionless would have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the son of David. It was therefore the general opinion of the Church of the Jews before our Saviour, and of divers :: Rabbins since his death, that this prediction did concern the Kingdom of Christ. And thus the Session of the Messias at the right hand of God, was not only represented typically, but foretold prophetically: which is our first Consideration.

\* This is the Argument which the Fathers used against the Jews, as Justin Martyr, in opposition to their pretence of Ezechias, ἱερὸς ἢ ὅτι ἔτε γέγονεν Ἐζεχίας, ἕτε δὲν ἀλόνιθ ἱερωσύνη Θεοῦ, ἐδὲ ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆν τοιοῦτων. Dial. cum Tryphone; and from him Tertullian. Quod & in ipso hic accedit, Tu es Sacerdos in ævum. Nec sacerdos autem Ezechias, nec in ævum, est fuisse. Secundum Ordinem, inquit, Melchisedech. Quid Ezechias ad Melchisedech Altissimi sacerdotem, & quidem non circumcisum? Adv. Marcion l. 5. c. 9. and so S. Chrystome in the words before mentioned. As in the Midrash Tillim, **פְּסַלְמֵי מִשׁוּב מִלֵּךְ** 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 at my right hand. So Moses Haddarshan on Gen. 18. Hereafter God holy and blessed shall set the King Messias **לְיָמֵינוּ** on his right hand, as it is written (Psal. 110.) The Lord said, &c.

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

fit down at the right hand of God. His Ascension was the way to his Session, and his Session the end of his Ascension; as the Evangelist expresseth it, *He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God*; or as the Apostle, *God raised Christ from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places*. There could be no such Session without an Ascension; and *David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool*. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, let all the blind and wilful Jews be convinced of this truth, that God hath not set at his own right hand neither Abraham nor David, neither Ezechias nor Zerubbabel, but hath made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ.

Mark 16. 19.

Acts 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, until I make thine enemies thy footstool*. But Christ was so assured of this honour, that before the Council of the Chief Priests and the elders of the People, when he foresaw his death contrived, and his Cross prepared, even then he expressed the confidence of his expectation, saying, *Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God*. And thus our Jesus, whom we worship as the true promised *Messias*, is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God. Which was our second Consideration.

Heb. 1. 13.

Luke 22. 69.

1 Pet. 3. 22.

Our next inquiry is, what may be the utmost importance of that phrase, and how it is applicable unto *Christ*. The phrase consists of two parts, and both to be taken metaphorically: First therefore, we must consider what is the *right hand of God*, in the Language of the Scriptures; Secondly, what it is to sit down at that right hand. God being a Spirit can have no material or corporeal parts; and consequently as he hath no body, so in a proper sense can he have no || hands at all: but because God is pleased to descend to our capacity; and not only to speak by the mouths of men, but also, after the manner of men, he expresseth that which is in him by some analogy with that which belongs to us. The hands of man are those organical parts which are most \* active, and executive of our power; by those the strength of our body is expressed, and most of our natural and artificial actions are performed by them. From whence the power of God, and the exertion or execution of that power is signified by the hand of God. Moreover being by a general custom of the world the right hand is more used than the left, and by that general use acquireth a greater firmitude and strength, therefore the *right hand* of God signifieth the exceeding great and infinite power of God.

¶ 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 tori, validæ ad operandum manus, & proceribus digitis habiles ad tenendum: Hinc aptior usus operandi, hinc scribendi elegantia, & ille calamus scribæ velociter scribentis, quo divinæ vocis exprimuntur oracula. Manus est quæ cibum ori ministrat; manus est quæ præclaris enitet factis, quæ conciliatrix divinæ gratiæ sacris infertur altaribus, per quam offerimus & sumimus sacramenta cœlestia. Manus est quæ operatur pariter atque dispensat divinæ mysteria, cujus vocabulo non 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, because the most honourable place amongst men is the right hand, (as when *Bathsheba* went unto King *Solomon*, he sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the Kings mother, and she sat on his right hand) therefore the *right hand* of God signifies the glorious Majesty of God.

1 King. 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 celestial happiness and perfect felicity; according

*Pfal.* 16. 11. according to that of the Psalmist, *In thy presence is fulness 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 expressly said,

*Matt.* 27. 64. *Mark* 14. 62. *Luke* 22. 69. *Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power.*

|| Secundum consuetudinem nostram illi confessus offertur qui aliquo opere

perfecto honoris gratia promeretur ut sedeat. Ita ergo & homo Jesus Christus passione sua diabolum superans, resurrectione sua inferna referans, tanquam perfecto opere ad coelos victor adveniens, audit à Deo Patre, *Sede ad dextram meam.*

*Max. Taurin. Hom. 1 de Pentecoste.* <sup>1</sup> Heb. 1. 3. <sup>2</sup> Heb. 8. 1.

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, <sup>1</sup> *When he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:* and again, <sup>2</sup> *We have an High-Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.*

\* Ad dextram intelligendum

est dictum esse in summa beatitudine, ubi iustitia & 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. Arrian* Beatus est à beatitudine, quæ dextera Patris vocatur; ipsius beatitudinis nomen est dextera Patris. *De Symb. ad Catech.* Salus temporalis & carnalis in sinistra est, salus æterna cum Angelis in dextra est. Ideo jam in ipsa immortalitate positus Christus dicitur sedere ad dextram Dei. Non enim Deus habet in seipso dextram aut sinistram; sed dextera Dei dicitur felicitas illa, quæ quoniam ostendi non potest, tale nomen accepit. *S. Aug. in Psal. 137.*

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 painful and shameful death, he resteth above in unspeakable joy, and everlasting \* felicity.

As for the other part of the phrase, that is, his *Session*, we must not look upon it as determining any posture of his body in the heavens, correspondent to the inclination and curvation of our limbs. For we read in the Scriptures a more general term which signifies only his being in heaven, without any expression of the particular manner of his presence. So *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 expressed in another position than that of *Session*: for *Stephen looking stedfastly into heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God:* And said, *Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.* He appeared standing unto *Stephen*, whom we express sitting in our Creed; but this is rather a difference of the occasion, than a diversity of position. He appeared || standing to *Stephen* as ready to assist him, as ready to plead for him, as ready to receive him: and he is oftner expressed sitting, not for any positional variation, but for the variety of his effect, and operation.

*Rom.* 8. 34.

*1 Peter* 3. 22.

|| Ἐπὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν καθύδαί πορτικόν αὐτοῖς ὡς, τῆς ἰσχυρίας αὐτοῦ.

ἡ δὲ σέως κινεῖ λόγον, ἢ φησὶν αὐτὸν ἰσαδαί. *S. Chrysof. Hom. 18. in Acta.* Si major gratia & manifestior 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 se vidisse 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 sedentem 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 Novo Test. 88.* Sedere judicantis est, stare verò pugnantis vel adjuvantis. *Stephanus* ergo in labore certaminis positus, stantem vidit quem adiutorem habuit. Sed hunc post ascensionem *Marcus* sedere scribit, quia post ascensionis suæ gloriam Judex in fine videbitur. *Greg. Hom. 29. in Evang. Maxim. Taurin. de Pentec. Hom. 1. moves the Question,* Quæ sit ratio quod idem Dominus à *David* sedens prophetatur, stans verò à *Stephano* prædicatur? and then renders this reason, Ut modo ejus omnipotentia, modo misericordia describatur. Nam utique pro potestate regis sedere dicitur, pro bonitate intercessoris stare suggeritur. At enim beatus Apostolus, quia *Advocatum habemus apud Patrem Jesum Christum.* Judex est igitur Christus cum residet. Advocatus cum assurgit. Judex plane Judæis, Advocatus Christianis. Hic enim stans apud Patrem Christianorum licet peccantium causas exorat; ibi residet cum patre Pharisæorum persequentium peccata condemnans. Illis indignans vehementer ulciscitur; his interveniens leniter miseretur. Hic stat ut suscipiat *Stephani* Martyris spiritum; ibi residet ut condemnet Judæ proditoris admissum.



This phrase then to *fit*, prescindng from the corporal posture of Session, may signifie no more than 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.

|| יושב which properly ſignifieth to ſit, is familiarly uſed for permanſit, and habitavit; as Jud. 5. 17.

אשר יושב אצל אלהים ואלהים יושב אצל אשר. *Asſer continued on the Sea ſhore. Lev. 8. 35.* ופתי אהל מועד יושבו יום וליל שבעת ימים. *Kal opan tin dusan tis sknitis se murtuēis kalhōsedē ēpti hūēōōō, hūēōōō; vōkēō, Therefore ſhall ye abide at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, day and night, ſeven days, Upon which place S. Auguſt. Quid eſt quod dicit Moyſes ad Aaron & filios ejus cū ſanctificantur ad ineundum ſacerdotium? Ad oſtium tabernaculi ſedebitis ſeptem dies, die & nocte, ne moriamini. Nunquid nam credibile eſt ſicū 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 & commemoratione 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 commemorationem quorum ſedes ſunt; habitatio quippe hoc nomen accepit. *Quæſt. ſuper levit. 24. And this is as familiar with the Latins as the Hebrews.* Si venti eſſent, nos hic Coreyræ non ſederemus. *Cic. l. 9. Epiſt.* Id horreum fuit præſidium Pœnis ſedentibus ad Trebiam. *Liv. l. 2. de Bell. Pun.* \* *Sedet ad dextram Patris.* Credite Sedere, intelligite habitare; quomodo dicimus de quocunque homine, in iſta patria ſedit per tres annos. Dicit illud & Scriptura ſediſſe quendam in civitate tantum tempus. Numquid ſedit, & nunquam ſurrexit? Ideo hominum habitaciones ſedes dicuntur. Ubi habitantur ſedes, nunquid 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, quietneſs and indiſturbance; according to that promiſe in the Prophet, *They ſhall ſit every man under his fig-tree, and none ſhall make them afraid.* So Chriſt is aſcended into heaven, where reſting from all pains and ſorrows, he is ſeated free from all diſturbance and oppoſition; God having placed him at his right hand, until he hath made his enemies his footſtool.

Mic. 4. 4.

Thirdly this *ſitting* implieth yet more than quietneſs or continuance, even || Dominion, Sovereignty, and Majeſty; as when *Solomon* ſat in the throne of his Father, he reigned over *Israel* after the death of his Father. And thus *Chriſt* is ſet down at the right hand of the throne of God. And *S. Paul* did well interpret thoſe words of the Prophet, *Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footſtool,* ſaying, *He muſt reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.*

|| Ipſum verbum ſedere regi ni ſignificat poteſtatem. *S. Hier. Com. ad Eph. c. 1. v. 19. Heb. 11. 2. Pſal. 110. 1. 1 Cor. 15. 25. 1 Prov. 20. 8. 2 Iſa. 16. 5. \* Sedere quod dicitur Deus non membro- rum poſitionem, ſed judicariam ſignificat poteſtatem, quā illa Majeſtas nunquam caret, ſemper digna dignis tribuendo; quamvis in ex-*

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 Judgment; as it is written In mercy ſhall the Throne be eſtabliſhed, and he ſhall ſit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and ſeeking judgment, and haſting righteousneſs.* And ſo *Chriſt* \* ſitting at the right hand of God is manifeſted and declared to be the great Judge of the quick and the dead. Thus to *ſit* doth not ſignifie any peculiar inclination or flexion, any determinate location or poſition of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happineſs of condition, regular and judiciary power; as in other || Authors ſuch ſignifications are uſual.

tremo judicio multo manifeſtius inter homines Unigeniti Dei Filii Judicis vivorum & mortuorum clarius indubitata eſſulgebunt. *S. Auguſt. de Fide & Symb. cap. 7.* Hoc quod dicitur Filius ſedere ad dextram Patris, demonſtratur quod ipſe homo, quem ſuſcepit Chriſtus, poteſtatem acceperit Judicantis. *Author, l. 3. de Symb. ad Catechum.* || *Moſt anciently, ſedere did ſignifie no more than eſſe, to be in any place; as Servius noteth on that place of Virgil, Æneid. 9. Luceo tum forte parentis Pili uni 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 were wont to do ſitting. Secundum Plautum autem ſedere eſt conſilium capere, qui inducit in Moſtellaria ſervum dicentem, Sine juxta aram ſedeam & dabo meliora conſilia. Sed ſecundum Augures ſedere eſt augurium captare: Namque poſt designata cœli partes à ſedentibus captabantur auguria. Quod & ſupra ipſe oſtendit latenter, inducens Picum ſolum ſedentem, ut, Parvaque ſedebat Succinētus trabea, quod eſt augurum, cum alios ſtantes induxerit. Ergo Sedebat, aut erat, aut conſilia capiebat, aut augurabatur.*

The importance of the Language being thus far improved, at last we find the substance of the Doctrine, which is, that sitting at the right hand of God was our Mediator's solemn entry upon his Regal Office, as to the execution of that full Dominion which was due unto him. For *worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom, and strength and honour and glory and blessing.* Wherefore Christ after his death and resurrection saith *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* For *because he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.* And this obedience and submission was and is due unto him, because God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet; and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church.

Rev. 5. 12.

Mat. 28. 18.

Phil. 2. 8, 9, 10.

2 Sam. 7. 16.

Psal. 132. 12.

There was an express promise made by God to David, *Thine house and thy Kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* This promise strictly and literally taken was but conditional: and the condition of the promise is elsewhere expressed, *Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore.* Notwithstanding this promise this Kingdom of David was intercepted, nor was his family continued in the Throne: part of the Kingdom was first rent from his posterity, next the regality itself; and when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but only ceased in the obligation of a promise, because the condition was not performed. The posterity of David did not keep the Covenant and Testimony of their God, and therefore the throne of David was not by an uninterrupted lineal succession established to perpetuity.

c

Luke 1. 32, 33.

|| Jer. 30. 9.

Ezek. 37. 24,

25.

Hos. 3. 5.

Ezek. 34. 23,

24.

1 Sam. 16. 13.

But yet in a larger and better sense, after these intercessions, the throne of David was continued. When they had sinned and lost their right unto the Crown, the Kingdom was to be given unto him who never sinned, and consequently could never lose it; and he being of the seed of David, in him the throne of David was without interception or succession continued. Of him did the Angel Gabriel speak at his conception, *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.* Thus the throne of Christ is called the throne of David, because it was promised unto David, and because the Kingdom of David was a type, resemblance and representation of it; infomuch that Christ himself in respect of this Kingdom is || often called David, as particularly in that promise, *I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them.*

1 Sam. 2. 4.

Now as David was not only first designed, but also anointed King over Israel; and yet had no possession of the Crown; Seven years he continued anointed by Samuel, and had no share in the Dominion; seven years after he continued anointed in Hebron only King over the tribe of Judah; at last he was received by all the Tribes, and so obtained full and absolute regal power over all Israel, and seated himself in the Royal City of Jerusalem: So Christ was born King of the Jews, and the conjunction of his humane nature with his divine in the union of his person was a sufficient unction to his Regal Office,

vice, yet as the Son of man he exercised no such dominion, professing that his *Kingdom was not of this world*; but after he rose from the dead, then as it were in *Hebron* with his own Tribe he tells the Apostles, *All power is given unto him*, and by virtue thereof, gives them injunctions, and at his Ascension he enters into the *Jerusalem* above, and there sits down at the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn entry upon the full and entire dominion over all things; then could St. Peter say, *Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, That God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.* Acts 2. 36.

The immediate effect of his Regal power, the proper execution of this Office, is the subduing of all his Enemies; For he is *set down at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.* This was the ancient custom of the Oriental Conquerors, to tread upon the necks of their subdued enemies; as when *Joshuah* had the five Kings as his prisoners, he *said unto the men of war which went with him, Come near, put your feet upon the necks of them.* Thus to signify the absolute and total conquest of *Christ*, and the dreadful Majesty of his throne, all his enemies are supposed to lie down before him, and he set his feet upon them. Heb 10. 12, 13. Josh. 10. 24.

The enemies of *Christ* are of two kinds, either Temporal or Spiritual; the Temporal Enemies I call such as visibly and actually oppose him, and his Apostles, and all those which profess to believe in his name. Such especially and principally were the *Jews*, who rejected, persecuted and crucified him; who after his Resurrection, scourged, stoned, and despightfully used his Disciples; who tried all ways and means imaginable to hinder the propagation, and dishonour the profession of Christianity. A part of his Regal Office was to subdue these enemies, and he 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 taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom.* For within few years the Temple, the City, and the whole Polity of the *Jews* were destroyed for ever in a revenging manner by the hands of the *Romans*, which they made use of to crucifie the Lord of life. The *Romans* themselves were the next Enemies, who first complied with the *Jews* in *Christ's* crucifixion, and after in defence of their heathen Deities endeavoured the extirpation of Christianity by successive persecutions. These were next to be made the footstool of the King of kings, and so they were when *Rome* the regnant City, the head of that vast Empire, was taken and sacked; when the Christians were preserved, and the Heathens perished; when the worship of all their Idols ceased, and the whole *Roman* Empire marched under the banner of Christianity. In the same manner all those Persons and Nations whatsoever, which openly oppose and persecute the name of *Christ*, are Enemies unto this King, to be in due time subdued under him, and when he calleth to be slain. Mat. 16. 28.

The Spiritual enemies of this King are of another nature; such as by an invisible way make opposition to *Christ's* dominion, as Sin, Satan, Death. Every one of these hath a Kingdom of its own, set up and opposed to the Kingdom of *Christ*. The Apostle hath taught us, that *sin hath reigned unto death*; and hath commanded us not to *let it reign in our mortal bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof.* There is therefore a dominion and Kingdom of sin set up against the throne of the Immaculate Lamb. Satan would have been like the most high, and being cast down from heaven, hath erected his throne below; he is *the Prince of this world: the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience is the Prince of the power of the air*; and thus the rulers Rom. 5. 21. John 12. 13. Ephes. 2. 2 & 6. 12.

Rom. 5. 14, 17.  
Acts 3. 15.

rulers of the darkness of this world oppose themselves to the true light of the world. Death also hath its dominion, and, as the Apostle speaks *reigned from Adam to Moses; even by one offence death reigned by one*, and so set up a ruling and a regal power against the *Prince of life*.

1 Cor. 15. 24.

Phil. 3. 21.

For the destruction of these Powers was *Christ* exalted to the right hand of God, and by his Regal office doth he subdue and destroy them all. And yet this destruction is not so universal, but that Sin, Satan and death shall still continue. 'Tis true he shall *put down all rule and authority and power*, but this amounts not so much to a total destruction, as to an absolute subjection: for as he is *able*, so will he *subdue all things to himself*. The principal end of the Regal office of the Mediatour is the effectual redemption and actual salvation of all those whom God hath given him, and whosoever or whatsoever opposeth the salvation of these, is by that opposition constituted and become an enemy of *Christ*. And because this enmity is grounded upon that opposition, therefore so far as 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 spiritual enemies, so far as they make this opposition; and farther than they do oppose they are not destroyed by him, but subdued to him: whatsoever hindreth and obstructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdom, for the demonstration of God's mercy is abolished; but whatsoever may be yet subservient to the demonstration of his justice is continued.

*Christ* then as King destroyeth the power of sin in all those which belong unto his Kingdom, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, destroying the dominion thereof by his actual grace, and taking away the spot thereof by grace habitual. But in the reprobate and damned souls, the spot of sin remaineth in its perfect die, the dominion of sin continueth in its absolute power, the guilt of sin abideth in a perpetual obligation to eternal pains: but all this in subjection to his throne, the glory of which consisteth as well in punishing Rebellion as rewarding Loyalty.

Heb. 2. 14.

Ephes. 6. 11.  
2 Tim. 2. 26.  
1 John 3. 8.  
1 Tim. 3. 6.

Again, *Christ* sitting on the right hand of God destroyeth all the strength of Satan and the powers of Hell: by virtue of his death perpetually represented to his Father, *he destroyeth him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil*. But the actual destruction of these powers of darkness hath reference only to the elect of God. In them he preventeth the *wiles*; those he taketh out of the *snare*, in them he destroyeth the *works*; those he preserveth from *the condemnation of the Devil*. He freeth them here from the prevailing power of Satan by his grace, he freeth them hereafter from all possibility of any infernal opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned souls are continued slaves unto the powers of Hell; and he which sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the Devil and his Angels, to be tormented with and by them for ever; and this power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the Divine justice.

1 Cor. 15. 26.

Hos. 13. 14.

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 farther than removing of all power to hinder the bringing of all such persons as are redeemed actually by *Christ* into the full possession of his heavenly Kingdom. He will ransom them from the power of the grave, he will redeem them from death. O death, he will be thy plague; O grave, he will be thy destruction. The Trump shall sound, the Graves shall open, the Dead shall live, the bodies shall be framed again out of the dust, and the Souls which left them shall be re-united to them, and all the Sons of men shall

return

return to life, and death shall be *swallowed up in victory*. The Sons of God <sup>1 Cor. 15. 54.</sup> shall then be made compleately both happy in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternal life. Thus he who sitteth at the right hand of God *hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light*. But to the reprobate and damned persons death is not destroyed but improved. They rise again indeed to life, and so the first death is evacuated; but that life to which they rise is a *second*, and a far worse death. And thus *Christ* is set down at the right hand of God, that he might subdue all things to himself.

The regal 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.* <sup>1 Cor. 15. 25.</sup> *But now we see not yet all things put under him.* <sup>Heb. 2. 8.</sup> 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,* <sup>Psal. 110. 1.</sup> *until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool*, 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 at the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his foot-stool.* <sup>Heb. 10. 12, 13.</sup> Being then the promise of God cannot be evacuated, being the expectation of *Christ* cannot be frustrated, it followeth, that our Mediatour shall exercise the Regal power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be subdued.

When all the enemies of *Christ* shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his Kingdom, when those which refused him to rule over them, shall be slain, that is, when the whole office of the Mediatour shall be completed and fulfilled, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As therefore there shall no longer continue any act of the Prophetical part to instruct us, nor any act of the Priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no further act of this Regal power of the Mediatour necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatifical vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will Prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actual defence and protection. As therefore the general notion of a Mediatour ceaseth when all are made one, because *a Mediatour is not a Mediatour of one*; so every part or branch <sup>Gal. 3. 20.</sup> of that Mediatourship, as such, must also cease, because that unity is in all parts compleat. *Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.* *For when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that hath put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* <sup>1 Cor. 15. 24, 28.</sup>

Now though the Mediatorship of *Christ* be then resigned, because the end thereof will then be performed; though the Regal Office as part of that Mediatourship be also resigned with the whole; yet we must not think that *Christ* shall cease to be a King, or lose any of the power and 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 kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever,* not only to the modiflicated eternity of his Mediatourship, so long as there shall be need of Regal power to subdue the enemies of God's Elect; but also to the compleat eternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future is co-eternal to his Divinity. <sup>Videamus an traditio regni defectio sit intelligenda regnandi, ut quod tradidit Filius Patri tradendo non teneat, S. Hilar. l. 11.</sup> <sup>2 Tim. 2. 12.</sup> <sup>Rev. 11. 15.</sup>

Lest we should imagine that *Christ* should ever cease to be King, or so interpret this Article, as if he were after the day of judgment to be removed from the right hand of God, the ancient Fathers added those words to the *Nicene Creed*, † *whose kingdom shall have no end*, against the Heresie which then arose denying the eternity of the Kingdom of *Christ*.

† Οὐδ' ἡ βασιλεία ἐκ ἑσῶ τέλει. We find not these words

in the *Nicene Creed*, as it was in it self before the additions at Constantinople. But not long after, S. Cyril expounds them in his *Catechism*, and Eriphanus in *Ancorato* repeating two several *Creeds*, a shorter and a longer, §. 120. and 121. hath these words in both. After this they were added expressly in the *Constantinopolitan Creed*. And the reason of their insertion without question was that which S. Cyril insinuateth in his explication, that is, the Heresie which was then newly begun. Καὶ ἄν ποτε τις ἀκρίως λέγοντος, ὅτι τέλος ἔχει ἡ Χριστοῦ βασιλεία, μίσσησον τὴν αἴρεσιν τῆ δόκοντός ἐστιν· ἀλλ' ἡ κεφαλὴ περισφάτως αὐτῶν τὴν Γαλατίαν ἀνακουήσα ἐτόλμηση λέγειν, ὅτι καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆ κόσμου ὁ Χριστὸς ἐ βασιλεύει· καὶ ἐτόλμηση εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὁ Λόγος ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐξελθὼν οὗτος εἰς Πατέρα· πάλιν ἀναλυθεὶς ἐκέτι ὄρει, Catech. 15. This was the particular Heresie of Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra, followed by Photius born in the same place, and therefore termed by S. Cyril αὐτὴν τὴν Γαλατίαν ἀνακουήσα. It consisted of two parts; first, that the Kingdom of *Christ* did wholly cease at the end of this world; secondly, that the Word was resolved again into the Father, and consequently did not only cease to reign, but also cease to exist. Which is yet more plainly expressed by Eusebius in his second Book against Marcellus. Καὶ πάλιν τῆτον ἀθρόως πανομήσεσθαι μετὰ τῆ τῆς κείσεως καὶ εἶναι, τὸ καὶ Λόγος ἐνωμήσθαι τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς μηδὲν ἕτερον εἶναι πλὴν τῆ Θεοῦ· τῆς δὲ σαρκὸς ἐρήμῃ καὶ ἀλειφθῆσοι μόνον ἐκ τῆ εἶναι, ὡς μήτε τὸν υἱὸν τῆ Θεοῦ ποτε ὑφῆσαναι, μήτε τὸν υἱὸν τῆ ἀνθρώπου ὃν ἐνέληψε. This Heresie of Marcellus S. Basil properly calls an impiety εἰς τὴν ὑπόστασιν τῆ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Epist. 78. and again, Epist. 52. εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ὑπαρξίν τῆς τῆ μονοθεοῦς θεότητος· which he there more fully expresseth, Ὁς (Μάρκελλος) Λόγος καὶ εἰρηθεῖς τῆ Μονοθεοῦς εἶδουσι καὶ χρεῖαν καὶ ὅτι καὶ εἰρηθεῖς ἀναλθόντα, πάλιν δὲ εἰς τὸν εἶθεν εἰρηθεῖς ἐπαναστρέφαντα, ὡς πρὸ τῆς ἐξόδου εἶναι, ὡς μετὰ τῆ ἐπάνοτον ὑφῆσαναι. This existence of the Word and the Kingdom of the Son, that Heresie made co-eval; beginning when the Word came from the Father, that is, at the Incarnation, and ending when the Word returned into the Father, that is, at the day of judgment. Which is manifestly delivered by the Eastern Bishops in that profession of Faith which they sent to those in Italy. Ἄλλ' ἐκ τῆς Χριστοῦ αὐτὸν γεγονέναι καὶ υἱὸν τῆ Θεοῦ ἐξ ἑῶ ἡμετέρων ἐκ τῆ παρθένου σάρκα ἀνέληψε, πρὸ τελεγκοσίων ὄλων εἶρη. Ἐκ τῆς καὶ τῆ Χριστοῦ ἀρχὴ βασιλείας ἐσχληναί θέλονται, καὶ τέλος ἐξείν αὐτὴν μετὰ τῆ σωτήλειαν καὶ κείσιν. Τοῖτοι δὲ εἶσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκέλλου καὶ Φωτένου τῆ Ἀγκυρογαλατῆς, οἱ τὴν προαιώνιον ὑπαρξίν τε καὶ θεότην τῆ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀτελεύτητον αὐτῆ βασιλείαν ἀπέτησιν, ἴσαθαι δοκεῖν τὴν μοναρχίαν, Socrat. l. 2. c. 19. But although Marcellus did thus teach the Kingdom of *Christ* not to be eternal, yet his Heresie did not so much consist in the denial of this eternity as of the subsistence and person of our Saviour: for otherwise he did truly teach that *Christ* was an eternal King; as appeareth out of his own words in his Book against Asterius the Arian, cited by Eusebius, Οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερον τινα δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἢ καὶ ἀνθρώπων αὐτῆ οἰκονομία τε καὶ βασιλεία, ἐδὲν καὶ ἕτερον βέλεται ἢ τὸτο τὸ ὑπὸ τῆ Ἀποστόλου ῥηθέν, ἕως ἄν εἴη τῆ ἐχθρὸς αὐτῆ ὑποπόδιον τῆ ποδῶν αὐτῆ· ἐκὼν ἐπειδὴν τῆ ἐχθρὸς καὶ ὑποπόδιον τῆ ποδῶν, ἐκ ἑτι χρεῖται τῆ ἐν μέρει ταύτης βασιλείας πάντων καθόλου βασιλεύς ὑπάρχων. And therefore he made the same confession with the Catholics, when he delivered an account of his Faith to Julius Bishop of Rome. Πισθῶν δὲ ἐπόμην τῆ αἰσ θείας γραφῆς, ὅτι εἰς Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ πᾶς μονογενὴς υἱὸς λόγος ὁ αἰεὶ συνυπάρχων τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ μηδὲ πάποτε ἀρχὴν τῆ εἶρη ἐσχλητῶς, ἀληθῶς ἐκ τῆ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, ἐ κληθεῖς, ἐ ποιηθεῖς, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ὢν, αἰεὶ συμβασιλευσὼν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ ἐ τῆ βασιλείας, καὶ τὴν τῆ Ἀποστόλου μαρτυρίαν, ἐκ ἑσῶ τέλος, Eriph. Hares. 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, than the consideration of the nature of his government. Subject we must be whether we will or no; but if willingly, then is our service perfect freedom; if unwillingly, then is our averfeness everlasting misery. † Enemies we all have been, under his feet we shall be, either adopted or subdued. A \* double Kingdom there is of *Christ*; one of power, in which all are under him; another of propriety, in those which belong unto him; none of us can be excepted from the first, and happy are we if by our obedience we shew ourselves to have an interest in the second; for then that Kingdom is not only *Christ's* but ours.

† Inimicus eras, eris sub pedibus ejus aut adoptatus aut vincetus, S. Augustine.  
\* Βασιλείας τῆ Θεοῦ δύο οἶδεν ἢ γραφῆ, τὴν ἑκῆ κατ' οἰκειώσιν, καὶ τὸν τῆς δημοκρατίας λόγον βασιλείας τῆ ἑκῆ πιστῶν καὶ ἐκόντων καὶ ὑποτέλα γράφειαν καὶ τὸν τῆς οἰκειώσεως, S Chrylost. Hom. 59. 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 gracious dominion. For God by his 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

The very name of † *head* hath the signification not only of Dominion but of Union, and therefore while we look upon him at the right hand of God we see our selves in heaven. This is the special promise which he hath made us since he sat down there, *'To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne.* How should we rejoyce, yea rather how should we \*fear and tremble at so great an honour!

† This is the exclamation of S. Chrysoft. upon those words of S. Paul. Βαβαὶ πᾶν καὶ τῆ Ἐκκλησίαν ἀνάγκη; ὡς περ δια τίνος ἔλκων μηχανῆς,

εἰς ὄψος αὐτὴν ἀνήγαγε μέγα καὶ αὐτὴν ἐκάθισεν εἰς ἐμέων τὸ θρόνον. ἔνθα γὰρ ἡ κεφαλὴ ἐπέε καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐδένε γὰρ μέσω διεργησῆναι ἢ κεφαλὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα. εἰ γὰρ διεργητο, ἐκ ἂν εἴη σῶμα, ἐκ ἂν εἴη κεφαλὴ, Hom. 3. in Epist. ad Ephes. Rev. 3. 21. \* Ἐννόει τὸν θρόνον τὸν βασιλικὸν, ἐννόει τὴ τιμὴν τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆτο καὶ γένηται, εἴγε βαλοίμεθα μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς φοβῆσαι δωλοῦσαι. Ἐἰ γὰρ μὴ γέεννα ἦν, τὸ τιμηθέντας τιμὴν ἀναξίως ἐυρεθῆναι καὶ κακῶς, τίνα ἐκ ἂν ἔχοι κόλασιν; τίνα τιμαρίαν; ἐννόησον τίνος ἔγγυς ἢ κεφαλὴ σε κάθισαι (τὰ το μόνον καὶ ἀπόρησιν πρὸς πᾶν ὅτιον) τίνος ἐν δεξιᾷ ἰδρῦσαι, idem ibidem.

Thirdly, the belief of *Christ's* glorious Session is most necessary in respect of the immediate consequence, which is his most gracious Intercession. Our Saviour is ascended as the true *Melchisedech*, not only as the *King of Salem*, the Prince of peace, but also as the *Priest of the most high God*; and whereas every *Priest* according to the Law of *Moses*, stood daily ministring and offering often times the same Sacrifices which could never take away sins, this man after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God. And now *Christ* being set down in that Power and Majesty though the Sacrifice be but once offered, yet the virtue of it is perpetually advanced by his Session, which was founded on his Passion: For he is 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 God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* For he which was accepted in his oblation; and therefore sat down on God's right hand, to improve this acceptation continues his intercession: and having obtained all power by virtue of his humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixtion; by an humble omnipotency, or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence, and presenting his \* postulations at the throne of God.

Heb. 7. 1.  
Heb. 10. 11, 12.  
Heb. 9. 24.  
1 John 2. 1.  
Heb. 7. 25.  
Rom. 8. 33, 34.

\* 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 nosti, 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 ἐνταῦθα. Et presertim 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 Jesu 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, Jesum Christum justum, ipse est exoratio pro peccatis nostris. Quamquam fortassis codices apud vos etiam in eo loco de Domino Jesu 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 oret precetur, & qui interpellat Deum ad hoc interpellat 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 adjoining attribute, though it be the same word, it is not the same notion of *Almighty*. What therefore we have spoken of

of the nature of God, and the Person of the Father is not here to be repeated but supposed ; for *Christ* is set down at the right hand of that God and of that Father, which we understand when we say, *I believe in God the Father*. 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 sixth Παντοδύναμος. See p. 50. And this distinction is very material, and much observed by the Greeks ; as Dionysius Areopagita (whosoever that is) in his Book De Divinis Nominibus in the 18 Chapter, explicates the Δωαμωνυμία, 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 ἄ γὰρ λέγειται διὰ τὸ πάντων αὐτὸν εἶναι παντοκράτορικὴν ἐξέραν σωέχουσαν καὶ φερέχουσαν τὰ ὅλα, καὶ οὐδένουσαν καὶ διεμελιῶσαν καὶ περιστρέφουσαν, καὶ ἀρραγῆς ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὸ πᾶν ὑποτελεῶσαν καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτῆς τὰ ὅλα καθάπερ ἐκ ῥίζης παντοκράτορικῆς παράγουσαν, καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ πάντα καθάπερ ἐκ πυθνῶνα παντοκράτορικῶν ὀπιστρέφουσαν καὶ σωέχουσαν αὐτὰ, ὡς πᾶν ἢ ἐξέραν παύσει τῆ τὰ σωεχόμενα πάντα καὶ μίαν ὑπερέχουσαν πάντα (σωοχὴν ἀσφαλιζομένην καὶ ἐκ ἐῶσαν αὐτὰ διεκπεσόντα ἑαυτῆς, ὡς ὅτι παύσει ἐξέρας κινεῖν ἢ παύσει).

But of the Δωαμωνυμία 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 natural force or activity, by which we are assured that God is able to act, work and produce true and real effects, which do require a true and real power to their production : and in respect of this he is often described unto us under the notion of a *mighty* God. The omnipotency or infinity of this power consisteth in an ability to act, perform and produce, whatsoever can be acted or produced, without any possibility of impediment or resistance : and in this respect he is represented to us as an *Almighty* God. And therefore such an Omnipotency we ascribe unto him: Which is sufficiently delivered in the Scriptures, first by the testimony of an Angel, *For with God nothing shall be impossible* ; secondly, by the testimony of Christ himself, who said, *With men it is impossible, but not with God ; for with God all things are possible*. Now 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.

Luke 1. 24.  
Mark 10. 27.

This truth, though confessed by the Heathens, hath yet been denied by some of them ; but with poor and insufficient † Arguments, that we shall need no more than an explication of the Doctrine to refute their objections.

† The Arguments which the Heathen used are

briefly touched by Plutarch, but were more largely delivered by Pliny. Ἀνεήσθη γὰρ (φασίν) τῶν Καλλιμάχῳ τὰ λέγοντι, Εἰ Θεὸν εἶδαι ἴδ' ὅτι καὶ ἐξέσαι Δαίμονι πᾶν Δωαῶν. (so it must be read) καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς διώσσει πᾶν ποιεῖν. Ἐπεὶ τοιγε εἰ Θεὸς εἶποι τὸ τὴν χίμα μέλαιναν, τὸ ἢ πῦρ ψυχρὸν, τὸ ἢ καθήμερον ἕρθον, καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον, Plutarch, de Plac. Philos. l. 1. c. 7. Imperfecta verò 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 oblivionis : atque (ut faceret quoque argumentis societas hæc cum Deo copuleretur) ut his dena viginti non sint, ac multa similiter efficere non possit ; per quæ declaratur hand dubie naturæ potentia, idque esse quod Deum vocamus, Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 2. c. 7. Add unto these the Objection of Elymas the Sorcerer, recorded by Dionysius, Καίτοι φασίν Ἐλυμας ὁ μάγος, Εἰ παντοδύναμος ὁ Θεὸς πᾶς λέγεται τι μὴ διώσσει πρὸς τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς Θεολόγῳ. Λοιδορεῖται ἢ τῷ Θεῷ Παύλω φήσαντι, μὴ δύναται ἢ Θεὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀρνῆσασθαι, 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 termed *Almighty*, who is the fountain of all might. There is no activity in any Agent, no influence of any Cause, but what dependeth and proceedeth from the Principal



cial Agent, or the first of Causes. † There is nothing in the whole circumference of the Universe, but hath some kind of activity, and consequently some power to act; ( for nothing can be done without a power to do it : ) and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their several and various powers flow from the first of powers: and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend of any but an infinite essence, so all those powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite power.

† Ἡ ἀπειρος δύναμις τῶ θεοῦ διὰ τὸ εἶς πάντα τὰ ὄντα χωρὶς οὐδ' ἐν ὅσῳ ὄντων ὁ παντελῶς ἀσημίαι τὸ ἔχειν τινα δυνάμειν, ἀλλ' δυνάμειν, εἰς τὸ εἶνα

ἠνοεργόν, ἢ λογικόν, ἢ αἰσθητικόν, ἢ ζῳικόν, ἢ ὑποστάσει δυνάμειν ἔχει. καὶ αὐτὸ ὃ, εἰ δέμις εἰσὶν, τὸ εἶδ' δυνάμειν, εἰς τὸ εἶνα ἔχει παρὰ τὸ ὑπερσίου δυνάμεως. Dionys. Areopag. De Divin. Nom. cap. 8.

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. *The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back? He doth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What dost thou?* According to the degrees of power in the Agent and the Resistent is an action performed or hindred; if there be more degrees of power in the Resistent than the Agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, not wholly hindred or suppressed. But if there be no degree of power in the Resistent in reference to the Agent, then is the action totally vigorous; and if in all the powers beside that of God there be not the least degree of any resistance, we must acknowledge that power of his being above all opposition, to be infinite. As *Isaiah* 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 than the least of creatures; but an equal facility in reference unto all things: which cannot be † imagined but by an infinite excess of power above and beyond all resistance.

\* Neque enim veraciter ob aliud vocatur Omnipotens nisi quia quicquid vult potest; nec voluntate cuiuspiam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus, S. Aug. Ench. ad Laur. cap. 95. † Isa. 14. 27. ‡ Dan. 4. 35.

‡ 2 Chro. 20. 6.

† Nisi omnipotens esset, non una eademque facilitate summa atque imae cisset, Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum cap. 3. \* Quis est omnipotens nisi qui omnia potest? S. Aug. de Trin. l. 4. c. 7. ‡ Job 42. 1, 2.

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 do. Thus when God several ways had declared his power unto *Job*, *Job answered the Lord and said, I know that thou canst do every thing.* Now that must needs be infinite activity which answereth to all kinds of possibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extensively, in respect of its object, which is all things; for whatsoever effects there be of his power, yet still there can be more produced; intensively, in respect of the action, or perfection of the effect produced; for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible is within the sphere of God's Omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatsoever is simply and absolutely possible, whatsoever is in it self such as that it may be; and so possible every thing is which doth not imply a contradiction. Again, whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible, and therefore is not within the object of the power of God, because impossibility is the contradiction of all power. For that is said to imply a contradiction, which if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be. But it is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be at the same time and in the same respect: and therefore whatsoever implieth a contradiction is impossible. From whence it followeth, that it may be truly said, God cannot effect that which involveth a contradiction, but with no derogation from his power: and it may be as truly said, God can effect whatsoever involveth not a contradiction, which is the expression of an infinite power.

Now an action may imply a contradiction two ways, either in respect of the

the Object or in respect of the Agent. In respect of the object it may imply a contradiction immediately or consequentially. That doth imply a contradiction immediately, which plainly and in terms doth signifie a repugnancy and so destroys it self, as for the same thing to be and not to be, to have been and not to have been. And therefore it must be acknowledged that it is not in the power of God \* to make that not to have been, which hath already been: but that is no derogation to God's power, because not within the object of any power. And he may certainly have all power, who hath not that which belongeth to no power. Again, that doth imply a contradiction consequentially, which in appearance seemeth not to be impossible, but by necessary consequence if admitted, leadeth infallibly to a contradiction. As that one body should be at the same time in two distinct places, speaks no repugnancy in terms; but yet by consequence it leads to that which is repugnant in it self; which is that the same body is but one body, and not but one. Being then a covert and consequential contradiction is as much and as truly a contradiction as that which is open and immediate, it followeth that it is as impossible to be effected, and therefore comes not under the power of God.

\* Τὸ γὰρ γινώσκοντες  
ἐκ ἐνδὲς χεῖρας  
μὴ φύσει αἰσθητῶν  
ἔσθαι ἄγασθαι  
Μόνη γὰρ αὐτῶν καὶ Θεὸν  
ἑξελίξαι. Ἀ-  
γέννητα ποιεῖν  
ἄω' ἐν ἡ πε-  
πευσία,  
Arist. Ethic.  
Eud. l. 5. c. 2.  
Quisquis dicit,  
Si omnipotens  
est Deus, faciat  
ut quæ facta

sunt facta non fuerint, non videt hoc se dicere, si omnipotens 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; as this proves nothing against omnipotency because it is no act of possibility. Had the act objected been seizable, and God had not the power to effect it, then had he wanted some power, and consequently had not been Omnipotent. But being it is not want of power in the Agent, but of possibility in the Object, it proveth no deficiency in God.

That doth imply a contradiction in respect of the Agent, which is repugnant to his essential perfection; for being every action floweth from the essence of the Agent, whatsoever is totally repugnant to that essence, must involve a contradiction as to the Agent. Thus we may say God cannot sleep, God cannot want, God cannot † die; he cannot sleep whose being is spiritual; he cannot want, whose nature is all-sufficient; he cannot die who is essentially and necessarily existent. Nor can that be a diminution of his Omnipotency, the contrary whereof would be a proof of his impotency, a demonstration of his infirmity. Thus it is impossible for God to lye, to whom we say nothing is impossible; and, he who can do all things, \* cannot deny himself. Because a lye is repugnant to the perfection of Veracity, which is essential unto God as necessarily following from his infinite knowledge, and infinite sanctity. We who are ignorant may be deceived, we who are sinful may deceive; but it is repugnant to that nature to be deceived which is no way subject unto ignorance; it is contradictory to that essence to deceive, which is no way capable of sin. For as it is a plain contradiction to know 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 sinful, 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 do, whatsoever is impossible to him, doth not any way prove that he is not Almighty, but only shew that the rest of his Attributes and perfections are as essential to him as his power; and as his power suffereth no resistance, so the rest of his perfections admit no repugnance. Well therefore may we conclude him absolutely † Omnipotent,

† Neque enim  
& vitam Dei  
& præscientiam  
Dei sub necessitate  
ponimus si dicamus,  
Necesse est Deum  
semper vivere & cuncta  
præscire, sicut nec  
potestas ejus minuitur,  
cum dicitur  
mori fallique  
non posse. Sic enim  
hoc non potest, ut  
potius si posset,  
minoris esset  
utique potestatis;  
Recte quippe  
Omnipotens dicitur  
qui tamen  
mori & falli  
non potest.  
Dicitur enim  
Omnipotens  
faciendo quod  
vult, non pati-

endo 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 non possit. Non potest mori, non potest peccare, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. Tanta non potest, quæ si posset non esset Omnipotens, Autor Serm. 119. ad Temp. \* Heb 6 18. \* Nunquid mentitur Deus? Sed non mentitur; quia impossibile est mentiri Deum. Impossibile autem istud nunquidnam infirmitatis est? Non utique; Nam quomodo omnia potest, si aliquid efficere non potest? Quid ergo ei impossibile? Illud utique quod naturæ ejus contrarium est, non quod virtute arduum. Impossibile

possible, inquit, est ei mentiri, & impossibile istud non infirmitatis est, sed virtutis & majestatis; quia veritas non recipit mendacium, nec Dei virtus levitatis errorem, S. Amb. Ann. in Num. Si volunt invenire quod Omnipotens non potest, habent prorsus, ego dicam, mentiri non potest. Credamus ergo quod potest non credendo quod non potest, S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 25. 2 Tim. 2. 13. This was the Argument of Elymas the Sorcerer before-mentioned, to which Dionysius gives this answer, Εαυτὸς ἀρνησις ἐκπλοῖσις ἀληθείας ἔστιν· ἢ ἡ ἀλήθεια ὄν ἔστιν· καὶ ἢ τὴ ἀληθείας ἐκπλοῖσις τῶν ὄντων ἐκπλοῖσις. Εἰ τοίνυν ἡ ἀλήθεια ὄν ἔστιν, ἢ ἡ ἀρνησις, τὴ ἀληθείας τῶν ὄντων ἐκπλοῖσις, οὐκ ἐστὶν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐδύναται· καὶ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἐκ ἔστιν, ὡς ἀντιφατικὸν τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἐδύνασθαι, καὶ τὸ μὴ εἶναι καὶ εἶναι· De Divin. Nom. cap. 8. Φαυλὸν δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἐδύναται αἰχρῶν ὁ Θεός, ἐπεὶ ἔσαι ὁ Θεὸς δυνάμει μὴ εἶναι Θεός· εἰ γὰρ αἰχρῶν δυνάμει ὁ Θεός, καὶ ἐστὶ Θεός. Orig. cont. Celsi l. 5. Jobius gives this Solution to the same Objection, Ἄφαυλόν μὴ δύνασθαι τὸ εἶναι ταῦτα ἢ μὴ εἶναι ὄντων ἔστι μὴτε δυνατὸν ὅλως ὑφεστῆναι, πῶς γὰρ ὑφέστηκε τὸ ἀρνήσασθαι τὸ εἶναι ἐκπλοῖσις, ἢ ἡ τρέψη, ἢ ἡ ἀγαθότης ἐκπλοῖσις, ἢ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ψεύδος γινέσθαι; Παντοδύναμος δὲ ὑμῖνεται καὶ λέγεται ὡς τάτε πρίποντα, αὐτὰ καὶ σωτήρια ἢ δυνάμει πάντα δυνάμει ὅτε βύλεται, Job. de Verb. Incarn. l. 3. apud Photium in Biblioth. Ὁ Ἀπόστολος φησὶ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, Ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεὸν ἐκ ἀδενείαν τινὰ κατήγορον τῆς παγκρατίας δυνάμεως, ἀλλὰ μεγίστην βώμην, ὅτι ἀνεπίδεκτός ἐστι τῆς ψεύσεως ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας πατήρ· Καὶ ἀλλὰ ἕως τῆ ταύτην ὄχρῶν τῶν ἐννοίαν ἔσθαι, ἢ ἀρνησώμεθα αὐτὸν ἐκείνοις πιστὸς μὴδὲ ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἐαυτὸν ἐδύναται. Καὶ ἔστι γὰρ ἀδυναμία ἐστὶν ἀπόδειξις, ἀλλὰ ἀνυπερβλήτε ἰχρῶς, ὅτι ἐκ ἐγχορεῖ τὴν θεϊαν φύσιν ἐαυτὸν ἀρνήσασθαι, Ibid. Pelus. Ep. 335. l. 3. Theodoret upon that place of S. Paul, It is impossible for God to lye, Οὐκ ἀδενείας τὸ ἀδυνατῆν, ἀλλὰ ἀγαν αὐτὸ δεινὸς δυνάμει· Οὕτω γὰρ φησὶν, ὅτι ἀληθὲς ὡς ἀδύνατον εἶναι ψεύδος ἐν αὐτῷ γινέσθαι ποτῆ. Τὸ δυνατὸν ἀρῆ (ita lege, non ἀδύνατον ἐν) τῆς ἀληθείας, διὰ τὸ ἀδυνατῆ σημαίνεται. And upon that, He cannot deny himself, πάλιν οὖν τὸ ἐδύναται τῆς ἀπίερα δυνάμεως ὑπάρχει θεολογικόν, Theod. Dial. 3. † Theodoret having proved that there were many things which fell not under the power of God, at last thus concludes, Πολλὰ τοίνυν ἀρῆκαρῶν ἀδύνατα ὄντα τῶν παρὰ δυνάμει Θεῶ. Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ δυνατῆναι τι τέτων, ἀπίερα δυνάμεως ἐκ ἀδενείας τεκμήριον· τὸ δὲ γε δυνατῆναι, ἀδυναμίας δὴ πικρῆς, ἐδύναμεως. Ὅτι τέτων ἕκαστον τὸ ἀρεττὸν τὸ Θεὸς κηρύττει καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, Dial. 3. And Origen cont. Celsi l. 3. gives this for the Christian's general Rule. Δύναται καθ' ἡμῶς πάντα ὁ Θεὸς ἀπερ δυνάμει τὸ Θεὸς εἶναι, καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸς εἶναι, καὶ τὸ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐκ ἐξίσταται. And the words of Celsus, though ill-intended, are yet very true. Ἄυτος γὰρ (ὁ Θεός) ἔστιν ὁ πάντων ἢ ὄντων λόγος, ἐδὲν ἐν οἷς τε κερῶλογον ἐδὲ παρ' ἐκπλοῖσις ἐργάσασθαι. Apud Orig. l. 4. And so Origen in his Answer confesses. Ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἡμῶς ἐδὲν οἷς τε κερῶλογον ἔτε παρ' ἐαυτὸν ἐργάσασθαι ἔστιν ὁ Θεός.

who by being able to effect all things consistent with his perfections, sheweth infinite ability : and by not being able to do any thing repugnant to the same perfections, demonstrateth himself subject to no infirmity or imbecillity. And in this manner we maintain God's Omnipotency, with the \* best and eldest, against the worst and latest of the Heathen Authors.

\* It was the constant Opinion of the most an-

cient Heathens, as appeareth by Homer, who expresseth it plainly, Odyss. κ'.

Καλεπὸν δὲ τ' ὀρύσσειν  
 Ἄνδρῶσι γε θυηλοῖσι, θεοὶ δὲ τε πάντα δύνανται.  
 And the same sense is attributed to Linus in a Distick cited for his by Stobæus; but may rather be thought to have been made by some of the Pythagoreans. For this was the plain Doctrine of Pythagoras, who taught his Scholars to believe miracles, and to doubt of nothing said to be done by the Gods, because all things were possible to them; Οὐ γὰρ εἶναι τὰ μὴ δύναται τῶν θεῶν, (vel potius τοῖς θεοῖς) τὰ ἢ δυνατὰ, ὡς περὶ οἰεῖσθαι τῶν σοφιστορῶν, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ δυνατὰ· καὶ ἢ ἀρχὴ ἢ αὐτὴ ἔστι τῶν ἐπιπῶν, ἀ ἐκείνοι φησὶ μὴ εἶναι Δίνε ἔστι μύθοι ἴσως ἐκείνων. Ἐλπεσθαι γὰρ πάντι· ἐπεὶ ἐκ ἐστ' ἐδὲν ἀλεπτον. Πάδια πάντα Θεῶ τρέσαι, καὶ ἀνυπερβλήτε ἐδὲν. Iamb. de Vit. Pythag. c. 28. So Epicarmus a Disciple of Pythagoras, Ἀδύνατον ἐδὲν Θεῶ. So Pater Omnipotens, and Jupiter Omnipotens, familiar in Virgil and the Poets before and after him. These do far over-weigh the authority in Plutarch, and that of Pliny, with the addition of Galen, who opposeth the Opinion of the Philosophers to that of Moses expressly, and to our Saviour obliquely, Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὸ βεληθῆναι, τοιαύτας γινέσθαι μόνον ἢ αὐταρκες· ἐδὲ γὰρ ἐστ' ἐπέσαν ἑξαίφνης ἐθαλήσειν, ἀνθρωπον ποιῆσαι δυνατὸν αὐτῶ, Which seems to be opposed to those words of our Saviour, God is able to raise children unto Abraham out of these stones. Καὶ τὰτ' ἐστὶ καθ' ὅ τῶ Μωσέως δόξης ἢ ἡμετέρα καὶ Ἰλατωνῶ καὶ ἢ ἢ ἄλλων παρ' Ἑλλουσιν ὀρδῶς μεταχειρισσασθαι τῶν περὶ φύσεως λόγους διαφέρει. Τὸ μὴ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τὸ βεληθῆναι τὸ Θεὸν κρημῶσαι τὴν ὕλην, ἢ εὐθύς κεκόσμηται· πάντα γὰρ εἶναι τῶ Θεῶ δυνάμει νομίζεις, καὶ εἶ τὴν τέφρα ἰππον ἢ βέν ἐθέλει ποιεῖν· ἡμεῖς δ' ἐχ ἔτω γινώσκουμεν, ἀλλ' εἶναι γὰρ ἵνα λέξωμεν ἀδύνατα φύσει, καὶ τέτοις μὴδ' ὀπιχειρεῖν ὅλως τὸ Θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶ δύνατῶ γινέσθαι τὸ βέλτιον εἰσεσθαι, De usu Part. l. 1. r.

Thus God is Omnipotent, and God only. 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 only is Almighty. For the reason why we say the Father is Almighty, is because he is God; and therefore we cannot say that he † only is Almighty, because it is not true that he only is God. Who-soever then is God, hath the same reason and foundation of Omnipotency, which the Father hath, and consequently is to be acknowledged properly and truly Omnipotent as the Father is. But we have already shewed 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;

† Non ergo quisquam 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. l. 2. c. 3.

\* Nor is it unusual in other Authors to make use of the word Omnipotens, rather in relation to the present occasion, than in reference to the Person who is said to be Omnipotent; as is

observed by Servius upon that verse of Virgil, *Æneid.* 9. Jupiter omnipotens audacibus annue cœptis. Hoc epitheton interdum ad gloriam numinis ponitur, interdum ad causam dicentis. Namq; hoc loco dicendo Omnipotens ostendit eum etiam his qui per se minus valent præstare posse virtutem.

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 than he exercised before: and that power which was then actually conferred upon him, acknowledgeth no bound or limits; but all power in the ultimate extent of its infinity is given unto him, who is set down on the right hand of him who is God the Father; and, being so, is therefore truly and properly Almighty.

Deut. 10. 7.  
Luke 12. 5.

It is necessary to profess belief in God Almighty; First, because the acknowledgment of his Omnipotency begetteth that fear and reverence, submission and obedience which is due unto his infinite Majesty. Our God is a great God, a mighty, and a terrible; therefore terrible because mighty. I will fore-warn you, saith our Saviour, whom ye shall fear: Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell, I say unto you fear him. Three times we are commanded to fear, and one only reason rendered, but sufficient for a thousand fears, the power of him who is able eternally to punish us. God gave a general command to Abraham, and with it a powerful perswasion to obedience, when he said unto him, I am the Almighty God, walk before me and be thou perfect. It was a rational advice which the Apostle gives us. Humble your selves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time. And it is a proper incentive to the observation of the Law of God, to consider that he is the one Law-giver who is able to save and to destroy.

Gen. 17. 1.

1 Pet. 5. 6.

James 4. 12.

Secondly, The belief of Gods Omnipotency is absolutely necessary as the foundation of our Faith. All the miracles which have been seen, were therefore wrought, that we may believe; and never miracle had been seen, if God were not Omnipotent. The Objects of our Faith are beyond all natural and 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 be-

lieved many miraculous actions, which others looked upon as fabulous. Because they would disbelieve nothing which was referred to the Divine power, and the reason of that was because they thought all things possible to God, as we shewed before. Τῶν τοιούτων ὅ (saith Iamblichus, having related several strange actions either fabulous or miraculous) ἢ δὲ δοκούντων μυθικῶν ὑπομνημάτων ὡς μὲν ἐν ἀπιστίαις ὁ, τι δὲ εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἀναγνῆται. And whereas others looked upon them as weak and simple people for giving credit to such fabulous relations, πρὸς πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐχὼ αὐτὸς εὐθέως νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν, Iambli. de vit Pythag. cap. 28.

Rom. 4. 20; 21.

Thirdly, It is not only necessary in matters of bare Faith, and notions of Belief, but in respect of the active and operative reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of Abraham the Father of the faithful, who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in Faith, giving glory to God, and being fully perswaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform. The promises of God are therefore

\* firm

\* firm and sure, because he is both willing and able to perform them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to do what they have promised, or cannot do what they intend; in the first, we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But being God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend by breaking his promises to deceive us; therefore if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the Apostle *I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.* I am assured that if I be a sheep, and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of darkness and the gates of hell can never prevail against me, for it was the voice of the Son of God, *My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.*

\* Nulla est in promissis Dei falsitas, quia nulla est in faciendis difficultas aut impossibilitas, Fulgent. l. i. Ad Monim.

2 Tim. i. 12.

John 10. 29

Lastly, The belief of God's Omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as, if God himself were not *Almighty*, he could not effect. And therefore in that form of Prayer which *Christ* hath taught us, we conclude all our Petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgment, *For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory.* Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midst of all our temptations, than that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, *who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.*

Matth. 6. 13

Eph. 3. 20

After this Explication of our Saviour's Session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be supposed to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that *Christ is set on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I assent unto this as a most infallible and necessary truth, That *Jesus Christ* ascending into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our Redemption, did rest in everlasting happiness; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetual habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a Judge, and as a King, according to his office of Mediatour, unto the end of the World, according to that which he merited by his Mediatourship, to all eternity; which hand of God the Father Almighty signifieth an Omnipotent power, able to do all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe in *Jesus Christ* who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

ARTICLE VII.

From † thence shall he come to Judge the Quick and the Dead.

† Or from whence; the Latines sometimes inde, some times unde And the Greek is ἐθεν, unde, both in the ancient MS. in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, and in the Creed of Marcellus. But ἐκείθεν ἐρχόμενον, in the latter MS. in Bennet College Library. Others neither ἐθεν nor ἐκείθεν, but πάλιν as Justin Martyr, Ἡμεῖς ἐπέγνωμεν Χριστὸν ὃν Θεὸς σαυραβήτικῶς ἀναστάντα, καὶ ἀναυθότα εἰς τοῦ ἐρχομένου, καὶ πάλιν παρευθυσόμενον κειτῶ παντῶν ἀπλῶς ἀνθρώπων μέχρις αὐτοῦ Ἀδάμ. Dial. cum Tryphone. Others without inde or unde, only venturus, as the Nicene Creed, ἐρχόμενον κείναι, others πάλιν ἐρχόμενον, or ἔρχοντα πάλιν; and Fortunatus leaving out inde venturus, bath only judicaturus vivos & mortuos.

THIS Article containeth in it four particular Considerations, and no more; First, That Christ, who is gone from us, shall come again. Secondly, That the place from whence he shall then come, is the highest Heaven, to which he first ascended; for from thence he shall come. Thirdly, That the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is to judge; for from thence he shall come to judge. Fourthly, That the object of that action, or the persons whom he shall judge, are all men, whether dead before, or then alive; for from thence 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 Messiah was to come again after he once was come; secondly, to declare how our Jesus (whom we have already proved once to have come as the true Messiah) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

That the Messiah was to come again, was not only certainly, but copiously foretold; the Scriptures did often assure us of a second advent. As often as we read of his griefs and humility, so often we are admonished of his coming to suffer: as often as we hear of his power and glory, so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fancy with the Jews, a double Messiah, one the Son of Joseph, the other of David; one of the tribe of Ephraim, the other of Judah; but we must take that for a certain truth, which they have made an occasion of their error; that the Messiah is twice to come, once in all humility, to suffer and die, as they conceived of their son of Joseph; and again in glory, to govern and judge, as they expect the son of David. Particularly, Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied of his Advent, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Angels. And more particularly Daniel saw the Representation of his judiciary power and glory. I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a Kingdom that all people, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. This Son of man the Jews themselves confess to be the promised Messiah, and they take the words to signify his coming, and so far give testimony to the truth, but then they evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying, that † if the Jews went on in their sins, then the Messiah should come in humility, according to the description in Zachary, lowly and riding upon an ass; but if they pleased

Jude 14.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

\*R. Saadias Gaon ad locum, והו' משיח צדקו בכבודו נאם

In Bereshit Rabba, speaking of the Genealogy concluding (1 Chron. 3. 34) with Anani the youngest of the seven sons of Elioenai, the Author asks this question, ומי הוא ענני and who is this Anani? and answers it thus, והו' משיח שנ' הוה דוית נחזי' ליליא יארו עם ענני שמיא כנר אנש אתח ה'אן This is the Messiah, as it is written, I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with Anani, that is, the clouds of heaven; Solomon Furchi ad locum, אנש הוא מלך המשיח, and Aben Ezra, ibidem, אנש הוא מלך המשיח

וְסוּר אָדָם הוּא סוּר הַמְּשִׁיחַ כְּאוֹמְרֵי כְנַר So the Author of Tzeror Hammor; **אִישׁ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וּנְבִין הַדָּבָר** The Myttery of man is the Myttery of the Messias, according to that of Daniel, he came as the Son of Man. **אִישׁ אֲתוֹ** This place is mentioned for one of the **כְּתוּבֵי** which speak of the Messiah, in the Midrash Tillim, Psal. 2. And the Midrash upon the 21. Psal. v. 7. **כְּתוּבֵי אַחֵר אִים וְעַם עֲנֵנֵי שָׁמַיָא כְנַר אִישׁ** 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 libro Sanhedrim, **אִישׁ אֲלֵכֶם־רִי בְּתוֹן עַל מַלְךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְאִרֵּו טַם עֲנֵנֵי שָׁמַיָא כְנַר אִישׁ אֲתוֹ הוּא וְכַתוּב** **עֲנֵי וְרוֹכֵב עַל חֲמוֹר וְכֹ עֲנֵי וְרוֹכֵב עַל חֲמוֹר** Idem etiam legitur in Bershebit Rabba R. Mosch. Haddarshan, Gen. 49. 11. This they make the coming of Christ to depend upon their merit or demerit; whereas the promises of the Messias are absolute and irrefeetive, depend only on the goodness of God, not to be evacuated or altered by the wickedness of man. Nay the unworthyness of the Jews, which Christ found, when he came in humility, is one special cause why he should come again in Glory.

God, then he should come in glory, according to the description in the Prophet Daniel, with the clouds of heaven. Whereas these two descriptions are two several predictions, and therefore must be both fulfilled. From whence it followeth, that, being Christ is already come lowly and sitting upon an ass, therefore he shall come gloriously with the clouds of heaven. For if both those descriptions cannot belong to one and the same advent, as the Jews acknowledge, and both of them must be true, because equally prophetical; 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 Angels, *This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.* We have the promise of Christ himself to his Apostles, *If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself: ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away and come again unto you.* He it is which from the beginning was to come; that express prophecy so represented him, *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come*; the name of Shiloh was obscure, but the notion of the corner, 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.* Our Jesus then shall come, and not only so, but shall so come, as the Messias was foretold, after the same manner, in the same glory of the Father, as the Son of man coming in his Kingdom. 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 do we expect the coming of our Jesus, even as he himself hath taught us to expect him, saying, *For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his Angels.* And thus our Jesus as the true Messias shall come again, which was our first Consideration.

Acts 1. 11.

John 14 3, 28.

Gen. 49. 19.

<sup>1</sup> H. b. 10. 37. **ד' עֲשָׂרָה עָשָׂר וְיָצָא** **וְיָצָא**, that is, he who is known by that vulgar appellation **ד' עֲשָׂרָה עָשָׂר**, he which did once come into the world to make that notion good, is still to be known by the same appellation, and therefore will come again. This was it

which made the Apostles ask that question, *Matt. 24. 3. When shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?* <sup>2</sup> *Matt. 26. 28.* <sup>3</sup> *Rev. 1. 7* † *As R. Saadiah Gaon upon that place of Dan 7. 13* **עֲנֵי עֲנֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם חֹם מְלֹאכֵי צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם וְזוֹ הַיְיָ רֹב חַגְדוּלָהּ שִׁיתָן חַבְרָא לְמַשְׁדֵּי** 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. **אִישׁ נְרַכְיָהּ נֶשֶׁם ר' שְׁמוּאֵל כְּתוּבֵי אַחֵר** **אִישׁ וְאִרֵּו עֲשָׂרָה עָשָׂר וְיָצָא** **אִישׁ אֲתוֹ הוּא וְכַתוּב** **עֲנֵי וְרוֹכֵב עַל חֲמוֹר וְכֹ עֲנֵי וְרוֹכֵב עַל חֲמוֹר** 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 days, and they brought him near before him. And another Scripture saith, (Jer. 30. 21.) and I will cause him to draw near and he shall approach unto me. Behold in what manner? The Angels shall bring him into the midst of them.

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

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 both the quick and the dead. For *him must the heaven receive till the time of the restitution of all things*; and when that time is fulfilled, from that heaven shall he come. For *the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and with the trump of God. Our conversation ought to be in heaven, because from thence we look for our Saviour the Lord Jesus*. Our High-priest is gone up into the Holy of Holies not made with hands, there to make an atonement for us; therefore as the people of *Israel* stood without the Tabernacle expecting the return of *Aaron*, so must we look unto the Heavens and expect *Christ* from thence, when the *Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty Angels*. We do believe that *Christ* is set down on the right hand of God; but we must also look upon him as coming thence, as well as sitting there; and to that purpose *Christ* himself hath 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 fulness of Majesty, from the highest heavens, as a demonstration of his sanctity: that by an undoubted authority, and unquestionable integrity, he might appear most fit to judge both the quick and the dead: which is the end of his second coming, and leads me to the third consideration, the act of his judging, *From whence shall he come to judge*.

For the explication of this Action, as it stands in this Article, three considerations will be necessary, First, How we may be assured that there is a Judgment to come, that any one shall come to judge. Secondly, In case we be assured that there shall be a Judgment, how it appeareth that he which is ascended into heaven, that is, that *Christ* shall be the judge. Thirdly, In case we can be assured that we shall be judged, and that *Christ* shall judge us, it will be worthy our inquiry in what this judgment shall consist, how this action shall be performed: and more than this cannot be necessary to make us understand, that *he shall come to judge*.

That there is a judgment to come after this life, will appear demonstrable, whether we consider our selves who are to undergo it, or God who is to execute it. If we do but reflect upon the frame and temper of our own spirits, we cannot but collect and conclude from thence, that we are to give an account of our actions, and that a judgment hereafter is to pass upon us. There is in the soul of every man a Conscience, and whose soever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to do, 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 only prove that there is a judgment in this life, and every man his own Judge. But being it doth not only allow and approve our good actions, but also doth create a complacency, apology, and confidence in us; being it doth not only disprove and condemn our evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us, and breed a fearful expectation and 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 witness, bound over to give testimony, for or against us at some judgment after this life to pass upon us. For all men are a Law unto themselves, and have the work of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.

Again,



Again if we consider the God who made us and hath full dominion over us, whether we look upon him in himself, or in his Word, we cannot but expect a judgment from him. First, If we contemplate God in Himself, we must acknowledge him to be the judge of all mankind, *so that a man shall say, verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.* Now the same God who is our Judge, is, by an attribute, necessary and inseparable, Just; and this Justice is so essential to his Godhead, that we may as well deny him to be God, as to be Just. It was a rational expostulation which *Abraham* made, *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* 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 righteousness. For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lie under the disposition of providence, they shew no sign of an universal Justice. The wicked and disobedient persons are often so happy, as if they were rewarded for their impieties; the innocent and religious often so miserable, as if they were punished for their innocency. Nothing more certain than that in this life, rewards are not correspondent to the virtues, punishments not proportionable to the sins of men. Which consideration will enforce one of these conclusions; either that there is no Judge of the Actions of mankind; or if there be a Judge, he is not just, he renders no proportionable rewards or punishments; or lastly, if there be a Judge, and that Judge be just, then is there a judgment in another world; and the effects thereof concern another life. Being then we must acknowledge that there is a Judge, which judgeth the earth, being we cannot deny but God is that Judge, and all must confess that God is most Just; being the rewards and punishments of this life are no way answerable to so exact a justice as that which is divine must be; it followeth that there is a judgment yet to come, in which God will shew a perfect demonstration of his justice, and to which every man shall in his own bosom carry an undeniable witness of all his actions.

Psal. 58. 11

Gen. 18. 25.

From hence the Heathen, having always had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man, and of the exactness of the justice of God, have from thence concluded that there is a judgment to come. Inso-much that when *S. Paul reasoned of righteousness and temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled.* The discourse of righteousness and temperance touched him who was so highly and notoriously guilty of the breach of both, and a preconception which he had of judgment after death, now heightened by the Apostles particular description, created an horror in his soul and trembling in his limbs. The same Apostle discoursing to the *Athenians*, the great lights of the Gentile world, and teaching them this Article of our Creed, that God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead; found some which mocked when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, but against the day of judgment none replied. That was † a principle of their own, that was confessed by all who either believed themselves, or a God; a conscience or a Deity.

Acts 24. 25.

Acts 17. 32.

† This principle of a Judgment to come, Justin Martyr propounds to the Gentiles, as generally acknow-

ledged by all their Writers, and as the great encouragement of his Apology for the Christian Religion. *Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας θεοσεβείας προκάλει λόγος ἢς εἰδὼν ὑμεῖς προτιμότερον τοῖς ἀκινδύως βίωσιν προσηρημένοις εἶναι τενύμισαι διὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν τῶν εὖ βίωσιν ἔσσεσθαι κείσιν ἢ ἡμῶν οἱ ἡμέτεροι καὶ θεὸν κηρύττουσι πρόγονοι προφῆται τε καὶ νομοθεταί, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν νομιζέμενοι εἶναι σοφοί, εἰ ποιηταὶ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλόσοφοι, οἱ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ θεῖαν ἐπαγγελίαν ἔγνωσαν παρ' ὑμῶν εἰδέναι γινώσκοντες, ad Græcos Cohort. 1. Tertullian shews the same not only 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 commendat, & Deo mihi reddet. O testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ! Apol. adv. Gentes. Indeed the ancient Gentiles have expressed this judgment to come very exactly. As Philemon cited by Justin Martyr de Monarch. Dei, Ἐστὶν Δίκης ὀφθαλμὸς*

ὁρθαλμοὺς ὁσὶ τὰ πᾶνθ' ὁρα. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δίκαιος κήσεβις ἔχουσιν ἐν, "Αρπαξ ἀπελθὼν, κλέψῃ ἀποσέγει κύκα. Μηνδὲν πλανηθῆναι, ἔστι καὶ ἀδ' κείσεσι. "Ἦνθε ποιήσει, Θεὸς ὁ πάντων δ' εσπότης. Οὐ τὸννομα φοβερῶν, ἔδ' ἀν' ὀνομάσαιμ' ἐγώ. 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; Eusebius de Præpar. Evang. lib. 11. c. 38. & lib. 22. c. 6. Theodor. Serm. de Fine & Judicio. Where after the citation of several places he concludes, Οὕτως ἀκείσεως ὁπίσθεν ὁ Πλάτων εἶναι τὰ ἐν ἀδ' κείσεσι.

But yet, beside the consideration of the eternal power of conscience in our selves, beside the intuition of that essential Attribute, the Justice of God (which are sufficient arguments to move all men,) we have yet a more near and inforsing persuasion grounded upon the expreis determination of the will of God. For the determinate council of the Almighty actually to judge the world in righteousness is clearly revealed in his word. *It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment.* There is a death appointed to follow this life, and a Judgment to follow that death, the one as certain as the other. For in all Ages God hath revealed his resolution to judge the world.

Heb. 9. 27.

Gen. 4. 7. † So the Targum of Jonathan renders it,

הלא אם תטיב עיבודך ישתבק לך תיכר ואין לא תטיב עבודך נעל מא הדין ליום דיבא רבא

Upon the first remarkable action after the fall, there is a sufficient intimation given to angry Cain, *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door*; which by the most ancient † interpretation signifieth a reservation of his sin unto the Judgment of the World to come. Before the Flood Enoch prophesied of a Judgment to come, *saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodlily committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.* His words might have an aim at the waters which were to overflow the world; but the ultimate intention looked through that fire which shall consume the world preserved from water.

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 judgment. And the Jerusalem Targum yet more expressly חטיב עובדך כעל מא הדין שחדרי וישתבק לך לעל מא דאחי ואין לא חטיב עובדך נעל מא הדין הלא אין ליום דיבא רבא חטאך נטיב. 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 sins shall be reserved unto the day of the great judgment. In the same manner the Chaldee Paraphrase of Onkelos, נטיב חטאך ליום דיבא רבא c. Jud. 4.

The testimonies which follow in the Law and the Prophets, the predictions of Christ and the Apostles, are so many and so known, that both the number and the plainness will excuse the prosecution. The Throne hath been already seen, the Judge hath appeared sitting on it, the Books have been already opened, the Dead small and great have been seen standing before him; there is nothing more certain in the Word of God, no doctrine more clear and fundamental, than that of *eternal Judgment*. I shall therefore briefly conclude the first consideration from the internal testimony of the conscience of man, from the essential attribute, the justice of God, from the clear and full revelation of the will and determination of God, that after death, with a reflection on this, and in relation to another life, there is a judgment to come there *shall some person come to judge.*

Heb. 6. 2.

Our second consideration followeth; (seeing we are so well assured that there shall be a judgment,) who that person is which *shall come to judge*, who shall sit upon that Throne, before whose tribunal we shall all appear, from whose mouth we may expect our sentence. Now the Judiciary power is the power of God, and none hath any right to judge the subjects and servants of God, but that God whose servants they are. The Law by which we are to be judged was given by him, the actions which are to be discussed were due to him, the persons which are to be tried are subject to his dominion; God therefore is *the Judge of all*. He shall bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil; and so the last day, that day of wrath is the revelation of the righteous judgment of God. Now if God, as God,

Heb. 12. 23. Eccles. 12. 14. Rom. 2. 5.



committed all judgment to the Son; and the reason why he hath committed it to him, is because he is, not only the Son of God, and so truly God, but also the Son of man, and so truly man; because he is that Son of man, who suffered so much for the sons of men.

From whence at last it clearly appeareth not only that it is a certain truth that *Christ* shall judge the World, but also the reasons are declared and manifested unto us why he hath that power committed unto him, why *He* shall come to judge the quick and the dead. For certainly it is a great demonstration of the justice of God, so highly to reward that Son of man, as to make him Judge of all the World, who came into the World and was judged here; to give him absolute power of absolution and condemnation, who was by us condemned to die, and died that he might absolve us; to cause all the sons of men to bow before his Throne, who did not disdain for their sakes to † stand before the Tribunal and receive that sentence, *let him be crucified*; which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, *Christ* himself did shew at the same time when he stood before the judgment seat, saying, *Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.*

† Veniet Christus ut iudex qui stetit sub iudice: veniet in ea forma, in qua iudicatus est, ut videant

in quem pupugerunt, & cognoscant Judæi quem negaverunt, convincat eos homo ille susceptus & ab eis crucifixus, *Autor l. de Symb. ad Catech. l. 1. c. 4.* Veniet ergo, fratres mei, veniet ille; qui prius venit occultus, veniet in potestate manifestus. Ille qui iudicatus est veniet iudicaturus. Ille qui stetit ante hominem iudicaturus est omnem hominem, *Idem l. 2. c. 8.* Iudex hic erit filius hominis; forma illa hic iudicabit quæ iudicata est. Audite & intelligite, jam hoc Propheta dixerat, *Videbunt in quem pupugerunt.* Ipsam formam videbunt quam lancea percusserunt. Sedebit Iudex qui stetit sub iudice. Damnabit veros reos qui factus est falsus reus. Ipse veniet, forma illa veniet, *S. Aug. de Verbis Domini. Serm. 64.* *Matth. 26. 64.*

Again, If we look upon our selves which are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before, rather than him who is of the same nature with us? If the children of *Israel* could not bear the presence of God as a 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 Mediatour, of the same nature that *Moses* was and we are, who is our Judge? In this appeareth the wisdom and goodness of God, that making a general Judgment, he will make a visible Judge, which all may see who shall be judged. *Without holiness no man shall ever see God,* and therefore if God, as only God, should pronounce sentence upon all men, the ungodly † should never see their Judge. But that both the righteous and unrighteous might see and know who it is that judgeth them, *Christ* who is both God and man is appointed Judge; so as he is man all shall see him, and as he is God they only shall see him who by that vision shall enjoy him.

† Cum boni & mali viseri sunt iudicem vivorum & mortuorum, proculdubio eum videre non poterunt mali, nisi secundum formam qua filius hominis est; sed tamen in claritate in qua iudicabit, non in humilitate in qua iudicatus est. Cæterum illam Dei formam in qua æqualis est Patri proculdubio impii non videbunt. Non enim sunt mundicordes, *Beati enim mundicordes, quoniam ipsi videbunt Deum, S. Aug. de Trin. l. 1. c. 13.* Hoc rectum erat ut iudicandi viderent iudicem. Iudicandi autem erant boni & mali. *Beati enim mundi corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt.* Restabat ut in iudicio forma servi & bonis & malis ostenderetur, forma Dei solis bonis servaretur, *Idem de verbis Domini. Serm. 64.* Et potestatem dedit ei iudicium facere quia filius hominis est. Puto nihil esse manifestius. Nam qui Filius Dei est æqualis Patri, non accepit hanc potestatem iudicii faciendi, sed habet illam cum Patre in occulto. Accepit autem illam ut boni & mali eum videant iudicantem, 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. lib. 1. cap. 13.*

*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 go 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 local translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. He then which ascended into heaven, was the same which was raised from the dead, and by that Resurrection God assured us that the same man should judge us. For to this end Christ both died, and rose and revived, that he might be the Lord both of the dead and living. It appeareth therefore by God's determination, by Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed judge.

Acts 10. 11.

Acts 17. 31.

Rom. 14. 9.

This Office and Dignity of the Son of man was often declared by several figurative and parabolical descriptions. John the Baptist, representeth him that cometh after him by his delineation of an husbandman. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. The Son of man describes himself as an householder saying to the Reapers in the time of harvest, \* Gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn: and this harvest is the end of the world. He representeth himself under the notion of a Fisherman, <sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> with him to the marriage, and shut the door upon the foolish. He is the man who travelling into a far country, delivered the talents to his servants, and <sup>3</sup> after a long time cometh again, and reckoneth with them, exalting the good and faithful, and casting the unprofitable servant into utter darkness. Lastly, He is the shepherd, and is so expressly described in relation to this judgment. For <sup>4</sup> when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy Angels with him, then shall he sit down upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left. Being then the Son of man is thus constantly represented as making the great decretory Separation, and the last judicatory Distinction between man and man; as an Husbandman separating the Wheat, sometime from the Chaff, sometime from the Tares: as a Fisherman gathering the good Fish, casting the bad away; as a Bridegroom receiving the wise, excluding the foolish Virgins; as a Master distinguishing the servants of his Family, rewarding the faithful, punishing the unprofitable; as a Shepherd, dividing his Sheep from the Goats, placing one on the right hand, the other on the left; it plentifully proveth that the same Son of man is appointed the Judge of all the Sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who shall be the Judge, which is the second consideration subservient to the present Explication.

Matt. 2. 12.  
Ἀναστραφὼν δὲ ἔκλεσεν ἑσέρας ἐλεῦθα ἃ ἔκλειον δίκηνουσι, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰερουσαλὴν ἀθάνατον εἰσάγει. S. Chryf. in loc.

\* Matt. 13. 30, 39.  
Πάλιν ἀναμιμήσκει αὐτὸς τοὺς τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ρημάτων τῷ κείνῳ αὐτὸν εἰσαγόντων, S. Chryf. ad locum.

<sup>1</sup> Mat 13. 47, 48.  
<sup>2</sup> Matt. 25. 10.  
<sup>3</sup> Matt. 25. 19, 21, 30.  
<sup>4</sup> Matt. 25. 31, 32, 33.

Thirdly, It being thus resolved that the Son of man shall be the Judge, our next consideration is, What may the nature of this Judgment be; in what that Judicial Action doth consist; what he shall then doe, when he shall come to judge. The reality of this Act doth certainly consist in the final determination, and actual disposing of all persons in soul and body to their eternal condition; and in what manner this shall particularly be performed.

† S. Austin speaking of the particulars foretold to be exhibited at the day of Judgment, 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 valeret consequi ad perfectum hominem intelligentia, De Civit. Dei, l. 2. c. 30.  
<sup>1</sup> Matth. 19. 28.  
<sup>2</sup> Rev. 20. 4, 11.  
<sup>3</sup> Rom. 14. 10.  
<sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. 5. 10.  
<sup>5</sup> Rev. 20. 12.  
<sup>6</sup> Matt. 25. 32.  
<sup>7</sup> Matt. 24. 31.  
<sup>8</sup> 2 Thess. 2. 1.  
<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. 4. 5.  
<sup>1</sup> Eccl. 12. 14.  
<sup>2</sup> Rev. 20. 12.  
 \* Dominus non accepta persona iudicat mundum, unusquisque secundum quæ facit accipiet. Si fuerit bonus, bonitas eum antecedit; si nequam merces nequitia eum sequitur, Ep. Barnab. c. 3.  
<sup>1</sup> Mat. 24. 34.  
<sup>2</sup> Verse 41.  
<sup>3</sup> Verse 46.

is not so † certain unto us; but that which is sufficient for us, it is represented under a formal judiciary process. In which first there is described a Throne, a tribunal, a judgment-seat; for <sup>1</sup> *in the regeneration the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory*: and that this Throne is a seat not only of Majesty but also of Judicature, appeareth by the following words spoken to the Apostles, *ye also shall sit upon the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel*. As in that vision in the Revelation, <sup>2</sup> *I saw thrones and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them*. And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away. This Throne of Christ is expressly called his judgment-seat, when the Apostle tells us, <sup>3</sup> *we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ*, and <sup>4</sup> *we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ*. In respect then of the Son of man, he shall appear in the proper form and condition of a Judge, sitting upon a Throne of Judicature. Secondly, there is to be a personal appearance of all men before that seat of Judicature upon which Christ shall sit, for *we must all appear, and we shall all stand before that judgment-seat*. <sup>5</sup> *I saw the dead*, saith the Apostle, *stand before the throne of God*. Thus <sup>6</sup> *all nations shall be gathered before him*. <sup>7</sup> *He shall send his Angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other*. For the <sup>8</sup> *coming of our Lord Jesus Christ is our gathering together unto him*. Thirdly, when those which are to be judged are brought before the Judgment-seat of Christ, all their actions shall appear; <sup>9</sup> *he will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts*: he will <sup>1</sup> *bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil*. To this end in the Vision of Daniel, when the Judgment was set, the books were opened; and in that of S. John, <sup>2</sup> *the books were opened; and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works*. Fourthly, after the manifestation of all their actions, there followeth a \*definitive sentence passed upon all their persons, according to those actions, which is the fundamental and essential consideration of this judgment; the sentence of Absolution, in these words expressed, <sup>1</sup> *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*; the sentence of Condemnation, in this manner, <sup>2</sup> *Depart 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, <sup>3</sup> *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal*. Thus appeareth Christ's Majesty by sitting on the throne, his Authority by convening all before him, his Knowledge and Wisdom by opening all secrets, revealing all actions, discerning all inclinations, his Justice in condemning sinners, his Mercy in absolving believers, his Power in his execution of the sentence. And thus the Son of man shall come to judge, which is the last particular subservient to the third Consideration of this Article.

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 several times in the Scriptures, and that upon the same occasion; for *Christ was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead*; and 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 ordained 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.

Acts 10. 42.

1 Pet. 4. 5.

2 Tim. 4. 1.

The Holy Ghost speaketh of death in several notions, which makes the quick and the dead capable of several interpretations. Because after death the soul doth live, and the body only remaineth dead; therefore || some have understood the souls of men by the quick, 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 die, at least a proper death, so that their bodies shall be left any time without their souls; secondly, because this is not a distinction of the parts of man, but of the persons of men.

|| So Theophylact testifieth, τινές ὃ καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα ἐνόησαν, Comment. in 2 Tim. 4. 1. Indeed Isidorus Pelusiota giveth this as the first Interpretation, Τὸ κείνεσθαι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρῶς, ἵνα ἴδῃ τὸ καὶ ψυχῶν καὶ σώματι εἰς κείσιν ἐλάσσεναι, καὶ ἔτε ἐν θαλάσσει.

τὸ ἐν κεχρησμένον ἄλλ' ὡς περ κοινῶν ἐσταυθῆσαν συνάρειαν ἐποίησαντο, ἔτω καὶ τῶ ἐκείθεν δίκαια ἢ ἀδικῶς ὑφέξεισιν; Epist. 222. lib. 1.

Again, because the Scripture often mentioneth a death in trespasses and sins, and a living unto righteousness, others have conceived by the quick to be understood 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 Metaphorical sense, because there is no adjunct giving any such intimation, and because the sense affordeth a fair explication; further yet, because the Scripture in the same particular naming the quick and the dead sufficiently teacheth us that it is to be understood of a corporeal death, *Whether we live or die, saith the Apostle, we are the Lords: for to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.*

|| This is the second exposition delivered by Isidorus Pelusiota to such as are not satisfied with the first, Εἰ ὃ καὶ ἄλλως ζητεῖς, ἔτω διακρίναι, ζῶντας τοῦ ἀζῶντος βίου καὶ θεοφιλιῶμεταδόντας, καὶ ἐποδῆναι αὐτοῖς τελευτήλας ἀμοιβῶν, κείναι.

καὶ νεκρωθέντας τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι καὶ τὸ δοθέν αὐτοῖς τάλαντον ὡς ἐν τάφῳ τῆ ἑαυτοῦ καταχάσαντας ῥαθυμίας, καὶ ἀμύνασθαι αὐτοῦ, Epist. 222. lib. 1. Rom. 14. 9.

Thirdly, therefore by \* the dead are understood all those who ever died before the time of Christ's coming to judgment, and by the quick such as shall be then alive: so that the quick and the dead literally taken are considered in relation to the time of Christ's coming; at which time there shall be a generation living upon the face of the earth, and before which time all the generations passed since the creation of the world shall be numbered among the dead. And this undoubtedly is the proper || and literal sense of the Article, that Christ shall come to judge, not only those which shall be alive upon the earth at his appearing, but also all such as have lived and died before. None shall be then judged while they are dead: whosoever stand before the judgment-seat shall appear alive; but those which never died, shall be judged as they were alive; those which were dead before, that they may be judged, shall rise to life. He shall judge therefore the quick, that is those which shall be \* then alive when he cometh, and he shall judge the dead, that is those which at the same time shall be raised from the dead.

\* this is the third Exposition of Isidorus Pelusiota, Εἰ ὃ καὶ ἄλλως, ἔτω καὶ κείναι τοῦ τὸ τε ζῶντας καταλειφθέντας, καὶ τῶν ἡδὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ κοιμηθέντας, Ib. Others of the Fathers give the second and the third explication, leaving it indifferent, and preferring neither; as S. Chrysost.

ὡς λέγει καὶ δίκαιος, ἦτοι καὶ τὰς ἀπελθόντας καὶ τὰς 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 inventurus est ejus adventus; mortuos autem qui de corpore priusquam veniat exiere

vel exituri sunt : five vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quoniam justis quoque; judicabuntur, S. August. in Enchirid. c. 54. Credimus etiam inde venturum convenientissimo tempore, & judicaturum vivos & mortuos, five istis nominibus justis & peccatores significantur; five quos tunc ante mortem nostram in terris inventurus est appellati sunt vivi, mortui vero qui in ejus adventu resurrecturi sunt, Idem de Fide & Symb. c. 8. Inde venturum 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 Benedicite, &c. Sinistris quid? Ite in ignem, &c. Sic judicabuntur à Christo vivi & mortui, Author l. 1. de Symb. ad Catechum. Duobus modis hac 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 præsentis invenerit ejus adventus; judicabit & mortuos in carne, quos resuscitaturus est Deus excelsus, Author l. 4. de Symb. ad Catech. c. 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 latter. 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. Eccl. c. 8. || This is the clear interpretation of Theodoret, without the least mention of any other, Νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κριτῶν ἢ κρείον κέκληκεν; ἐπειδὴν καὶ τὸς νεκρὸς ἀνίστησι καὶ εἰς τὸ κριτέριον ἄγει, καὶ τὸς καὶ ἢ ἢ σωτελείας καὶ ἐν ἐνείσοι κωδῆς ἐν δύων τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν ἀπαίρει τὰς ἐνθάδε. Πάντες γὰρ, φησιν, ἢ κοιμηθῆσόμεθα, πάντες ἢ ἀλλαγῆσόμεθα, 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 ἢ ἀναστάσεως δῶρον πᾶσι τοῖς θανῶσιν ὁ Θεὸς δίδόναι ὑπέσχετο, καὶ πάντες ἐκ τῶν τάφων ἀνάστατες πρὸς κριτῆν παρισταδαί μελλοσι, πῶς πληρωθῆσεται τὸ, κείνιν νεκρὸς καὶ ζῶντας ἢ κρείον; πῶς ἢ νεκροὶ κριθῆναι δυνήσονται, ἂν τὰ μὲν σώματα ἐν μνήμασιν ἔρριπῶν, αἱ δὲ ψυχὰς τῶν σωμάτων κεχωρισμέναι εἰσιν. Resp. Οὐ πάντες, φησὶ, κοιμηθῆσόμεθα. κείνιν ἔν ζῶντας μὲν, τὸς τότε ζῶντας, νεκρὸς ἢ, τὸς ἀνιστάμενος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Quest. 109.

The only 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 judgment; or upon his first appearance they shall die, and after death revive, and so together with all those which rise out of their graves, appear before the judgment-seat. The consideration of our mortality, and the cause thereof, (that it is appointed for all men once to die, in that death hath passed upon all) might persuade us that the last generation of mankind should taste of death as well as all the rest that went before it; and therefore it || hath been thought, especially of late, that those whom Christ at his coming finds alive shall immediately die; and after a sudden and universal expiration shall be restored to life again, and joynd with the rest whom the graves shall render, that all may be partakers of the Resurrection.

|| Omnium enim hominum erit resurrectio. Si omnium erit, ergo omnes moriuntur, ut ducta omnibus Filiis ejus dominetur, & maneat illud privilegium in Domino, Non dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem. Hanc rationem maxima Patrum turba tradente suscepimus, Gennadius de Eccl. Dogmat. cap. 7.

|| Thes. 4. 15, 16. 17.

\* This is the observation of Epiphanius who from these words proves as much. For having repeated the text, he thus infers, Ἀπὸ τῶν σωζομένων ἀποδείξω λέξεως ὅτιν ἰδεῖν τὰ ὅτι χειρᾶ. Διαίρων γὰρ ὁ ἄγιος Ἀπόστολος τῶν δύο ῥόπων τὸ εἶδος εἰς μίαν ἐλπίδα σωτήρα, ἂν τὸ, ἡμεῖς ἀπαληθόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς σπάντησιν αὐτῶ. ἵνα δείξῃ ὅπως τὸ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἕχ ἕτερον παρὰ τὸ τοῦ ὁ γὰρ ἐρηγείσῃ ἔπω τέθνηκε. Hæref. 65. §. 70.

But the Apostles description of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea rather excludeth it. For we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the 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.

|| Cor. 15. 51.

The same is farther 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





self hath passed upon the one, and only a change different from death shall pass upon the other; and so conceive that *Christ* is called the Lord and Judge of the quick and dead, in reference at least to this expression of the Creed. For although it be true of the living of any Age to say that *Christ* is Lord and Judge of them and of the dead, yet in the next Age they are not the living but the dead which *Christ* shall come to judge, and consequently no one generation but the last can be the quick which he shall judge. As therefore to the interpretation of this || Article I take that distinction to be necessary, that in the end of the World all the generations dead shall be revived, and the present generation living so continued, and *Christ* shall gather them all to his tribunal seat, and so shall truly come to judge both *the quick and the dead*.

|| This was well observed by S. Austin. Si autem in illis verbis Apostoli nullus alius sensus poterit

reperiri, & hoc cum 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 conveniet quod in Regula Fidei confitemur, *venturum Dominum, judicaturum vivos & mortuos*, ut non hic intelligamus, vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quamvis judicandi sint & justus & injusti, sed vivos, quos nondum exiisse, mortuos autem, quos jam exiisse de corporibus advenus ejus inveniet, ad 3. *Quest. Dulcissimi. And Origin long before did make the same exposition of those words*, That he might be Lord both of the dead and living, *Rom. 14. 9.* "Οὐ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ὁμοίαις ἀπέθανεν Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα νεκρῶν κριθῆσθαι ἀνάσθῃ ἢ ζώντων κριθῆσθαι. Καὶ οἷός ἐστι γὰρ ὁ ἄποστολος νεκρῶν μὴ ὡν κριθῆσθαι ὁ Χριστός, τὸ ἔτι καὶ ζωντῶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτη (σουλπίσει γὰρ καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἀφθαρτοί) ζώντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀλλαγισμῶν, ἑτέρας οὐσίας ἢ ἐγερθήσονται νεκρῶν. Ἐχει δὲ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἑσχατοῦν ἢ λέξις ἕτως, Καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγισμῶν ἐξῆς εἰρημῶν τῶν, Οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται πρῶτον. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς πρώτῃ ἐν ἐτέροις λέξεσι ἢ αὐτῶν διαφορὰν παρὰ τὴν φησιν, ἄλλες μὲν εἶναι τῶν κοιμηθῶν, ἄλλες δὲ τῶν ζώντων λέγων, *Sc. l. 2. contra Celsum. Which Exposition is far more proper than that of Methodius.* Ἐπὶ τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ ὅτι τῶν 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.*

*Psal. 73. 2.*

To believe an universal Judgment to come is necessary: First, to prevent the dangerous doubts arising against the ruling of the World by the providence of God; that old rock of offence upon which so many souls have suffered shipwrack. That which made the Prophet *David* confess, his feet were almost gone, his steps had well nigh slipt, hath hurried multitudes of men to eternal perdition. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent miseries of the righteous, the frequent persecution of Virtue, and eminent rewards of Vice, the sweet and quiet departures often attending upon the most dissolute, and horrid tortures putting a period to the most religious lives, have raised a strong temptation of doubt and mistrust whether there be a God that judgeth the earth. Nor is there any thing in this life considered alone, which can give the least rational satisfaction in this temptation. Except there be a life to come after such a death as we daily see, except in that life there be rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed than here they are, how can we ground any acknowledgment of an over-ruling justice. That therefore we may be assured that God who sitteth in heaven ruleth over all the earth, that a divine and most holy Providence disposeth and dispenseth all things here below: it is absolutely necessary to believe and profess, that a just and exact retribution is deferred, that a due and proportionable dispensation of rewards and punishments is reserved to another World; and consequently that there is an Universal Judgment to come.

Secondly it is necessary to believe a Judgment to come, thereby effectually to provoke our selves to the breaking off our sins by repentance, to the regulating our future actions by the Word of God, and to the keeping a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. Such is the sweetness of our sins, such the connaturalness of our corruptions, so great our confidence of impunity here, that except we looked for an account hereafter, it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, renounce his complacencies, and by a severe repentance create a bitterness to his own Soul. But being once persuaded of a judgment, and

with-

withal possessed with a sense of our sins, who will not tremble with *Felix*? who will not flee from the wrath to come? what must the hardness be of that impenitent heart which treasureth up unto it self wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God? We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills, and the inclination of our own hearts: all external rules and perscriptions are burthenfome to us; and did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfie any other desires than our own: especially the dictates of the Word of God are so pressing and exact, that were there nothing but a commanding power, there could be no expectation of obedience. It is necessary then that we should believe that an account must be given of all our actions; and not only so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule of God's revealed will, that *God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel.* There is in every man not only a power to reflect, but a necessary reflection upon his actions, not only a voluntary remembrance, but also an irresistible judgment of his own conversation. Now if there were no other judge beside our own souls, we should be regardless of our own sentence, and wholly unconcerned in our own condemnations. But if we were perswaded that these reflections of conscience are to be so many witnesses before the tribunal of Heaven, and that we are to carry in our own hearts a testimony either to absolve or condemn us, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and endeavour above all things, for a good conscience. For seeing that all things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God. Reason it self will tell us thus much; but if that do not, or if we will not hearken to our own voice; the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, That denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, 'Tis necessary to profess faith in *Christ* as Judge of the quick and the dead, for the strengthening our hope, for the augmenting our comfort, for the establishing our assurance of eternal life. If we look upon the Judgment to come only as revealing our secrets, as discerning our actions, as sentencing our persons according to the works done in the flesh, there is not one of us can expect life from that tribunal, or happiness at the last day. We must confess that we have all sinned, and that there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no proportion to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgment, as such, there can be nothing but a fearful expectation of eternal misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happiness. It is necessary therefore that we should believe that *Christ* shall sit upon the throne, that our Redeemer shall be our Judge, that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigour of the Law, but the mildness and mercies of the Gospel; and then we may look upon not only the precepts but also the promises of God; whatsoever sentence in the sacred Scripture speaketh any thing of hope, whatsoever Text administheth any comfort, whatsoever argument drawn from thence can breed in us any assurance, we may confidently make use of them all in reference to the Judgment to come; because by that Gospel which contains them all we shall be judged. If we consider whose Gospel it is, and who shall judge us by it, *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 ransom for us.* He is our High-priest who made an atonement for our sins, a merciful and faithful

Rom. 2. 5.

Rom. 2. 16.

2 Pet. 3. 11.

Tit. 2. 11, 12, 13.

Ephes. 5. 30.

Heb. 2. 11.

Lev. 25. 48.

*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 pass the sentence upon us, who maketh intercession for us? Well therefore may we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him unto the Throne of that Judge, who is our Brother, who is our Redeemer, who is our High-Priest, who is our Advocate, who will not by his Word at the last day condemn us, because he hath already in the same Word absolved us, saying, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation: But is passed from death unto life.*

Ephes. 3. 12.

John 5. 24.

Having thus explained the nature of the judgment to come, and the necessity of believing the same, we have given sufficient light to every Christian to understand what he ought to intend, and what it is he professeth, when he saith, I believe in him who *shall come to judge the quick and the dead.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much. I am fully persuaded of this as of an infallible and necessary Truth, That the eternal Son of God, in that humane nature, in which he died, and rose again, and ascended into Heaven, shall certainly come from the same Heaven into which he ascended, and at his coming shall gather together all those which shall be then alive, and all which ever lived and shall be before that day dead: when causing them all to stand before his judgment-seat, he shall judge them all according to their works done in the flesh; and passing the sentence of Condemnation upon all the Reprobates, shall deliver them to be tormented with the Devil and his Angels, and pronouncing the sentence of absolution upon all the Elect; shall translate them into his glorious Kingdom, of which there shall be no end. And thus I believe in *Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead.*

ARTICLE VIII.

I Believe in the Holy Ghost.

**I**N this Article we repeat again the first word of the Creed, *I believe*; whereas a Conjunction might have been sufficient, but that so many particulars concerning the Son hath intervened. For as we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: so do we make Confession of our Faith, saying, *I believe in the Father, the Son,\* and the Holy Ghost*; and the ancients whose Creed was something shorter, made no repetition of the Act of Faith, but only an addition of the Object; † *And in the Holy Ghost*. And as we repeat the Act of Faith in this Article, so some did also in the second, || *I believe in Jesus Christ*. Wherefore being this word, *I believe*, is taken here only by way of resumption or repetition, and consequently must be of the same sense or 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.

\* Sed enim ordo rationis, & Fidei auctoritas digestis vocibus & Hieris Dominis, admonet nos post hæc credere etiam in Spiritum S. olim Eccl. re-promissum, sed statuti. tempo-

rum opportunitatibus reddidit. *Novatiani de Trin. c. 29* Schillingius the Socinian in his Preface to the Polonian Confession of Faith endeavourth to persuade us that this Article of the Holy Ghost is not so ancient as the rest; which being diametrically opposite to that Original of the Creed, which I have delivered, the Baptismal words, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it will be necessary to examine his reason, which is drawn only from the authority of Tertullian; who in his Book de veland. Virg. reciting the Rule of Faith, makes no mention of the Holy Ghost: and de Præser. Hæret. propounds this Article no otherwise, quam ut credamus Christum in caelos receptum sedere ad dextram Patris, misisse vicariam vim Sp. Sancti. But this Objection made for the Novelty of this Article is easily answered. For Irenæus before Tertullian hath it expressly in his Confession, l. 1. c. 2. and calls it the Faith in Patrem & Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum, and also declares, That the Church received that Faith, and preserved it through the whole World. † So the ancient Greek MS. κ' εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον; and Marcellus, κ' εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα; as also Arius and Euzoius, and the Council of Nice. Thus also the Latines, Post hoc ponitur in ordine fidei, Et in Spiritum Sanctum, *Ruffinus in Symb. Max. Turin.* & Author lib. de Symb. ad Cavechum. The MS. in the Oxford Library, Et in Spiritu Sancto. Others instead of the Conjunction made use of Credo by way of repetition as we do: Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, *Chrysolog. Euseb. Gallican. Author Sem. de Tempore, Eucherius Uxam. the Greek and Latine MS. in Bennet College Library; and Credo in Sancto Spiritu: Venantius Fortunatus.* || As the ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus.

For although the \* Ancient Fathers did frequently make use of this Language to prove the Divinity of the Spirit, and did thence argue that he is really and truly God, because we believe in the Holy Ghost; yet being that Language is not expressly read in the Scriptures in relation to the Spirit, as it is in reference to the Son; being to believe in the Holy Ghost, is only the expression of the Church contained in the Creed; being in the same Creed many of the Ancients, without any reprehension, have used the same phrase in the following Articles expressly, and where the Preposition is not expressed it may very well be thought it was understood; therefore I think fit to acquiesce in my former Exposition, and lay no great force in the Preposition.

\* Gregory Nazianzen disputing for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, proveth that he is no Creature thus. Ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν κτίσμα, πῶς εἰς αὐτὸ πιστεύομεν; ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ τελειώμεθα, ἢ γὰρ ταῦτόν ἐστι πιστεύειν εἰς τι, πῶς αὐτὸ πι-

στέον. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ θεότης, τὸ δὲ παντὸς τελέωσις, Orat. 37. Epiphanius seems to speak thus much, showing that though the Fathers of the Nicene Council had determined nothing particularly of the Holy Ghost, yet they sufficiently shew that he is God by these words, κ' εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Εὐθύς γὰρ ἡ ἐκθεσις ὁμολογεῖ κ' ἐκ ἀρνείται. Πιστεύομεν γὰρ εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα πάντοτε κρείττονα. Τὸ δὲ πιστεύομεν ἔχει ἀπλῶς εἰρησίου, ἀλλ' ἡ πίστις εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἔχει ἀπλῶς εἰρησίου, ἀλλ' εἰς Θεὸν ἢ Πίστις. Καὶ, εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἔχει ἀπλῶς εἰς μίαν δοξολογίαν, κ' εἰς μίαν ἐνοσίχθονος, κ' μίαν ὁμολογήσαν, εἰς τρία τέλη, μίαν ἢ θεότητα, μίαν ἐστίαν, μίαν δοξολογίαν, μίαν κρείττονα, ἀπὸ τοῦ πιστεύομεν κ' πιστεύομεν καὶ πιστεύομεν. *Hæres. 4.* 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 & demones credunt & contremiscunt. In Deum vero credere, hoc est fideliter credere dicere, & 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.*

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 contained in it, what

we are obliged to believe concerning the *Holy Ghost*. And as to this we shall discharge our undertaking, and satisfy whatsoever is required in this Exposition, if we can set forth these two particulars, the Nature and the Office of that blessed Spirit. For the name of *GHOST* or *GAST* in the ancient Saxon Language signifieth a Spirit, and in that appellation of the Spirit of God, his nature principally is expressed. The addition of Holiness though it denote the intrinsecal sanctity essentially belonging to that Spirit, yet notwithstanding it containeth also a derivative notion, as signifying an emanation of that Holiness and communication of the effects thereof; and in this communication his Office doth consist. Whatsoever therefore doth concern the Spirit of God, as such, and the intrinsecal sanctity, which belongeth to that Spirit, may be expressed in the explication of his Nature; whatsoever belongeth to the derivation of that sanctity, may be described in his Office; and consequently more cannot be necessary than to declare what is the Nature, what the Office of the Spirit of God.

For the better indagation of the Nature of the Holy Ghost, I shall proceed by certain steps and degrees, which as they will render the Discourse more clear, so will they also make the Reasons more strong, and the Arguments more evident. And first, as to the existence of the Spirit of God, it will be unnecessary to endeavour the proof of it; for although the Sadduces seemed to deny it, who said that there is no resurrection, neither Angel, nor spirit; though it hath † been ordinarily concluded from thence that they rejected the Holy Ghost, yet it cannot be proved from those words that they denied the existence of the Spirit of God, any more than that they denied the existence of God, who is a Spirit: nor did the Notion which the Jews had of the Spirit of God any way incline the Sadduces, who denied the existence of the Angels and the Souls of men, to reject it. The Resurrection, Angel, and Spirit, which the Sadduces refused to acknowledge, were but two particulars, for it is expressly added that the *Pharisees confessed both*; of which two the Resurrection was one, \* Angels and Spirits were the other; wherefore that which the Sadduces disbelieved was the existence of such created spiritual natures, as the Angels and the Souls of men are conceived to have. And as for those Disciples at *Ephesus*, who had <sup>1</sup> not so much as heard whether there be an 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 baptism of *John*, it signifieth not that they never heard of the Spirit of God, but only that they had not heard of the giving of it, which the Apostle mentioned. As we read elsewhere, that the <sup>2</sup> *Holy Ghost was not yet*; not denying the existence, but the plentiful effusion of it. For, whatsoever the Nature of the Spirit of God may be thought to be, no man can conceive the Apostle should deny his existence before *Christ's* glorification, whose operation was so manifest at his conception. Howsoever, the Apostle asked those ignorant Disciples, *Unto what then were ye baptized?* 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 only question consists in this, what that *Holy Ghost* is, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom, according to our baptism, we profess in the Creed to believe.

In order to the determination of which question; our first Assertion is, That the Holy Ghost, described to us in the Word of God, and joyned with

the

Acts 23. 8.  
 † As Epiph.  
 Hæres. 14.  
 Πνεῦμα τὸ ἁ-  
 γιον Σαδδου-  
 κῆται ἢ ἕδ' ἔ-  
 ἴνας τὸ παρ' ὅ-  
 παν ἐνόμισαν  
 (ἕδ' ἔχ' ἀγγέ-  
 λων, ἕδ' ἐσπῆσα-  
 σιν) ἐκ οὗτ' ὅ-  
 θεν τὰς τοσοῦ-  
 τας πάλ' αὐτῶ  
 μαρτυρίας ἐν  
 τῇ παλαιᾷ δι-  
 ἀπίστῳ, Ο-  
 ραί. 37.  
 \* Φαρισαῖοι δ',  
 φησὶν, ὁμολο-  
 γῶσι τὰ αὐ-  
 τήτερα \* ἄγγε-  
 λων ὅτι. πῶς  
 ἐν λέγει ἀμφό-  
 τερα; ἢ ὅτι  
 πνεῦμα καὶ  
 ἀγγέλων ἐν  
 ἑα; S. Chryl.  
 ad locum.  
 1 Acts 19. 2.

1 John 7. 39.

the Father and the Son in the form of Baptism, is a Person. We are all baptized in the name of three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and the publick Confession of our Faith hath relation to those Three. We all confess that two of these, the Father and the Son, are persons: that which we now assert is only this, that the Holy Ghost, who is of the three the third, is also a Person as the other two. That blessed Spirit is not only an \* energy or operation, not a quality or power, but a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. || If we conceive it is an operation only, then must it only be actuated and not act; and when it is not actuated, it must not be at all. If we say that it is a quality, and not a substance; we say that it is that which we cannot prove to have any being. It seemeth to me strangely unreasonable that men should be so earnest in endeavouring to prove that the Holy Ghost which sanctifieth them is no substance, when they cannot be assured that there is any thing operative in the world beside substantial beings, and consequently if they be not sanctified by that, they can be susceptible of no holiness. By what reason in nature can they be assured, by what revelation in Scripture can they be confident, that there is a reality deserving the name of quality distinguished from all substance, and yet working real and admirable effects? If there were no other Argument but this, that we are assured by the Christian Faith, that there is 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 boldness to assert the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, to be nothing else but a quality.

\* To conclude the nature of the Holy Ghost which is not so immediately expressed in the Scriptures, it will be needful so to place our assertions, as that they may occur to all other misconceptions. Now the old notions (and more they cannot now have,) were thus delivered by Gregory Nazianzen, that great Divine, so much concerned in this Subject. Τῶν ἢ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἢ ὡς σαρῶν οἱ ἢ ἐνεργειῶν

τῆτο (τὸ πνεῦμα) ὑπέλαβον, οἱ ἢ κλίσμα, οἱ ἢ Θεὸν, οἱ δὲ ἄκ' ἐγνωσαν ὁπότερον τῶτων· αἰδοί τ' ὑπεφθῆς, ὡς φασιν· ἐδέξασαν σαφῶς δηλωσάτης. 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 ἢ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑπεσπύκτων πάντως ὑποθετέον, ἢ ἢ ἐν ἑτέρῳ θεωρουμένων, ὡν τὸ ἢ ἐσίαν καλεῖται οἱ σαρῶν ταύτα δεινοί, τὸ ἢ 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. || This is the Argument of the same Father, Εἰ μὲν ἐν συμβεβηκεν, ἐνεργεια τῆτο ἀν εἰ Θεῶ, τί γὰρ ἑτερον, ἢ τίνος; τῆτο γὰρ πως μᾶλλον κ' φεύγει (αὐθεσίαν, κ' εἰ ἐνεργεια, ἐνεργηθῆσεται δηλονότι ἐκ ἐνεργήσας, κ' ὁμῶς ἐνεργηθῆσεται παύσεται· τοῦτον γὰρ ἢ ἐνεργεια. Πῶς ἐν ἐνεργεί, κ' τὰδε λέγει, κ' ἀφορίζει, κ' λυπεῖται, κ' παροξύνεται, κ' ὅσα κινεῖται σαφῶς ὅτιν ἢ κινήσεως.

But we are not left to guess at the nature of the Spirit of God; the word of God which came from that Spirit hath sufficiently delivered him as a person. It is indeed to be observed that in the Scriptures there are some things spoken of the Holy Ghost which are proper and peculiar to a Person, as the Adversaries confess: others, which are not properly and primarily to be attributed to a Person, as we cannot deny: and it might seem to be equally doubtful, in relation to the Scripture Expressions, whether the Holy Ghost were a person or no; and that they which deny his Personality may pretend as much Scripture as they which assert it. But in this seeming indifferency we must also observe a large diversity; inasmuch as the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is not always taken in the same propriety of signification; nor do we say that the Holy Ghost which signifieth a Person, always signifieth so much. It is therefore easily conceived, how some things may be attributed to the Spirit in the Scriptures which are not proper to a Person, and yet the Spirit be a Person, because sometimes the Spirit is taken for that which is not a Person, as we acknowledge. Whereas, if ever any thing be attributed to the Holy Ghost as to a Person, which cannot be otherwise understood of the Spirit of God than as of a Person, then may we infallibly conclude that the Holy Ghost is a Person. This therefore we shall endeavour fully and clearly to demonstrate; first, that the Scriptures declare unto us the Holy Ghost as a Person, by such attributes and expressions as cannot be understood to be spoken

spoken of the Spirit of God any other way than as of a Person : Secondly, that whatsoever attributes or expressions are used in the Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, and are objected as repugnant to the nature of a Person, either are not so repugnant, as is objected ; or if they be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifies not a Person.

First then the Holy Ghost, or good Spirit of God is clearly and formally opposed to those evil Spirits, which are and must be acknowledged persons, of a spiritual and intellectual subsistence. As, *the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil Spirit from the Lord troubled him.* Now, what those evil spirits from the Lord were, is apparent from the sad example of *Ahab*, concerning whom we read, *there came out a Spirit and stood before the Lord and said, I will entice him ; and the Lord said unto him wherewith ? and he said, I will go out and be a lying Spirit in the mouth of all his Prophets ; and the Lord said, Thou shalt entice him, and thou shalt also prevail ; go out and do even so.* From whence it is evident that the evil Spirits from God were certain persons, even bad Angels, to which the one good Spirit as a person is opposed, departing from him to whom the other cometh.

Again, The New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personal dispositions, and with such operations, as are evident as marks and signs of a person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, which are unquestionable persons, and whatsoever terms are spoken of the Spirit by way of quality, are spoken as well of those which are acknowledged persons. We are exhorted by the Apostle *not to grieve the Spirit of God*, and grief is certainly a personal affection of which a quality is not capable. We are assured that the same *Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered ;* and we can understand what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly personal : for he *searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God,* and so he knoweth all things, *even the things of God,* which can be no description of the power of God ; he *worketh all the spiritual gifts, dividing to every man severally as he will ;* in which the operation, discretion, distribution, and all these voluntary, are sufficient demonstrations of a person. He revealeth the will of God and speaketh to the sons of men, in the nature and after the manner of a person ; for the Spirit said unto Peter, *Behold three men seek thee. Arise therefore and get thee down, and go with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them :* 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 than by the description given by Christ which sent him : and he said thus to his Disciples, *The Comforter (or, the Advocate) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, he shall testify of me : and ye also shall bear witness. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world, and he will guide you into all truth ; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he shall shew you things to come ; he shall glorify 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 reproofing, a person instructing.

† 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

The † Adversaries to this truth acknowledging all these personal expressi-

tionibus, & ea quæ personarum sunt propria, ex hoc nihil concludi potest, cum aliis rebus quas personas non esse constat



stat, 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 per multa tribuens, quæ revera non nisi in personam cadunt, *Faustus Socinus contra Wiekum, c. 10.*

ons, 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, *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, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* All which personal actions are attributed to Charity which is no person, as in \* other cases it is usual, but 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, personal actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no person, but only the virtue, power, and efficacy of God the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*; because that God the Father is a person, and doth perform those personal actions, attributed to the Holy Ghost, by that virtue, power, and efficacy in himself which is the Holy Ghost. As when we read *the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee; arise therefore and get thee down and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them:* we must understand that God the Father was the person which spake those words, and which sent those men; but because he did so by that virtue which is the Holy Ghost, therefore the Holy Ghost is said to speak those words and send those men. In the same manner when we read, *the Holy Ghost said unto those at Antioch, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them;* we must conceive it was God the Father who spake those words, who had called *Barnabas* and *Saul*, and to whom they were to be separated: but because God did all this by that power within him which is his Spirit, therefore those words and actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost. This is the sum of their answer; and more than this I conceive cannot be said in answer to that Argument which we urge from those personal expressions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a person.

1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7.

\* So the *Racovian Catech.* doth enlarge this Answer, stating the question thus, Qui vero in Scripturæ loci accipienti sunt in quibus Sp. S. actiones personarum propriæ & ad Deum ipsam spectantes attribuantur? And returning this solution, Ad eam modum, quo in Scripturis rebus id attribuitur sæpè, penumero, quod personarum est neque tamen res illæ propterea personæ censentur, ut peccato, quod deceperit, & occiderit, Rom. 7. 11. & legi, quod

loquatur, Rom. 2. 19. & Scripturæ quod prospiciat & prænunciet, Gal. 3. 18. & Charitati quod sit longanimitas, &c. 1. Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. Denique Spiritui, i. e. vento, quod spiret ubi velit, c. 6. Vide *Socini Epistolam 3. ad Petrum Statorium.* || 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, certumq; sit alioqui spiritum alicujus personæ non posse esse personam ab ea cujus est Spiritus distinctam, non minus constare cum Spiritui S. ea tribuantur, 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. sæpè Deus ipse intelligatur, quatenus suam virtutem Deus per Spiritum suum exercit. *Catech. Racov. ibid.* <sup>1</sup> Acts 10. 20. <sup>2</sup> Acts 13. 2.

But this answer is most apparently insufficient, as giving no satisfaction to the Argument. For if all the personal actions, attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, might proceed from the Person of God the Father, according to the power which is in him, then might this answer seem satisfactory; but if these actions be personal, as they are acknowledged and cannot be denied, if the same cannot be attributed to the Person of God the Father, whose Spirit it is, if he cannot be said to do that by the power within him, which is said to be done by the Holy Ghost, then is that defence not to be defended; then must the Holy Ghost be acknowledged a person. But I shall clearly prove, that there are several personal attributes given in the sacred Scriptures expressly to the Holy Ghost, which cannot be ascribed to God the Father, which God the Father by that power which is in him, cannot be said to do; and

and consequently cannot be any ground why those attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a person.

Rom. 8. 27.

To make intercession is a personal action, and this action is attributed to the Spirit of God, *because he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God.* But to make intercession, is not an act which can be attributed to God the Father, neither can he be said to intercede for us according to that power which is in him; and therefore this can be no Prosopopœia, the Holy Ghost cannot be said to exercise the personal action of intercession for that reason because it is the Spirit of that person which intercedeth for us. To

John 15. 26.

come unto men, as being sent unto them, is a personal action, and so the Comforter, or Advocate, who is the Holy Ghost, did come, being sent; *when the Comforter is come whom I will send you from the Father,* saith Christ, and again,

John 16. 7.

*If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him to you.* But to come unto men as being sent, cannot be ascribed to God the Father, who sendeth, but is never sent; especially in this particular, in which the Father is said expressly to send, and that in the name of the Son

John 16. 13.

(*whom the Father will send in my name,* saith our Saviour.) When therefore the Holy Ghost cometh to the Sons of men, as sent by the Father in the name of the Son, and sent by the Son himself, this personal action cannot be attributed to the Father as working by the power within him, and consequently cannot ground a Prosopopœia by which the virtue or power of God the Father shall be said to do it. To speak and hear are personal actions, and both together attributed to the Spirit, in such a manner as they cannot

John 16. 14.

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 doth all things of himself; to speak what he heareth, and that of the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorify him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as

Christ speaketh of the Holy Ghost, *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and 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 do these personal actions, because that person whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is, doth those actions, by and according to his own power, which is the Holy Ghost.

It remaineth therefore that the Answer given by the Adversaries of this truth, is apparently insufficient, and consequently that our Argument, drawn from the personal actions attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, is sound and valid.

I thought this discourse had fully destroyed the Socinian Prosopopœia; and indeed as they ordinarily propound their Answer, it is abundantly refuted. But I find the subtilty of Socinus prepared \* another explication of the Prosopopœia to supply the room where he foresaw the former would not serve. Which double figure he groundeth upon this distinction. The Spirit, that is, the power of God, saith he, may be considered either as a propriety and power in God, or as the things on which it worketh are affected with it. If it be considered in the first notion, then if any Personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is there taken for God, and by the Spirit God is signified: if it be considered in the second notion, then if any Personal attribute be given to the Spirit, the Spirit is taken for that man in which it worketh, and that man, affected with it, is called the Spirit of God.

\*Credo me factis ostendisse, Spiritum S. non esse personam, non magis quam alia vel proprietates, vel effecta Dei sint persona, cum nihil sit aliud quam peculiaris quaedam virtus & efficacia Dei; quæ si ut ipsius Dei proprietates, & vis per quam agit consideratur & accipitur, figuræ metonymiæ aut prosopopœiæ accommodatissimus est locus: & metonymiæ quidem, si Spiritus S. nomine ipse Deus cuius est Spiritus, quiq; per eum agit significetur: prosopopœiæ vero, ut quando Deus per Spiritum S. agit, ipsi Spiritui S. Dei actio tribuatur: sin autem hæc virtus & efficacia

efficacia

efficacia Dei consideratur & accipitur, ut res in quibus agit, ab ipsa afficiuntur, utrique isti figuræ similiter aptissimus est locus quandoquidem commodissime per metonymiam is qui à Spiritu S. aliquo modo affectus quidpiam agit, quatenus id agit, Spiritus S. seu Spiritus Dei metonymicè dici potest: ut factum est apud Paulum, cum ait (1 Cor. 2. 10.) Spiritum (sub. Dei) omnia scrutari etiam profunda Dei: ubi Spiritus Dei nomine sine dubio intellexit hominem Spiritu Dei præditum, quatenus viz. ab isto Spiritu afficitur. Jam per prosopopœiam ipsi Spiritui S. actionem tribui, quæ ipsius Spiritus ope ab homine fiat adeo est proclive ut nihil magis, *F. Socin. in Resp. ad Wick. cap. 10.*

So that now we must not only shew that such things which are attributed to the Holy Ghost cannot be spoken of the Father, but we must also prove that they cannot be attributed unto man, in whom the Spirit worketh from the Father. And this also will be very easily and evidently proved. The Holy Ghost is said to come unto the Apostles as sent by the Father and the Son, and to come as so sent is a personal action, which we have already shewed cannot be the action of the Father, who sent the Spirit; and it is as certain that it cannot be the action of an Apostle who was affected with the Spirit which was sent, except we can say that the Father and the Son did send S. Peter an Advocate to S. Peter: and S. Peter, being sent by the Father and the Son did come unto S. Peter. Again, Our Saviour, speaking of the Holy Ghost, saith, *He shall receive of mine*: therefore the Holy Ghost in that place is not taken for the Father; and shew it unto you, therefore he is not taken for an Apostle: in that he receiveth the first *Socinian Prosopopœia* is improper; in that he sheweth to the Apostle the second is absurd. The Holy Ghost then is described as a person distinct from the Person of the Father, whose power he is, and distinct from the Person of the Apostle in whom he worketh, and consequently neither of the *Socinian* Figures can evacuate or enervate the Doctrine of his proper and peculiar Personality.

Secondly, For those attributes or expressions used of the Holy Ghost in the sacred Scriptures, and pretended to be repugnant to the nature of a Person, either they are not so repugnant, or if they be, they belong unto the Spirit, as it signifieth not the Person but the gifts or effects of the Spirit. † They tell us that the Spirit is given, and that sometimes in measure, sometimes without measure, that the Spirit is poured out, and that men do drink of it, and are filled with it, that it is doubled and distributed, and something is taken from it, and that sometimes it is extinguished; and from hence they gather, that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, because these expressions are inconsistent with Personality. But a satisfactory Answer is easily returned to this Objection. 'Tis true, that God is said to have *given the Holy Ghost to them that obey him*, but it is as true that a Person may be given; so we read in the Prophet *Isaiah*, *unto us a Son is given*, and we are assured that *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son*; and certainly the Son of God is a Person. And if all the rest of the expressions be such as they pretend, that is, not proper to a Person, yet do they no way prejudice the truth of our Assertion, because we acknowledge the effects and operations of the Spirit to have in the Scriptures the name of the Spirit, who is the cause of those operations. And being to that Spirit, as the cause, we have already shewn those Attributes to be given which can agree to nothing but a Person; we therefore conclude against the *Socinians* and the \* *Jews*, That the Holy Ghost is not a Quality, but a Person; which is our first Assertion.

† Spiritum S non esse Deitatis Personam hinc discere potes, primum quod ea quæ Spiritui S. in Scripturis attribuantur, nulla prorsus ratione Personæ convenient, ut sunt quod detur, quod ex eo detur, idq; aut secundum mensuram, aut absque omni mensura quod effundatur ipse & ex ipso effundatur, & quod eo potentur homines, quod augeatur, quod in duplo detur,

in partibus distribuatur, tollatur ipse, & ex ipso tollatur; & similia in Scripturis extant. *Catech. Racov. c. 6. Quæst. 12. Acts 5. 32. Isa. 9. 6. \* The Opinion of the Jews was, That the Holy Ghost was nothing else but the afflatus or energy of God, and therefore they which denied the substantiality of the Spirit were looked upon as symbolizing with the Jews in this particular. 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 utriusq; Personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari, S. Hier. Ep. 55. Moses Maimonides sufficiently declareth the Opinion of the Jews, who delivering the several significations of  $\text{רוח}$ , maketh the fifth and sixth to be these. Quinto significat influentiam illam intellectualem divinam à Deo Prophetis instillatam, cujus virtute Prophetant. Sexto significant Propositum, & Voluntatem. And then concludes, Vox hæc  $\text{רוח}$  quando Deo attribuitur, ubiq; sumitur partim in quinta, partim in sexta significatione, quatenus voluit talem significat, *Mose Nevechem, p. 1. c. 40.**

1 Cor. 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, and, 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 inest homine? Ita quæ sunt Dei nemo novit nisi Spiritus Dei.* Quoniam vero Spiritus S. in Deo est, nec tamen in Spiritu S. reciprocè 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. non esse personam divinam.* Denique si Spiritus S. esset persona, essentiam quoque divinam eum habere oporteret. Nam ea attribuntur illi quæ propria sunt essentia: divinæ: ac superius docuimus substantiam divinam unam esse numero, nec tribus personis esse posse communem. Quamobrem Sp. non esse Deitatis personam planum est, *Catech. Racovian. c. 6.* To the same purpose doth Socinus argue against Wickus, *That the nature of the Spirit is the Nature of God, and that the Spirit cannot therefore be a Person, because there can be but one Person in the Nature of God. Whereas therefore independently from this place we have proved, That the Holy Spirit is a Person, and from this place have inferred with them, That the same Spirit is in God and of the Divine Nature, it followeth, That he is no created Spirit, inasmuch as nothing in the Divine Nature can be created.*

Our second Assertion is, That the *Holy Ghost*, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is not a created, but a divine and uncreated, Person. And for the proof of this Assertion, we shall first make use of that Argument which our Adversaries have put into our hands. The Spirit of God which is in God is not a created Person: But the Holy 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 denied 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; inasmuch as that cannot be a created person which hath not a created nature, and that can neither have nor be a created nature, which by nature is in God. Wherefore although it be replied by others, that it is not said in the Text that the Spirit is in God, yet our Adversaries reason over-weighs their negative observation; and it availeth little to say that it is not expressed, 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 only denied to be in God, because it is not said so when it is implied,) therefore he is no created Person.

Secondly, The *Holy Ghost* is such a one, as against whom a sin may be committed, and when it is so, cannot be remitted. But if he were no Person, we could not commit that sin against him; and if he were a created Person, the sin committed against him could not be irremissible. Therefore he is a Person, and that uncreated. The Argument is grounded upon the words of our Saviour, \* *All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.* By which words it appeareth there is a sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost distinct from all other sins and blasphemies committed against God the Father or the Son of God; that this sin hath an aggravation added unto it, beyond other sins and blasphemies: but if the Holy Spirit were no Person, the sin could not be distinct from those sins which are committed against him whose Spirit he is; and if he were a Person created, the sin could receive no such aggravation beyond other sins and blasphemies.

\* *Matt. 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 creaturæ audent quisquam Spiritum computare? Aut quis sic se obligat, ut si creaturæ derogaverit, non putet sibi hoc aliqua venia relaxandum? S. *Ambros. de Spiritu S. l. 1. c. 3.*

To this they answer, That the sin against the *Holy Ghost* is not therefore unpardonable, because he is God, which is not to our purpose; but they do not, cannot 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 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 incapable, if the Spirit were not God.

Thirdly, Every created person was made by the Son of God as God, and is now put under the feet of the Son of God as man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the Son of God, nor is He now put under the feet of the Son of man. Therefore the Spirit 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, as *Isaiah* testifieth, saying, *Now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me,* and with the same authority, since the exaltation of our Saviour, sent forth such as were separated to himself, as appeareth in the case of *Barnabas* and *Saul*, and † with the same authority giveth all Spiritual Gifts, *dividing to every man severally as he will;* so that in this Kingdom of *Christ* all things are done *by the power of the Spirit of God.*

John 1. 3.

1 Cor. 15. 27.

\* Job 26. 13. Those which anciently did believe the Spirit of God to be a created Person, did also teach that he was made by the Son, as Epiphanius testifieth of the Arians, Παντὲ τῶτο δὴ λόγον ἐσιν ὅτι ὁμολο-

γῆσι καὶ ἀγγέλους ὑπὸ τῆς ἡμῶν γεγονέναι, καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον βλασφημῶσι καὶ τολμῶσι λέγειν κελίωθαι ὑπὸ τῆς ἡμῶν. Her. 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. Aug. Her. 49. At Eusebius, τὸ ἡ παρὰ κλήσιν Ἁγίου Πνεύμα, ἕτε Θεός, ἕτε υἱός, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐν τῷ Πατρὸς ὁμοίως τῷ υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν ἡμῶν εἰληφει, ἀν δὲ τι τῷ διὰ τῆς ἡμῶν ἡμῶν τυγχάνει, ὅτι ἡ πάντα δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο ἕδ' ἐν, De Eccl. Theol. 1. 3. c. 6. Ὅδ' ἡμῶν μόνος πατρικῆ θεότητι τέλει μὲν ἡμῶν ποιητικὸς ἀν εἶη καὶ δημιουργικὸς τῷ ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἀπάντων ὁμοίως τε καὶ ὁμοίως, καὶ δὴ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς πατρικῆς Πνεύμα ἅγιον ἕδ' ἐξ ἡμῶν. πάντα γὰρ δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο ἕδ' ἐν, Ib. 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 Catholics used to refute that Heresie of the Arians, viz. ὁ γέγονεν. All things which were made were made by the Son, but the Holy Ghost was not amongst them ἡ γέγονεν, which were made, and therefore was not made by the Son. τὸ Ἁγιον γὰρ Πνεῦμα κλίσμα πάλιν κ' ἰσμάτος φασιν εἶναι, διὰ τὸ, διὰ τῆς ἡμῶν τὰ πάντα γέγονεν, ὡς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ἀσυνέτως τινὰς διασπάζοντες, ἕ καθὼς εἶρηται τὸ ῥητὸν ἔχοντες, ἀλλὰ κακῶς ὑπονοοοῦντες, καὶ ἀποφῆναι τὸ κακῶς εἰρημῶν κατ' ἰδίαν κακῶς αὐτῶν ὑπόνοιαν μεθερμηνεύοντες. ἕ γὰρ τὸ θεῖον Ἐυαγγέλιον αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔφη, ἀλλὰ περὶ πάντων ἡμῶν κελίωθαι, ὅτι εἶ τι κλίσμα διὰ τῆς Λόγου γέγονεν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς Λόγου. τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο ἕδ' ἐν, παρεκλινομένης τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ἔχει, ὁ γέγονεν, ἵνα ἔτο γνωσθῆ, ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο ἕδ' ἐν, Epiph. Her. 69. §. 56 † S. Chryl. Tom. 5. p. 10. Ταῦτα πάντα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαίρεσιν, ἵδ' ἡμῶν καθὼς βέλεται. Καθὼς βέλεται φασιν. ἕ καθὼς προσάπεται. Διαίρεσιν, ἕ διαίρεσιν. αὐθεντῶν, ἕ αὐθεντία ὑποκείμενον. τὸ γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐξουσίαν ἡμῶν ἐμαρτύρησε τῷ Πατρὶ ταύτην καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι ἀνατίθεισιν ὁ Παῦλος. καὶ ὡς περὶ ὅτι τῷ Πατρὸς φασιν. Ὁ δὲ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν, ἕ τῷ καὶ ὅτι τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι. ταῦτα ἡμῶν πάντα, φασιν, ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαίρεσιν, ἵδ' ἡμῶν καθὼς βέλεται. ἕδ' ἐν ἀπρητισμῶν ἐξουσίαν; ὡν γὰρ ἡ ἐξουσία μία, δὴλον καὶ ὅτι ἡ αὐθεντία μία. καὶ ὡν ἰσότης ἡ ἀξία, τέτων καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία μία. 1 Cor. 12. 1. 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 been the cause of his Conception, he had been in that respect the Son of a Creature, nay, according to the Adversaries Principles, he had taken upon him the Nature of Angels. But the Holy Ghost it was by whose operation *Christ* was conceived in the womb of the Virgin. For it was an Angel that said to *Mary*, (not that an Angel, but that, ) *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the*

Luke 1. 35

power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. Therefore the Spirit of God is no created Person; which is our second Assertion against the ancient, but newly revived Heresy of the \* Arians and Macedonians.

\* This express  
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 Arians (such as were Aetius, Eunomius, and Eudoxius) and the Homousians, or Semi-Arians (such as Eusebius and Macedonius) they both alike denied the Divinity, and asserted the creation of the Holy Ghost. The Opinion of the Anomeans is clear out of the words of Eunomius, who very subtilly delivered it, as if it had been the Opinion of the Ancients. Τὸ ἅγιον ἐν ἅπασιν φυλάσσοντας διδασκαλίαν, παρ' ὧν τρίτον αὐτὸ ἀξιώματι καὶ τάξει μαθόντες, τρίτον ἐν αἰεὶ καὶ τῆ φύσει περισεύκαμεν. The Confession of the Ancients was that the Holy Ghost was the third Person in the Trinity in Order and Dignity, and Eunomius pretending to follow them, added, That he was also third in Nature, which the Ancients never taught. And what this third in Nature was, he thus declared, Τρίτον τάξει καὶ φύσει προσάγματι ἢ τῷ Πατρὸς ἐνεργείᾳ ἢ τῷ ἕξει γινόμενον: τρίτη χάρις, τιμώμενον, ὡς πρῶτον καὶ μείζον ἀπάντων, καὶ μόνον τοῦ ἔσθον τῷ μονοθεῶς ποίημα, θεότης καὶ δημιουργικὴς δυνάμεως ἀπολειπόμενον. And again, Εἰ μὴ κτίσμα ὄντιν, ἐκείν γίνετο ἢ ἀγγέλιον ἢ εἰς τὸ ἀναρχὸν Θεὸς καὶ ἀγγέλιον. ἔτε μὲν γίνετο, λέγεται οὖν κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα αὐτὸ ὀνομάζεσθαι, apud S. Basil. advers. Eunom. l. 3. So Gregory Nyssen repeats the words of the same Eunomius, Πιστώμενος εἰς τὸ Παράκλητον, γινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ διὰ τὸ μονοθεῶς, and declares that their ordinary language was, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κτίσμα κτίσμα καὶ ἔργον ἔργου ὀνομάζειν, Orat. 1. Cont. Eunom. Beside these, the Semi-Arians 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 Ἡμαρειῶν καὶ τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων) and afterward Macedoniani. Macedoniani sunt à Macedonio Constantinopolitanae Ecclesiae Episcopo, quos & Πνευματομάχος Graeci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu S. litigent. Nam de Patre & Filio rectè sentiunt, quod unius sint ejusdemque substantiae vel essentiae, sed de Spiritu S. hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes, S. Aug. Heres. 52. This Heresie was first condemned by the Council of Alexandria, ἦνθα τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα θεολογήσαντες τῆ ὁμοσίῳ τελεῖδι (Ἰωαν. λαμβάνοντο, Socrat. l. 3. c. 7. Afterward by the Council held in Illyricum. Ἡμεῖς δὲ προσημασμένως καὶ αἱ Σύνοδοι οὖν ἢ τε καὶ Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἢ καὶ Γαλίαν, μίαν εἶναι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐσίαν, τὸ Πατρὸς, καὶ τὸ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. ἐν τρισὶ προσώποις, τυτέσιν ἐν τρισὶ τελείαις ὑποστάσεσι, apud Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 8. The Synod held at Rome with the Gallican Bishops under Damasus. Ὡς τὸ Πατὸρ καὶ τὸ Υἱὸν μιᾶς ἐσσίας, μιᾶς θεότης, μιᾶς ἀρετῆς, μιᾶς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἐνὸς χαρηματῶν πιστεύεσθαι καὶ τῆ αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ ἐσσίας, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, Apud Theodoret l. 2. c. 22. Another Synod held under the same Damasus at Rome, Εἰ τις εἶποι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ποίημα ἢ διὰ τὸ ἕξει, γεγενῆσθαι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, apud Theodor. l. 5. c. 10. After and upon these particular Synods this Heresie was fully condemned in the second general Council held at Constantinople, in which these words were added to the Nicene Creed, Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ ἰσοδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλήσαν διὰ τῆ Περφορῆς, And in the first Canon mentioning the Heresies condemned expressly by the Council; they name ἰδικῶς τὴν ἡν Ἐυνομιανῶν, εἶπεν Ἀνομοίαν, καὶ τὴν ἡν Ἀρειανῶν, εἶπεν Ἐυδοξιανῶν, καὶ τὴν ἡν Ἡμαρειανῶν, ἢ τὴν Πνευματομάχων. And thus the Heresie of Macedonius, who made the Holy Ghost a created Person, was condemned by the second general Council, ἔτως ἢ ἐν ὁ ἱεροφάνης χορὸς Μακεδόνιον τινα τὸ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θεῶν ἀρπαγμα πάλαι ποιησάμενον, εἶτι τὸ πανάγιον καὶ ζωαρχικὸν ἐδυσφήμει Πνεῦμα, ἐσθμίας ἐδικαίως εἶνα. ὡς γὰρ Ἀρειὸς καὶ τὸ Υἱὸς, ἔτω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ παναγίως πνεύμα ἡν ἡν Πνεύμα, εἰς δόλους καὶ ὑπηρετίας τῶν δεσποτικῶν καὶ ὑπερκειμένων αὐτῶ συνέταπε κλειότησα, 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 profess to believe, is properly and truly God. For if he be a Person, as we have proved in the Declaration of our first Assertion, if he be a person not created, as we have demonstrated in the corroboration of the second Assertion, then must he of necessity be acknowledged to be God, because there is no uncreated essence beside the essence of the one eternal God. And there is this great felicity in the laying of this third Assertion, that it is not proved only by the two 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 eternal and omnipotent power of God; he which denies the second, that is the Macedonian, asserts that he is a Person of an intellectual nature subsisting; but whatsoever is a Person subsisting of eternal and omnipotent power, must be acknowledged to be God. Whether therefore we look upon the truth of our Assertions, or whether we consider the happiness of their Negations, the Conclusion is, That the Holy Ghost is God.

But were there nothing, which is already said, demonstrated, there is enough written in the Word of God to assure us of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, to make us 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 veil off, until he came out. And that Lord with whom Moses spake was the one Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth. But we are assured that the

Exod. 34 34.

the Spirit was and is that Lord to which *Moses* spake; for the Apostle hath taught us so much by his own interpretation, saying, *Even unto this day when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit. The Spirit is here so plainly said to be the Lord, that is, Jehovah, the one eternal God, that the Adversaries of this truth must either deny that the Lord is here to be taken for God, or, that the Spirit is to be taken for the Spirit of God: either of which denials must seem very strange to any person which considereth the force and plainness of the Apostles discourse.*

2 Cor. 3. 15, 16, 17.

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 called the Spirit of the Lord. Nay, were it not that the coherence of the discourse did satisfy us; yet the objection ought not at all to move us; for the name of *Spirit* in those places mentioned by them to signify *the sense of the law* hath no affinity with this, according to their own way of argumentation: for it is \* never so taken with the emphasis of an Article, and put in the place either of an intire subject or a predicate in a proposition, except by way of opposition; and one of those it must of necessity be, in those words of the Apostle, *Now the Lord is the Spirit*, and that without the least intimation of any opposition.

\* The places alledged by them are these, Πειρασμὸν καρδίας ἐν Πνεύματι ἔ γέγραμμεν, Rom. 2. 29. Ὡσε δὲ λαλεῖν

ἡμᾶς ἐν κωνόσῃτι πνεύματῳ, καὶ ἐ παλαιότητι γέγραμμεν, Rom. 7. 6. ἥτις καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ Αἴγυπτος, Rom. 11. 8. One of these places speaks only 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 Predicate, 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 γέγραμμεν ὑποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶσσοποιεῖ, and this not. Howsoever, in that sense objected, it neither agrees with the words before it, nor with those which follow it.

Again, We are assured that by *the Lord* the Apostle did understand the eternal God; for he speaketh of the same Lord which he mentioned in the verse before, and that is the Lord God spoken of in the Book of *Exodus*; of which except the Apostle speaks, his Argument hath neither inference nor coherence. In vain therefore is this pretended for an answer, that the Apostle by *the Lord* doth always, unless he cite some place out of the old Covenant, understand *Christ*; for in this particular he \* citeth a certain place out of the Book of *Exodus*, and useth the name of the *Lord* in the same notion in which there 'tis used, framing an Argument and urging it from thence; and if he did not, † that rule is not so universal and infallible, but that *the Lord* in the Language of the same Apostle may not signify the second, but the first or third Person of the Trinity. If then the Lord be the eternal God, as the Apostle without any question understood him in *Moses*, if the *Spirit* be the Spirit of the Lord, as the Apostle expounds himself in the words immediately following, then the Spirit of the Lord is the eternal God, and so termed in the Scriptures.

\* The words in Exodus were these, 34. 34. Ἠνίκα ἃ ἀνείπετο ὁ θεὸς Μωϋσῆς ἕνεκα τῆς Κύριος λέγειν αὐτῷ, πείρησεν τὸ κάλυμμα· which are thus made use of by the Apostle, Ἠνίκα ἃ ἀνείπετο ὁ θεὸς Κύριος

ἐν περιαιρείται τὸ κάλυμμα: Κύριος then is here used by S. Paul citing some place out of the old Covenant, and the words which follow, Ὁ ἃ Κύριος signify the same Κύριος, as appeareth by the Conjunction ἃ: and if so, then according to the Doctrine





he lyed was the Holy Ghost, and therefore it might be well † translated, that he lyed to the Holy Ghost.

† Our Translation is here accused without

reason. For though the original be *ἔψαυεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, yet some Copies have it *εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα*, and the Syriac did so read and interpret it. *ܘܫܩܪܐ ܕܩܪܝܢܐ ܕܗܘ ܕܗܘ*, the Vulgar Latin to the same purpose, *mentiri te Spiritui S.* And the Author of the *Traſtate de temp. Barcarico*, under the name of *S. Auſtin*, *mentiri te apud Spiritum S. c. 3.* Now *ἔψαυεν εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα* is the same with *τὸ πνεῦμα*, as *Μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους*, 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 *τὸ πνεῦμα*. As *Psal. 66. 2. : יַכְחֹשׁ לךְ אִיבִיד* Lxx. *ἔψαυεν* *ὅτι οἱ ἐχθροί σου*, of the same sense with that *Psal. 18. 61. : לִי יְהוָה יִכְחֹשׁ לִי* Lxx. *Οἱ ἐχθροί σου* *ἔψαυον* *αὐτῶν*. So *Deut. 33. 26. : יַכְחֹשׁ אִיבִיד לךְ תְּכַוֵּן* Lxx. *καὶ ψεύσονται σε οἱ ἐχθροί σου* And *IIa. 57. 11. : כִּי תִכְוֶן* *καὶ ἔψαυον με*. 2 *Kings 4. 13. : אֵל תִּכְוֶן בְּשִׁפְחוֹךָ* *μὴ διαψύσῃ τὴν δουλίαν σου*. If therefore we read it *ἔψαυεν 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 *Psal. 78. 36. : τὴν γλῶσση αὐτῶν ἔψαυον αὐτῶν*, and verse 41. *ἐπέστρεψαν καὶ ἐπίεσαν τὸ θεόν*. Therefore whatsoever shifts are laid upon the phrase, or difference of expression, are either false or frivolous.

Next, Because they may very well be conscious that this verbal or phraseological answer may not seem sufficient, they tell us though both the phrases were synonymous, yet they did no way prove that the Spirit is God: and the reason which they render to justify this negation, is, because there are several places of the Scripture, in which the Messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation unto God, as here the Spirit is. To which the answer is most plain and clear, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they alledge those words of the Apostle, *He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man but God, who hath also given us his Holy Spirit*: I cannot see what similitude can be made unto the Scripture now in question: for if the Spirit be not understood in the first words, *he therefore that despiseth*, it hath no relation to the present question; and if it be, it were so far from being a confutation, that it would be another confirmation. As for the other, *He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*; it is so far from justifying their interpretation, that it hath nothing in it like that which 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 been 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 sinfulness of it, *thou hast not lyed unto men but unto God*: it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lyed is God.

1 *Thess.* 4. 8:

*Matt.* 10. 40:  
*Luke* 10. 15.

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 our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* Therefore the Holy Ghost is God.

1 *Cor.* 6. 19.

To this is replied indifferently according to the diversities of our Adversaries; as it is not probable that the deniers of so great a truth should agree. The first tell us, that if we would enforce by this reason, that the Holy Ghost is God, we must † prove that he is a person, and that he doth possess our bodies by a

† *Si quis ex eo quod corpus nostrum Spiritus S. templum*

*fit, concludere velit eum esse Deum, illi demonstrandum est ita corpus nostrum Sp. S. templum dici, ut intelligatur eum esse personam cujus honori corpus nostrum fit dedicatum, à qua corpus nostrum eo jure quod divini numinis proprium est possideatur, & principaliter iacolat, Crell. de uno Deo Patre, l. 1. §. 3.*

1 Cor. 3 16.

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 only those words of the Apostle, *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.* We do certainly know that we are the Temple of God; and we also know that the Spirit of God therefore dwelleth in us; and we therefore know that we are the Temple of God, because we know that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, and we know no other reason why we are the Temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but only because we know the Spirit of God is God; for if the Spirit were any other Person not divine, or 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 only 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 honor. If the Holy Ghost had no interest in us, because he is given unto us, then *Christ* can have no interest in us, for he is also given unto us. Indeed if the Apostle had said, 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, than the Assertion of his Deity to be false Divinity. And whereas it is said, that *the Apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the Temple of the Holy Spirit, to wit, by inhabitation;* that is so far from breeding in me the least thought of diminution, that by this only notion I am fully confirmed in the belief of my Assertion. For I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabiteth in us but by the inhabitation of the Spirit: and I understand no other way by which we can be the Temple of God but by the inhabitation of God, as it 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.

1 Cor. 6 16

Fourthly, He, to whom the Divine attributes do belong as certainly as they belong unto God the Father, is truly and properly God; because those are divine attributes which are proprieties of the divine nature, and consequently none can be indued with them to whom the nature of God belongeth not. But the divine attributes, such as are Omniscience, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost as they do unto God the Father. Therefore we are as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The Scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known, that I shall not need to mention them, and they are so many that to manage them against the exceptions of the Adversaries would take up too much room in this discourse: especially considering they question some of them in the Father as well as in the Spirit, and so I should be forced to a double proof.

fifthly

Fifthly, He, to whom are attributed those works which are proper unto God, by and for which God doth require of us to acknowledge and worship him as God, is properly and truly God: because the operations of all things flow from that essence by which they are, and therefore if the operations be truly divine, that is, such as can be produced by no other but God, then must the essence of that Person which produceth them be truly such. But such works as are proper unto God, by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge him and worship him as God, are attributed often in the Scriptures to the Spirit of God, as the acts of Creation and Conservation of all things, the miracles wrought upon and by our blessed Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of true Believers, and the like. Therefore without any further disputation, which cannot be both long and proper for an Exposition, I conclude my third Assertion, That the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is a Person truly and properly Divine, the true and living God.

Now being we do firmly believe, That the true and living God can 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 denied by none, and have also proved, That the only Son is the same God, receiving by an eternal generation the same Divine Nature from the Father; it will also be necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Spirit of God, to 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 God.

First, Though the Father be undoubtedly God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods,) the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Father, For the Scriptures do as certainly distinguish them in their Persons, as they do unite them in their nature. He which proceedeth from the Father is not the Father, because it is impossible any person should proceed from himself; but the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father. He which is sent by the Father, and from the Father, is not the Father, by whom and from whom he is sent; for no person can be sent by himself, and by another from himself. But the Holy Ghost is sent by God the Father, and by the Son *from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father.

John 15: 26.

Secondly, Though we have formerly proved, That the Son of God is properly and truly God, though we now have formerly 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 expressly 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 Son's departing, and his sending after his departure; as he told the Apostles before he departed, *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you*; therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son.

John 16: 15.

Thirdly, Though the Father be God, and the Son be God, and the Holy Ghost

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 loe, 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 access 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 access. So God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons : and because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son, into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.* Where the Son is distinguished from the Father as first sent by him, and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after he had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us several times in a word, as, *The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name ; the Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father,* and when that Comforter is come, *Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* 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.

Matt. 3. 16.  
Ephes. 2. 18.  
Gal. 4. 4, 5, 6.  
John 14. 26.  
15. 26.  
Matt. 28. 19.

\* This Heresie was very ancient, even before Sabellius, tho'

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, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, Therefore that which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God, answered thus, *Filius Dei Deus est, & virtus altissimi altissimus est.* After Praxeas followed Noetus, *μονοτόπος ὁ αὐτὸν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἡγνοῦντος,* Epiph. Her. 57. Noetiani à quodam Noeto, qui docebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem & Spiritum S. S. Aug. Her. 36. Suddenly after Noetus arose Sabellius. *Δογματικῶς ὁ οὗτος, καὶ οἱ ὅτι αὐτὸς Σαβελλιανὸς, ὁ αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα, ὁ αὐτὸν Υἱὸν ὁ αὐτὸν ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ὡς εἶναι ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει τριῶν ὀνομασίας,* Epiph. Her. 62. From him afterwards were all which held the same opinion called Sabellians Sabelliani ab illo Noeto quem supra memoravimus defluxisse dicuntur. Nam & discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas hæreses Epiphanius computet nescio, cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, & ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen acceperit. Noetiani enim difficillime ab aliquo sciuntur, Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum, S. Aug. Her. 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 is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than three, so there is also an order, by which, of these Persons, the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or external, but internal and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father ; though therefore this 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 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

the Persons are signified together by the Apostle, saying *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared, and the same order is expressly mentioned, in the baptismal Institution made *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* As therefore we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second Person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have, but briefly, spoken, prove that the Holy Ghost is the third; which is our fifth Assertion.

† Vide p. 68.  
S<sup>r</sup> Epiphanius  
several times  
calls the Holy  
Spirit τριτον  
τη ονομασια.

Our sixth and last Assertion, (sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God,) teacheth that Spirit to be a Person proceeding from the Father and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same Nature, Attributes, and Operations with the Father, and the Son, as receiving the same Essence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both. Now this procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son, is contained virtually in the Scriptures. First, It is expressly said, That the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, *When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And this is also evident from what hath been already asserted: for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their Personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other, and because the Father hath been already shewn to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him.

John 15: 26.

Secondly, Though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son; and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Father. *It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* For by the Language of the Apostle the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, *The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.* And we have received not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God. Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son, for because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts: the Spirit of Christ, Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his; even the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets; the Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the Apostle speaks, *I know that this shall turn to my salvation through my prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.* If then the Holy Ghost be called the Spirit of God and the Father, because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son.

Mat. 10: 20.

I Cor. 11: 12

Gal. 4: 6.

Rom. 8: 9.

I Pet. 1: 11.

Phil. 1: 19.

Again, Because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath by the original communication a right of mission; as, *the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send:* But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father is also sent by the Son, as he saith, *when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you.* Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and conse-

John 14: 26.

quently 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 do they also virtually teach, That he proceedeth from the Son.

† 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. Hil. de Trin. l. 2. Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit à Patre & Filio, non separatur à Patre, non separatur à Filio, S. Amb. de Sp. Sanct. c. 10. Spiritus autem Sanctus vere Spiritus est

From whence it came to pass in the Primitive times, that the † Latine Fathers taught expressly the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, because by good consequence they did collect so much from those passages of the Scripture which we have used to prove that truth. And the Greek Fathers, though they stuck more closely to the phrase and language of the Scripture, saying, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, and \* not saying, that he proceedeth from the Son; 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 *received 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 being of the Father, †† and the Son, as receiving that infinite and eternal Essence from them both.

procedens quidem à Patre & Filio: sed non est ipse Filius, quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroque; *Id de Symb. c. 3. Et in servos cœlestia dona profudit. Spiritum ab Unigena Sanctum & Patre procedentem, Paulinus in Nat. 9. S. Felicis. Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus S. & à Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra Spiritus & Patris & Filii Spiritus dicitur. S. Aug. de Trin. l. 4. Firmissime tene & nullatenus dubites, eundem Spiritum S. qui Patris & Filii unus est Spiritus, de Patre & Filio procedere, Fulg. de Fide ad Petrum. Qui noster Dominus, qui tuus unicus spirat de Patrio corde Paracletum. 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. c. 1. Audi manifestius proprium Patris esse genuisse, & proprium Filii natum fuisse: proprium vero Sp. S. procedere de Patre Filioque; Vigil. cont. Eut. l. 1. By which testimonies, and the like, of the Latine Fathers we may well guess in which Church the Creed commonly attributed to Athanasius first was framed; for as it is confessed to be written first in 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. \* The Ancient Greek Fathers speaking of this procession, mention the Father only, and never, I think, express the Son, as sticking constantly in this to the language of the Scriptures. Thus Gregory Nazianzen distinguisheth the three Persons, Ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὄρων ἰσάμφοι, τὸ ἀγνόνιον εἰσαγωγῆν, καὶ τὸ ἡμνυῖόν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον, Orat. de Filio. And the three properties attributed to the three Persons, are these, ἀγνόνισια to the Father, ἡμνυῖσις to the Son, and ἐκπορεύσις to the Holy Ghost. But this word ἐκπορεύσις, or the very ἐκπορεύεσθαι, was not used by the Greeks in reference to the Son, but only, as the Scriptures speak, in relation to the Father. || As Epiphanius, Καὶ ὡς καὶ πάλιν Πνεύματι βλασφημῶσι, καὶ τοιμῶσι λέγειν κεκλιῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῆ ἡμῶν ὁπερ ὅτιν ἀκλίσιον, ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον, καὶ τῆ Ἰησοῦ λαμβάνον, Hæc. 69. §. 52. Τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, Πνεῦμα ἕγιον, Πνεῦμα Θεῦ, αἰὲν ὄντων Πατρὶ καὶ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ ἀλλότριον Θεῦ, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ὄν, ὡς Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον, καὶ τῆ Ἰησοῦ λαμβάνον, idem Ancor. c. 6. Αἰὲν τὸ Πνεῦμα ὡς Πατρὶ καὶ Ἰησοῦ, ἕστω ἀδελφόν Πατρὶ, ἕστω ἡμνυῖτον, ἕστω κτιστὸν, ἕστω ἀδελφόν Ἰησοῦ, ἐκ ἕστων Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς ἢ πορευόμενον, καὶ τῆ Ἰησοῦ λαμβάνον, Id. Hæc. 62. §. 4. \* A Filio accipit, qui & ab eo mittitur, & à Patre procedit: & interrogo utrum id ipsum sit à Filio accipere quod à Patre procedere. Quod si nihil differre credetur inter accipere à Filio, & à Patre procedere, certe id ipsum atque unum esse existimabitur, à Filio accipere, quod sit accipere à Patre. Ipse enim Dominus ait, Quoniam de me accipiet, & annuntiabit vobis, S. Hil. l. 8. de Trin. So S. Cyril. Ἐπειδὴ (τὸ Πνεῦμα) ὁμοῦσιον τέ ἐστι τῶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ πρῶσις θεοπραπῶς ἐξ αὐτῆ πᾶσαν αὐτῆ τῶ ἰφ' ἀπασι τελειοτάτῳ ἔχον ἐνεργεῖαν τε καὶ δύναμιν, διὰ τὸ τὸ ὄντων, ἐκ τῆ ἐμῆ λήφεται, Com in Joan. l. 11. De Filio ergo accepit, & omnia quæ habet Pater Filii sunt, quæ Spiritus S. accepit; quia non de solo Filio, sed simul de utroque procedit, Fulg. l. 7. contr. Fab. apud Theodulph. de Sp. S. †† That this was the sense of the Greek Fathers anciently, who used those two Scriptures of the Holy Ghost, appeareth by Epiphanius, who frequently declares so much: As in Ancorato, Πνεῦμα ὡς Θεῦ καὶ Πνεῦμα Πατρὸς καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ, ἐκ τῆ Πατρὸς καὶ τῆ Ἰησοῦ, τρίτον τῆ ὀνομασῆα, cap. 8. And speaking of Ananias who lied unto the Spirit, Ἄρα Θεός ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ, τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὡς ἐφύσαντο οἱ ἀπὸ τῆ τιμῆματ' νοσοσιάμφοι, cap. 9. Οὐκ ἀλλότριον Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆ αὐτῆς ἐστίας, ἐκ τῆ αὐτῆς δεύτητ' ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ, ὡς Πατρὶ καὶ Ἰησοῦ ἐνυπόστατον αἰὲν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, Id. Hæc. 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 ἢ Χεῖρὸς ἐκ τῆ Πατρὸς πορεύεται Θεός ἐκ Θεῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆ Χεῖρὸς ἢ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων, ὡς φησιν ὁ Χεῖρὸς ὁ παρὰ τῆ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ οὐτ' ἐκ τῆ ἐμῆ λήφεται, Epiphani. Ancor. §. 67. Εἰ τοίνυν*

τοῖσιν παρὰ τῆ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ ἐκ τῆ ἐμῆ, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος, λήψεται. Ὁν γὰρ ῥόπον ἐδίδεξεν ἡ Πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, ἐδίδεξεν ἡ Πατὴρ, ἔτω τοσαύτῳ λέγειν, ὅτι ἐδίδε τὸ πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱός, παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνεται, καὶ ἐδίδεξεν ἡ Πατὴρ καὶ ἡ Πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὁ παρὰ τῆ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τῆ Υἱοῦ, Ibid. Non loquetur à semetipso, hoc est non sine me, & Patris arbitrio, qui inseparabilis à mea & Patris est voluntat e 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. Et 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 general Doctrine of the Eastern and the Western Church, differing only in the manner of expression, and that without any opposition; \* Theodoret gave the first occasion of a difference, making use of the Greeks expression against the Doctrine both of Greeks and Latins; 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 against whom he wrote, taking small notice of this Objection; and the writings of Theodoret in which this was contained being condemned; there was no sensible difference in the Church, for many years, concerning this particular. Afterwards divers of the Greeks expressly denied the procession from the Son, and several disputations did arise in the Western Church, till at last the Latins put it into the † Constantipolitan Creed, and being admonished by the Greeks of that, as of an unlawful addition, 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.

\* S. Cyril having set forth Anathematism against the Heresie of Nestorius, in the ninth Anathematism condemned all who did not speak of the Holy Ghost as ἰδίον τῆς Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ πνεῦμα. To which Theodoret returned this answer, Ἰδίον δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὡς ὁμοουσιος καὶ ἐκ Πατρὸς

ἐκπορεύεται. Ὁν γὰρ ῥόπον ἐδίδεξεν ἡ Πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ ὁ Υἱός, ἐδίδεξεν ἡ Πατὴρ, ἔτω τοσαύτῳ λέγειν, ὅτι ἐδίδε τὸ πνεῦμα εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ Υἱός, παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνεται, καὶ ἐδίδεξεν ἡ Πατὴρ καὶ ἡ Πατὴρ, εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὁ παρὰ τῆ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τῆ Υἱοῦ, Ibid. Non loquetur à semetipso, hoc est non sine me, & Patris arbitrio, qui inseparabilis à mea & Patris est voluntat e 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. Et 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. S. Cyril in his reply takes no great notice of this high charge of impiety and blasphemy, and only answers to the Argument so far as it concerned his expression, viz. that the Spirit is ἰδίον τῆς Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ πνεῦμα, but in this Answer makes use of that Scripture by which he and others used to prove that the Spirit had his essence from the Son. Ἐκπορεύεται μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἐκ τῆ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται ὡς ἐκ τῆ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. S. Cyril doth not go to maintain that which Theodoret denied, 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. † The second General Council held at Constantinople, finding it necessary to make an addition to the Nicene Creed in the Article concerning the Holy Ghost, of which that Council had said no more than this, I believe in the Holy Ghost, framed this accession against Macedonius, εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τῆ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύον. 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 called Philopatris, Καὶ τίνα ἐπομόσομαί γε τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ μέγα, ἀμείνονος, ἑρανοῦνα ἡδὼν Πατρὸς, πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύον, ἐν ἐκ τῶν, καὶ ἐξ ἐνός τε. Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζυῶνα, τὸν δὲ ἡγεῖ 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 lawful to make any addition to it. Notwithstanding the Question being agitated in the West, Utrum Sp. S. sicut procedit à Patre, ita & procedat à Filio, and it being concluded in the affirmative they did not only declare the doctrine to be true, but also added the same to the Constantinopolitan Creed, and sang it publicly in their Liturgy. Credimus & in Spiritum S. Dominum & vivificantem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem. This being first done in the Spanish and French Churches, and the matter being referred to Leo the third Bishop of Rome, he absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated. For in the acts of the Synod held at Aquigranum, 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 saepe fato Symbolo tollatur, & tunc demum à quolibet licite ac libere sine cantando, sine 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, lest the Roman Church might be accused to join with the Spanish and French Churches in this addition, the same Pope caused the Creed publicly to be set forth in the Church graven in silver Plates, one in Latin, and another in Greek, in the same words in which the Council of Constantinople had first penned it. Hic pro amore & 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 vivificantem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre & Filio coadorandum, & glorificandum, P. Lombardus. These were taken out of the Archiva at Rome, saith Photius, and so placed by Leo, that they might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true Copies of that Creed not to be altered. Ὁ Θεὸς τῆσι Δεῖον καὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς Θεσσαλονικαίοις ἡ κορυφαίων Πέτρῳ καὶ Παύλῳ ἐκ παλαιότατων χρόνων ἀποβησασαυεστῶν τοῖς ἱεροῖς κειμένοις δύο ἀπίδας αὐ γράμμασι καὶ ῥήμασιν ἐλληνικοῖς ἔλεγον τῆ ἱερὰν τῆ ἡμῶν πίστεως ἐκθεσιν, ταύτας καταναγνώδωαι κατενώπιον τῆ Ῥωμαϊκῆς πλήθους καὶ εἰς ὅσον ἀπάντων ἐλθεῖν ἐδικαίωσε καὶ πολλὰ τῆ διασαυδῶν τῆνικαῦτα καὶ ἀνεγνωκῶτων ἐτι τῶ βίῳ παρεμύσει, Photius apud Nicetan. Thef. Orthod. Fid. 1.21. ut exscriptit Archiep. Armachanus. Οὗ τῶ ὁλέων καὶ τὸ Θεσσαυεφυλάκιον τῆ Ἀποσολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ῥωμαίων ἀνοίξας ἀπίδας δύο τοῖς ἱεροῖς κειμένοις ἀποβησασαυεστῶν ἐξέλεγε ἐλληνικοῖς καὶ γράμμασι καὶ ῥήμασιν ἐκείσας τῶ ἐυσεβῆ τὴν πίστεως ἐκθεσιν. 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 General 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, than desirous of the Peace and Unity of the Church, neglected the Tables of Leo, and admitted.

mitted the addition 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 Epist. to the Archiepiscopal Sees of the Eastern Church. Ἀλλὰ ἄξιόν μόνον εἰς ταῦτα παρενομεῖν ἐξελήχθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς κακῶν βεῖ κομῶν εἰς ταύτην ἀνίδειμον, πρὸς τὸ τοι τοῖς εἰρημίοις ἀτοπήμασι καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἅγιον σύμβολον ὃ πᾶσι τοῖς (ἡνωτικοῖς καὶ οἰκουμενικοῖς) ἡφίστασιν ἀμαχῶν ἔχει τὸ ἴδιον, νόθοις λογισμοῖς καὶ παρεγγράφτοις λόγοις καὶ θεῶσας ὑπερβολῆς κινδυνεύειν ἰπευγείρησαν (ὡς τῆς τῆς πονηρῆς μηχανημάτων) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ ἐκ τῆς Πατρὸς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι καινολογήσαντες, Phot. Epist. 2. §. 8. Hugo Etherianus legit καινολογήσαντες, dum vertit frustra profiteretur; 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 General Council, as the Greeks call it, it was declared that the addition of Filioque made in the Creed should be taken away. Ἐξήτησεν ὁ ἡ Σύνοδος αὐτῆ καὶ πάλιν τὸ παρεθήκη τῆς Συμβόλου, καὶ ἔκεινεν ἄξιον ἵνα ἐξαιρεθῆ παντελῶς, says Maraway. Ἐξήτησεν ὁ ἡ Σύνοδος αὐτῆ καὶ πάλιν τὸ παρεθήκη τῆς Συμβόλου, καὶ ἔκεινεν ἄξιον ἵνα ἐξαιρεθῆ παντελῶς, says Maraway. After this the same complaint was continued by Michael Cerularius, and Theocritus Bishop of Ephesus in the Council of Florence. Ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ μέγιστον ἐκείνο σφάλμα, καὶ τῆτο ὅ τῷ Σολομῶντι ἄδυσπεταύτης ποιῶν σωαντῶν, ἢ ἐν τῷ τῆ πίστεως Συμβόλου καινοτομία, ἡ ἐποιήσαντο ἀνακηρύττοντες τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆς Πατρὸς καὶ ἐκ τῆς Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι. Theoph. ad Joan. c. 3. Καὶ τοῖς Δυτικοῖς τοῖσιν ἐστὶ μὲν πάλιν τὸ δόγμα διαμαρτάνεται τὴν πατερικῶν πίστεως σαλευθῶν, ὅς δὴ τὸ ἐν τῷ Συμβόλου πάλιν τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματος προσθήκη, ἐνθα ὁ κίνδυνος μέγιστος, τῆτο μὴ διορθεύσῃ ἀξίωμα ὁ συλχωρῶν ἀσωχῶρητος; Ibid. Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for adding Filioque to the Creed contrary to a General Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the Authority of another Council; and so the Schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words either Council; and so the Schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words, and the Filioque are taken out of the Creed. The one relying upon the truth of the doctrine contained in those words, and the other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for 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 Latins should force the Greeks to make an addition to the Creed, with out 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.

Now although the addition of words to the formal Creed without the consent, and against the Protestation of the Oriental Church be not justifiable; yet that which was added is nevertheless a certain truth, and may be so used in that Creed by them who believe the same to be a truth; so long as they pretend it not to be a Definition of that Council, but an addition or explication inserted, and condemn not those who, out of a greater respect to such Synodical determinations, will admit of no such insertions, nor speak any other Language than the Scriptures and their Fathers spake.

Howsoever we have sufficiently in our Assertions declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, distinguishing him from all qualities, energies or operations, in that he is truly and properly a Person; differencing him from all creatures and finite things, as he is not a created Person; shewing him to be of an infinite and eternal essence, as he is truly and properly God; distinguishing him from the Father and the Son, as being not the Father, though the same God with the Father, not the Son, though the same God with him; demonstrating his order in the blessed Trinity, as being not the first or second, but the third Person, and therefore the third, because as the Son receiveth his essence communicated to him by the Father, and is therefore second to the Father, so the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence communicated to him by the Father and the Son, and so proceedeth from them both, and is truly and properly the Spirit of the Father, and as truly and properly the Spirit of the Son.

Thus far have we declared the Nature of the Holy Ghost, what he is in himself, as the Spirit of God; it remaineth that we declare what is the Office of the same, what he is unto us, as the Holy Spirit. For although the Spirit of God be of infinite essential and original holiness, as God, and so may be called Holy in himself; though other Spirits which were created, be either actually now unholy, or of defectible sanctity at the first, and so having the name of Spirit common unto them, he may be termed Holy, that he may be distinguished from them: yet I conceive he is rather called the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of Holiness, 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 do not understand any Ministerial office or function, such as that of the created Angels is, who are all ministering Spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;

Heb. 1. 14.



vation; for I have already proved this Spirit to be a Person properly divine and consequently above all ministrations. But I intend thereby whatsoever is attributed unto him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by him, for which he is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the Persons in the Godhead are represented unto us as concurring unto our salvation: *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, and through that Son we have an access 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 holiness it is impossible to please God, because we all are impure and unholy, and the purity and holiness which is required in us to appear in the presence of God whose eyes are pure, must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God, who is called Holy because he is the cause of this holiness in us, therefore we acknowledge the Office of the Spirit of God to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God, and the declaration of this Office, added to the description of his nature, to be a sufficient explication of the object of Faith contained in this Article, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

John 3. 16.  
Ephes. 2. 18.

Now this sanctification being opposed to our impurity and corruption, and answering fully to the latitude of it, whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holiness and perfection, must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore being by nature we are totally void of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God; being as *no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him, even so none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God; this Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God,* and revealeth them unto the sons of men; so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of their God. This work of the Spirit is double, either external and general, or internal and particular. The external and general work of the Spirit, as to the whole Church of God, is the Revelation of the Will of God, by which so much in all Ages hath been propounded as was sufficient to instruct men unto eternal life. For there have been *holy Prophets ever since the world began; and prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* When it pleased God in the last days 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 Universal Church of God, which object is propounded externally by the Church to every particular Believer, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe that they may receive the truth. For Faith is the gift of God not only in the object but also in the act; *Christ is not only given unto us, in whom we believe, but it is also given us in the behalf of Christ to believe on him,* and this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent unto that which by the word is propounded to us: by this *the Lord opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul; by this the word preached profiteth being mixed with faith in them that hear it.* Thus by grace are we saved through faith, and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God. As the increase and perfection, so

1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.

Luke 1. 70.  
2 Pet. 1. 21.

Heb. 1. 2.  
John 16. 13.

Phil. 1. 29.

Acts 16. 14.  
Heb. 2. 4.  
Ephes. 2. 8.

the

† This is the ancient determination of the second Araufican Council, Si quis sicut augmentum, ita etiam initium Fidei, ipsumque credulitatis affe-

the original, or † initiation of Faith is from the Spirit of God, not only by an external proposal in the word, but by an internal illumination in the soul; by which we are inclined to the obedience of Faith, in assenting to those truths; which unto a natural and carnal man are foolishness. And thus we affirm not only the Revelation of the will of God, but also the illumination of the Soul of man, to be part of the Office of the Spirit of God, against the old and new \* Pelagians.

Etum quo in eum credimus qui justificat impium, & ad regenerationem baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratia donum, id est, per inspirationem Sp. 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 cepit in vobis bonum opus perficiet usque in diem Domini nostri Jesu 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. Arauf. & Gennad. Eccl. Dogm. c. 42.* \* It was the known opinion of the Pelagians that it is in the power of man to believe the Gospel without any internal operation of the grace of God, and S. Austin was once of that Opinion. Neque enim fidem putabam, says he, Dei gratia praveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur quod posceremus uilliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non pracederet praconium veritatis. Ut autem predicato nobis Evangelio consentiremus nostrum esse proprium, & nobis ex nobis esse arbitrabar. Quem meum errorem nonnulla Opuscula mea satis indicant ante Ep scopatum meum scripta, De Prædest. Sanct. l. 1. c. 3. But whatsoever he had so written before he was made a Bishop, he recalled and reversed in his Retraction, l. 1. c. 23. and disputed earnestly against it as a part of the Pelagian Heresie. This, as the rest of Pelagianism is renewed by the Socinians, who in the Racovian Catechism deliver it in this manner, Nonne ad credendum Evangelio Spiritus Sancti interiore dono opus est? Nullo modo: neque enim in Scripturis legimus cuiquam id conferri donum, nisi credenti Evangelio.

Tit. 3. 5.

The second part of the Office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our natural corruption consisting in an averiation of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God. For according to his mercy he saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. So that except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of 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

Gal. 5. 25.  
Gal. 5. 16.

Rom. 8. 14.

Zach. 12. 10.

1 John 5. 14.

Rom. 8. 26, 27.

John 14. 16.

1 John 2. 1.

Rom 8. 34.

The third part of this Office is to lead, direct and govern us in our actions and conversations, that we may actually do 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 fulfil the lusts of the flesh; for we are not only directed but animated and acted in those operations by the Spirit of God, who giveth both to will and to do, 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 effectual, we are also guided in our prayers, and acted in our devotions by the same Spirit, according to the promise, I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplication. 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 sin we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, saith S. John: who also maketh intercession for us, saith S. Paul, and





personally their Apostolical functions, fitted them also for the Ordination of others, and the committing of a standing power to a successive Ministry unto the end of the World; who are thereby obliged to *take heed unto their selves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers to feed the Church of God.* A<sup>ct</sup>: 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 Holy Spirit. And thus have I sufficiently described the Object of our Faith contained in this Article, What is the *Holy Ghost* in whom we believe, both in relation to his \* Nature, as he is the Spirit of God, and in reference to his Office, as he is the Holy Spirit.

\* In respect of the Nature of the Holy Ghost, I have endeavoured

*voured the same which Faustus Rhegiensis did, of whom Gennadius relates thus much; Faustus ex Abbate Lirinensis Monasterii apud regnum Gallia<sup>e</sup> 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 & coaeternalem 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 essential part, as without which it could not be looked upon as a Creed. For being the Creed is a Profession of that Faith into which we are baptized, being the first Rule of Faith was derived from the sacred Form of Baptism, being we are baptized *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, we are obliged to profess Faith in them three; that as they are distinguished in the Institution, so they may be distinguished in our profession. And therefore the briefest comprehensions of Faith have always included the Holy Ghost, and some \* concluded with it.

\* I have formerly shewn at large how the Creed did first arise from the Baptismal Institution,

p. 34, 35. *And therefore as the Name of the Holy Ghost is an essential part of that form, so must the belief in him be as essential to the Creed, which was at first nothing else but an explication of that form. The first enlargement and explication we find in Justin Martyr, thus expressed: 'Επ' ὀνόματι τοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σαρωθεντος ὑπὸ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὁ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος περικληρωθεὶς τὰ κρῖνα ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς πάντα ὁ φωτισθὼν ἄετα, Apol. 2. And the Rule of Faith delivered soon after by Irenæus is very consonant unto it: Εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα τὸν πεποιμηκότα τὸν ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἰς ἓνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρωθέντα ὑπὲρ ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας, καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τὸ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος κληρωθὲς τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις, Adv. Hær. l. 1. c. 2. As that delivered soon after him by Tertullian. Unum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione (quam οἰκονομίαν dicimus) ut Unici Dei sit & Filius Sermo ipse, 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 Jesum Christum; Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepultum secundum Scripturas, resuscitatum à Patre, & in cœlos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris venturum judicare vivos & mortuos. Qui exinde miserit secundum promissionem suam à Patre Spiritum S. Paraclerum, Sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem & Filium & Spiritum S. Adv. Prax. c. 2. Indeed there is an objection made against this truth by the Socinians, who would have us believe that in the first Creeds or Rules of Faith the Holy Ghost was not included. Thus Schlichtingius writing against Meisner. Porro observatum est à quibusdam tertiam hanc Symboli istius partem quæ à Sp. S. incipit, ab initio defuisse, seu in Symbolo non fuisse additam: idq; non immerito, cum non personas ullas in quas credendum sit, (quas solas, ut apparet, auctoribus Symboli commemorare propositum fuit) sed res tantum credendas complectatur, quæ implicite fide in Deum & in Jesum Christum omnes continentur. Hoc si ita est sane defuit tertia Persona, quæ Deum illum unum nobis declararet. Tertullianus sane Author antiquissimus & temporibus Apostolorum proximus, hanc tertiam Symboli istius partem non tantum ita non apposuit, ut omitteret; sed ita ut excluderet, lib. de Virginibus velandis. But as he argues very warily with his Hoc si ita est, so he disputes most fallaciously. For first he makes Tertullian the most ancient and next to the Apostles, and so would bring an example of the first Creed from him, whereas Justin Martyr and Irenæus were both before him, and they both mention expressly the Holy Ghost in their Rules of Faith. Secondly, He makes Tertullian exclude the Holy Ghost from the Rule of Faith, which he clearly expresseth in the place fore-cited: and therefore that place by him mentioned cannot be an exclusion, but an omission only, and the cause of that omission in that place is evident, that he might bring in his opinion of the Paraclerus with the better advantage. Thus when Eusebius Cæsariensis gave in a Copy of the Creed (by which he was catechized, baptized and consecrated) to the Council of Nice, it runs thus, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα, &c. καὶ εἰς ἓνα 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 against the Arians, concludeth in the same manner, Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. And the Arian Bishops in the Synod in Antioch not long after: Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, εἰ δὲ δὲ προσείναι, πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου. From whence it appeareth that the Profession of Faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was counted essential to the Creed, the rest which followeth was looked upon as a προσθήκη. Quid nunc de Spiritu Sancto dicimus quem credere consequente Symboli parte in Trinitate præcipimur? Al. Avit. Serm. de Symb.*

Secondly, It is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, not only for the acknowledgment of the eminency of his Person, but also for a desire of

the excellency of his graces, and the abundance of his gifts. What the Apostle wished to the *Corinthians*, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, That *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all.* For if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his; if he have not that which maketh the union, he cannot be united to him: if he acknowledgeth him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant; and no man can say that *Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* That which is born of the Spirit is spirit; such is their felicity which have it; that which is born of the flesh is flesh; such is their infelicity which want it. What then is to be desired in comparison of the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ; especially considering the encouragement we receive from Christ; who said, *If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?*

Thirdly, It is necessary to profess Faith in the Holy Ghost, that the will of God may be effectual in us, even our sanctification. For if God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit; if we be elected according to the fore-knowledge 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 should we follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord? how should we endeavour to cleanse our selves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness 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 Honour dwelleth. Now if we know that our body is the Temple of the Holy Ghost within us which we have of God, if we know that we are not our own, for that we are bought with a price; we must also know that we ought therefore to glorifie God in our body, and in our Spirit, which are God's: thus it is necessary to believe in the Spirit of Sanctification, that our hearts may be established unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his Saints.

Fourthly, It is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, that in all our weaknesses we may be strengthened, in all our infirmities we may be supported, in all our discouragements we may be comforted, in the midst of miseries we may be filled with peace and inward joy. For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. 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 gladness 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.

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 Timothy, *Lay hands suddenly on no man, and to Titus, For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that*

*that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee. Thus by virtue of an Apostolical Ordination there is for ever to be continued a Ministerial succession. Those which are thus separated by Ordination to the work of the Lord, are to feed the flock of God which is among them, taking the oversight thereof; and those which are committed to their care, are to remember and obey them that have the rule over them, and submit themselves, for that they watch for their souls as they that must give account.*

1 Pet. 5. 2.

Heb. 13. 7, 17.

Having thus at large asserted the verity contained in this Article, and declared the necessity of believing it, we may easily give a brief exposition, by which every Christian may know what he ought to profess, and how he is to be understood, when he saith, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I freely and resolvedly assent unto this as unto a certain and infallible truth, that beside all other whatsoever, to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, who is truly and properly a person, of a true, real and personal substance, not a created but uncreated Person, and so the true and one eternal 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 eternal Spirit to be not only of perfect and indefectible holiness in himself, but also to be the immediate cause of all holiness in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed Apostles, and inabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetual succession to continue the edification of the Church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and affections, renovating their natures, uniting their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the adoption of sons, leading them in their actions, directing them in their devotions, by all ways and means purifying and sanctifying their souls and bodies, to a full and eternal acceptation in the sight of God. This is the eternal Spirit of God: In this manner is that Spirit Holy; and thus *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

ARTICLE

## ARTICLE IX.

## The holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints.

**I**N this ninth Article we meet with some variety of position, and with much addition, for whereas it is here the ninth, in some Creeds we find it the \* last, and whereas it consisteth of two distinct parts, the latter is wholly added, and the former partly augmented; the most Ancient professing no more than to believe † *the Holy Church*, and the Greeks having added by way of explication or determination, the word *Catholick*; it was at last received into the Latin Creed.

\* Although generally the Article of the Holy Church did immediately follow the Article of the Holy Ghost, as Tertullian well observeth, Cum sub tribus &

testatio fidei & sponso salutis pignorentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiae mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus ibi Ecclesia quæ trium corpus est, De Baptis. c. 6. and S. Aug. in Enchir. c. 56. Spiritus S. si creatura non Creator esset, profecto creatura rationalis esset. Ipse enim esset summa creatura; & ideo in Regulâ fidei non poneretur ante Ecclesiam, quia & ipse ad Ecclesiam pertineret. And the Author of this first Book de Symb. ad Catech. Sequitur post S. Trinitatis commendationem S. Ecclesia, and S. Hier. cited in the next note. Yet notwithstanding this order was not always observed, but sometimes this Article was reserved to the end of the Creed. As first appeareth in that remarkable place of S. Cyprian. Quod si aliquis illud opponit ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Chatholica Ecclesia tenear, eodem Symbolo quo & nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum; nec habebit Deum Patrem qui Ecclesiam noluerit habere matrem. Thus 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 habent Ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce sua ipsi confitentur remissionem peccatorum non dari nisi per Sanctam Ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce sua ipsi confitentur remissionem peccatorum non dari nisi per Sanctam Ecclesiam. And the Author, Ep. ad Magn. 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 Symb. ad Catech. placeth the Remission of sins after the Holy Ghost. Noli injuriam facere ei qui te fecit, ut conseqaris ab illo quod in isto S. Symbolo sequitur, *Remissionem omnium peccatorum:* and after he hath spoken of the Resurrection and life everlasting, procedeth thus to speak of the Church, *Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis Sacramenti terminatur autoritas, &c. and life everlasting, procedeth thus to speak of the Church, Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis Sacramenti terminatur autoritas, &c.* Ideo Sacramenti hujus conclusio per Eccl. terminatur quia ipsa est mater fecunda. And the Author of the third. Ideo Sacramenti hujus conclusio per S. Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absq; Per Sanctam Ecclesiam. Propterea hujus conclusio Sacramenti per S. Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absq; 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 design of this transposition was to signifie that remission of sins and resurrection to eternal life, are to be obtained in and by the Church. As the Creed in the first Homily under the name of S. Chrysostom, *Credo in Sp. S. Spiritus perducit ad S. Ecclesiam, ipsa est quæ dimittit peccata, promittit carnis resurrectionem, promittit vitam æternam.* Spiritus perducit ad S. Ecclesiam, ipsa est quæ dimittit peccata, promittit carnis resurrectionem, promittit vitam æternam. † Tertull. Quæ est mater nostra, in quam repromissimus Sanctam Ecclesiam, Adv. Marcion. l. 5. c. 4. So Rufinus Sanctam Ecclesiam. For Catholicam is added by Pamelius. So S. Hier. contra Lucif. Præterea cum solenne sit in lavacro post Trinitatis Confessionem interrogare, *Credi Sanctam Ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum? Quam Ecclesiam credidisse eum credices? Arianorum? sed non habent: nostram? sed extra hanc baptizatus non potuit eam credere quam nescivit; and S. Aug. De Fide & Symb. Credimus & Sanctam Ecclesiam, with this declaration, utiq; Catholicam. So. Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. and Venantius Fortunatus. The Author of the first Book de Symb. ad Catech. Sequitur post Sanctæ Trinitatis commendationem S. Ecclesia. The Author of the other three who placeth this Article last of all, *Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis hujus sacramenti terminatur autoritas, l. 2. and l. 4. expressly 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 before out of S. Cyprian. So likewise of these two Homilies on the Creed which are falsely attributed to S. Chrysost. 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 Freherus, *Tha halgan gelathingc, i. e. the Holy Church, the Greek Creed in Saxon Letters in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, and the old Latin Creed in the Oxford library. Deus qui in cœlis habitat, & condidit ex nihilo ea quæ sunt, & multiplicavit propter Sanctam Ecclesiam suam, irascitur tibi, Herm. l. 1. Visione 1. Virtute sua potenti condidit Sanctam Ecclesiam suam confirmaret, Vis. 4. But though it were not in the Roman or Occidental Creeds, yet it was anciently in the Oriental, 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; Arch-Bishop of that place, *ἡ μίαν ἐγίεν καθολικὴν Ἑκκλησίαν.* And in the Alexandrian it was as ancient, for Alexander Archbishop of that place inserts it in his Confession, in his Epistle at Alexandrum, *μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν Ἑκκλησίαν.* Theodoret Hist. l. 2. c. 4. And Arius and Euzoius in their Confession of Faith given in to Constantine, thus conclude *καὶ εἰς καθολικὴν Ἑκκλησίαν τῆς Θεῆς, τὴν ὑπὸ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ περιεργασμένην.* Socrates Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 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



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 holiness and Catholickism are but affections of this Church which I believe, I must first declare what is the 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 sub-

tracted make any difference. For although some of the Latin and Greek Fathers press the force of that Proposition as is before observed, though Ruffinus urge it far in this 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 namq; 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 eademq; 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 credendum 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 eis 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 and Euzoius, p. 18, 19. and that of Epiphanius in Ancorato. Thus also the Latins, and S. Cyprian, In æternam pœnam sero credent, qui in vitam æternam credere noluerunt, Ad Demetrianum. So Interpres 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 fateatur, in Ecclesiam se confessus est credidisse, Serm. 62. And in the ancient edition of S. Jerome in the place before cited it was read, Credis in Sanctam Ecclesiam, and the word in was left out by Victorius.

For the understanding of the true notion of the Church, first we must observe that the nominal definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If we look upon the old English word now in use, † Church or Kirk, it is derived from the Greek, and first signified the House of the Lord, that is, of Christ; and from thence was taken to signify the People of God, meeting in the House of God. The Greek word used by the Apostles to express the Church, signifieth \* a calling forth, if we look upon the origination; a congregation of men, or a company assembled, if we consider the use of it. But neither of these doth fully express the nature of the Church, what it is in it self, and as it is propounded in our Belief.

† Κύριος the Lord and that properly Christ; from whence Κυριακός belonging to the Lord Christ, οἰκία Κυριακός from thence Kyrk, and Church.

sed by the Apostle is Ἐκκλησία from ἐκκαλεῖν evocare. From ἐκκέκλησται, ἔκκλησιν; from ἐκκλησις, ἐκκλησία, of the same notation with the Hebrew קהלה Ecclesia quippe ex vocatione appellata est, S. Aug. Exp. ad Rom. And though they ordinarily take it primarily to signify convocatio, as S. Aug. Inter congregationem, unde Synagoga, & convocacionem, unde Ecclesia nomen habet, distat aliquid, Enar. in Psal. 177. yet the Origination speaks only of evocation, without any intimation of congregation or meeting together, as there is in Σύγκλητος. From whence arose that definition of Methodius, Ὅτι Ἐκκλησίαν παρὰ τὸ ἐκκεκλημέναι τὰς ἡδονὰς λέγουσιν, Photius Biblioth. Whereas ἐκκαλεῖν is here no more than καλεῖν, ἐκκλησις no more than κλήσις; as κλητεῖν and ἐκκλητεῖν with the Atticks were the same; From whence it came to pass that the same preposition hath been twice added in the composition of the same word; 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 ἐκκλησις, not the evocation or the action of calling, but the κλητοὶ or the company called, and that (according to the use) gathered together; from whence ἐκκλησιάζειν is to gather together, or to be gathered. Hence S. Cyril, Ἐκκλησία ἡ καλεῖται φερωνύμως, διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμοῦ συναῖναι, Catech. 18. So Ammonius, Ἐκκλησίαν ἔλεγον οἱ Ἀθιωαῖοι ἡ σύνοδον ἢ κτίσθαι πόλιν. To this purpose do the Lxx use ἐκκλησιάζειν adively, to convocate or call together an Assembly, as ἐκκλησιάζειν λαόν, and ἐκκλησιάζειν συναγωγὴν, and ἐκκλησιάζεσθαι passively, as ἐκκλησιάζεσθαι πᾶσα ἡ συναγωγή, which the Attick Writers would have expressed by ἐκκλησιάζειν, as Aristophanes, Ἐδοξέ μοι πρῶτον ὕπνον ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἐκκλησιάζειν πρὸς ἅπαντας συγκαθήμενα, Vespiis. Where though the Scholiast hath rendred it Ἐκκλησιάζειν, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συναῖναι, whereby the Lexicographers have been deceived, yet the word is even there taken as a neuter, in the passive sense, as generally the Atticks use it. Howsoever from the notation of the word we cannot conclude that it signifies a number of men called together into one assembly out of the Mass or generality of mankind; first because the 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.

\* The word us-

Our second observation is, that the Church hath been taken for the whole complex of men and Angels worshiping the same God; and again, the Angels being not considered, it hath been taken as comprehending all the sons of men believing in God ever since the † foundation of the World. But being Christ took not upon him the nature of Angels, and consequently did not properly purchase them with his blood, or call them by his Word; being they

† Translatum in Paradisum jam tunc de mundo in Ecclesia. Tertull. l. 2. adv. Marcion.

are

are not in the Scriptures mentioned as parts or members of the Church; nor can be imagined to be built upon the Prophets or Apostles; being we are at this time to speak of the proper notion of the Church, therefore I shall not look upon it as comprehending any more than the sons of men. Again, being though Christ was the Lamb slain before the foundation of the World, and whosoever from the beginning pleased God were saved by his blood; yet because there was a vast difference between the several dispensations of the Law and Gospel, because our Saviour spake expressly of building himself a Church when the Jewish Synagogue was about to fail, because Catholicism, which is here attributed unto the Church, must be understood in opposition to the legal singularity of the Jewish Nation, because the ancient Fathers were generally wont to distinguish between the Synagogue and the Church, therefore I think it necessary to restrain this notion to Christianity.

\* Thus S. Ignatius speaking of Christ, *Αὐτὸς ἂν θύρα τῆς Πατρὸς δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἄβραμ, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ οἱ Περσῆται, οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία*, Ep. ad Philad. Where ἡ ἐκκλησία is plainly taken for the multitude of Christians who were converted to the Faith by the Apostles, and those who were afterwards joyned to them in the Profession of the same Faith. 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. 34.* Quid Judaicus populus circa beneficia divina perfidus & ingratus? nunc quod à Deo primum recessit impatientiæ crimen fuit. S. Impatientia etiam in Ecclesia hæreticos facit, *S. Cypr. 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, therefore I observe that the only way to attain unto the knowledge of the true notion of the Church, is to search into the New Testament, and from the places there which mention it, to conclude what is the nature of it. To which purpose it will be necessary to take notice that our Saviour first spake 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 *³ three thousand souls* which were added to the *³ hundred and twenty* Disciples, then was there a Church, (and that built upon \* Peter, according to our Saviour's promise,) for after that we read, *⁴ The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.* A Church then our Saviour promised should be built and by a promise made before his death; after his Ascension, and upon the preaching of S. Peter, we find a Church built or constituted, and that of a nature capable of a daily increase. We cannot then take a better occasion to search into the true notion of the Church of Christ, than by looking into the origination and increase thereof; without which it is || impossible to have a right conception of it.

† In quem tingeret... in Ecclesiam? quam nondum Apostoli struxerant, *Tert. de Bapt. c. 16.*  
*¹ Matt. 16. 18.*  
*² Acts 2. 41.*  
*³ Acts 1. 15.*  
\* Qualis es evertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem, *Super te, inquit, edificabo Ecclesiam meam, & dabo tibi claves, non Ecclesiæ.* Sic enim & exitus docet: in ipso Ecclesia exstructa est, id est, per ipsum, ipse clavem imbut, vides quam. *Viri Israelita, auribus mandate quæ dico: Jesum Nazarenum virum à Deo vobis destinatum, & reliqua Tertul. de Pudicitia, c. 21.* So S. Basil. *Εὐθύς γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ὄψεων ταύτης νοήσω Πέτρον.... ἢ διὰ τὴν πίστεως ὑποχρῆσθαι ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δεξιᾶν, ἀδύ. Eunom. l. 2.* S. Peter took upon himself the building of the Church, that is, to build the Church, which he then performed, when he preached the Gospel by which the Church was first gathered. *⁴ Acts 2. 47.* || Tertullian mentioning the Acts of the Apostles, addeth these words, Quam Scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec Spiritus Sancti esse possunt, qui necdum Spiritum possint agnoscere discipulis missum; sed nec Ecclesiam defendere qui quando & quibus incunabulis institutum est hoc corpus, probare non habent. *De Prescr. Hæret. c. 22.*

Now what we are infallibly assured of the first actual existence of a Church of Christ is only this. There were twelve Apostles with the Disciples before the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the number of the names together were an hundred and twenty. When the Holy Ghost came after a powerful and miraculous manner upon the blessed Apostles, and S. Peter preached unto the Jews, that they should repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; they

*Acts 1. 15.*  
*Acts 2. 38, 42, 47.*

they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. These being thus added to the rest, continued steadfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers: and all these persons so continuing are called the † Church. What this Church was is easily determined, for it was a certain number of men, of which some were Apostles, some the former Disciples, others were persons which repented, and believed, and were baptized in the name of *Jesus Christ*, and continued hearing the Word preached, receiving the Sacraments administered, joyning in the publick Prayers presented unto God. This was then the Church, which was daily increased by the addition of other persons received into it upon the same conditions, making up <sup>1</sup> the multitude of them that believed, who were of one heart and one soul, <sup>2</sup> believers added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.

<sup>1</sup> Acts 4. 32.  
<sup>2</sup> Acts 5. 14.  
 † Cum remissis summis Sacerdotibus Petrum & Joannem, & reverentissimum ad reliquos coapostolos & Discipulos Domini, id est in Ecclesiam, S. Iren. l. 3. c. 3.

But though the Church was thus begun, and represented unto us as one in the beginning, though that Church which we profess to believe in the Creed be also propounded unto us as one; and so the notion of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles might seem sufficient to express the nature of that Church which we believe; yet because that Church was one by way of † origination, and was afterwards divided into many, the actual members of that one becoming the members of several Churches; and that Church which we believe, is otherwise one by way of complexion, receiving the members of all Churches into it; it will be necessary to consider, how at the first those several Churches were constituted, that we may understand how in this one Church they were all united. To which purpose it will be farther fit to examine the several acceptions of this word as it is 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.

† Hæ voces Ecclesiæ ex qua habuit omnis Ecclesia initium. S. Iren. ibid.

First then that the word which signifies the Church in the Original Greek, is sometimes used in the vulgar sense according as the Native Greeks did use the same to express their Conventions, without any relation to the Worship of God or Christ, and therefore is translated by the word *Assembly*, of as great a latitude. Secondly, It is sometimes used in the same notion in which the Greek Translators of the Old Testament made use of it, for the Assembly of the people of God under the Law, and therefore might be most fitly translated the *Congregation*, as it is in the Old Testament. Thirdly, It hath been conceived that even in the Scriptures it is sometimes taken for the place in which the members of the Church did meet to perform their solemn and publick services unto God; and some † passages there are which seem to speak no less, but yet are not so certainly to be understood of the place, but that they may as well be spoken of the people congregated in a certain place. Beside these few different acceptions, the Church in the Language of the New Testament doth always signifie a company of persons professing the Christian Faith, but not always in the same latitude. Sometimes 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.

Acts 19. 32, 39, 40.

Acts 8. 38.  
 Heb. 2. 12.

† Acts 11. 26.  
 1 Cor. 11. 18, 22.  
 From these places S. Augustine did collect that Εκκλησία 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 the Christians in his time. Sicut Ecclesia dicitur locus, quo Ecclesia congregatur. Nam Ecclesia homines sunt de quibus dicitur, *Ut exhiberet sibi gloriosam Ecclesiam*. Hanc tamen vocari etiam ipsam domum orationum, idem Apostolus testis est, ubi ait, *Nunquid domos non habetis ad manducandum & bibendum, Ecclesiam Dei contempnitis?* Et hoc quotidianus loquendi usus obtinuit, ut, ad Ecclesiam prodire, aut ad Ecclesiam confugere, non dicatur, nisi quod ad locum ipsam parietesq; prodierit, vel confugerit, quibus Ecclesiæ congregatio continetur, *Quest. super Levit. l. 3. c. 57.* By these words it is certain that in S. Augustin's time they used the word Ecclesia, as we do now the Church, for a place set apart for the Worship of God; and it is also certain that those of the Greek Church did use Εκκλησία in the same sense; as Eusebius speaking of the flourishing times of the Church, before the Persecution under Dioclesian, says the Christians *μὴ ἀμῶς ἔτι τοῖς παλαιῶν οἰκοδομήμασιν ἐρχόμενοι εὐρείας εἰς τὰ ἱερά*

πλάτῳ ἀνά πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας, *Hist. l. 8. c. 1. and S. Chryf. Eὶ γὰρ Ἐκκλησίαν κατὰσκέψαι χαλεπὸν καὶ ἀνόσιον, πολλῶ μάλλον γὰρ πνευματικὸν, καὶ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἐκκλησίας σεμνότερον. Hom. 26. ad Rom. But it is not so certain that the Apostle used Ἐκκλησίαν 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 denies it, and distinguishes between Ἐκκλησία and Ἐκκλησιαστικόν, after this manner, Ἄλλο δὲ ἔστιν Ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλο Ἐκκλησιαστικόν, ἢ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἀμώμων ψυχῶν σωέσῃκε, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ λίθων καὶ ξύλων οἰκοδομεῖσθαι. And thus he proveth this distinction, Ὅμοιος γὰρ ἄλλο ἔστι θεσιαστικόν καὶ ἄλλο θεσια, καὶ ἄλλο θυμιατικόν καὶ ἄλλο θυμίαμα, καὶ ἄλλο βυλβυθικόν, καὶ ἄλλο βυλβυθίον, καὶ ἄλλο βυλβυθίον, καὶ ἄλλο βυλβυθίον. τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ τόπον ἐν ᾧ σωείσθῃκεσι μνήμει, ἢ ὅτι βυλβυθίον ἀνδρῶν, οἷς καὶ ὁ κίνδυνος καὶ ἡ σωφειά ἀνήκει, ἔτω καὶ ὅτι τῷ Ἐκκλησιαστικῷ καὶ τῷ Ἐκκλησίᾳ. Then he concludes that in the Apostles times there were no Ἐκκλησιαστικὰ, Ἐπὶ μὲν τὴν Ἀποστόλων ὅτε ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἐκδόμα μὲν χαρίσματος πνευματικοῖς, ἔβρετο ὁ πολιτεία λαμπρῆ, ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἢ ἐν Ἐπιστ. 246. l. 2.*

† Acts 16. 5.  
1 Cor. 14. 34.  
2. Cor. 8. 19.  
23, 24.  
11. 8, 28.  
12. 13.  
Rev. 22. 16.  
1 Thess. 1. 4.  
1 Cor. 11. 16.  
Rom. 16. 4.  
1 Cor. 14. 23.

For first in general there are often mentioned † the Churches by way of plurality, the Churches of God, the Churches of the Gentiles, the Churches of the Saints. In particular we find a few Believers gathered together in the house of one single person, called a \* Church, as the Church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila, the Church in the house of Nymphas, the Church in the house of Philemon; which Churches were nothing else but the believing and baptized persons of each Family, with such as they admitted and received into their house to joy in the worship of the same God.

thus Origen for the most part speaks of the Church in the plural number αἱ ἐκκλησίαι. \* Rom. 16. 5. 1 Cor. 16. 19. Col. 4. 15. Philem 2. S. Chryf. observeth of Priscilla and Aquila. Οὕτω γὰρ ἦσαν εὐδοκίμοι ὡς καὶ τῷ οἰκίαν ἐκκλησίαν ποιῆσαι, διὰ τε τῆ πάντας ποιῆσαι πιστῶν, καὶ διὰ τῆ τοῖς ξένοις αὐτὴν ἀνοίξαι πᾶσιν, Chrysof. Homil. 30. in Epist ad Romanos.

\* Gal. 1. 22.  
Acts 9. 31.  
1 Cor. 16. 1, 19.  
Rev. 1. 11.  
1 Thess. 2. 14.  
2 Cor. 8. 1.  
Gal. 1. 2.

Again, when the Scripture speaketh of any Country where the Gospel had been preached, it nameth always by way of plurality the \* Churches of that Country, as the Churches of Judea, of Samaria and Galilee, the Churches of Syria and of Cilicia, the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Asia, the Churches of Macedonia. But notwithstanding there were several such Churches or Congregations, of Believers in great and populous Cities, yet the Scriptures always speak of such Congregations in the notion of one Church: As when S. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, 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 Caesarea, 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 several Congregations, every one of which is in some sense a Church, and may be called so, is properly one Church by virtue of the subordination of them all in one Government under one Ruler. For thus in those great and populous Cities where Christians were very numerous, not only all the several Churches within the Cities but those also in the adjacent parts, were united under the care and inspection of one Bishop, and therefore was accounted one Church; the number of the Churches following the number of the Angels, that is, the Rulers of them, as is evident in the Revelation.

\* 1 Cor. 14. 34.  
1 Cor. 1. 2.

† Acts 8. 1, 21, 22.  
15. 1, 15.  
3. 18, 22.  
20. 17.

2 Thess. 1. 10.  
Col. 4. 15.  
Rev. 3. 14. 28.  
12. 18. 3. 1. 7.  
And thus after they grew yet far more numerous in the time of Clemens Bishop of Rome.

Ἡ Ἐκκλησία τῶ Θεοῦ ἢ παρ-οικῆσα Ῥώμην τῆ ἐκκλησία τῷ Θεῷ παρῆκῃσθαι Ἐκκλησία ὀργία

Κλεινῶν. Ep. 1. So after him Ignatius τῆ ἐκκλησία τῆ ἀξίωμα καίεω τῆ ἡσθ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆ Ἀσίας, And τῆ ἡσθ ἐν Τεγάλλειον. And so the rest.

Now as several 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 Cities 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 Souls. Wherefore the Apostle speaking of that in which all Churches do agree, comprehendeth them all under the same appellation of one Church; and therefore often by the name

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 General and Universal Church which is one by unity of aggregation; and this is the Church in the Creed which we believe, and which is in other Creeds expressly termed † *One, I believe in one Holy Catholic Church.*

\* *Matt. 16. 18. 1 Cor. 12. 28. 15. 9. Gal. 1. 13. Ephes. 1. 22. 3. 10. 21. 5. 23. 25. 27. 29. 32. Phil. 3. 6. Col. 1. 18. 24. Heb. 12. 23. Of this as of one Church Celsus calls the*

*Christians, τὰ ἀπὸ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας, apud Orig. l. 5. † So the Creeds of Epiphanius in Ancorato, πνεύματι 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 Euzoius.*

It will therefore be farther necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Church which is thus one, to consider in what that Unity doth consist. And being it is an aggregation not only of many persons, but also of many congregations, the unity thereof must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If then we reflect upon the first Church again, which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all other since have been in a manner added and conjoined, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other Churches are united and agree. Now they were described to be believing and baptized persons, converted to the Faith by S. Peter, continuing stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers. These then were all built upon the same Rock, all professed the same Faith, all received the same Sacraments, all performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same Church. To this Church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same Church by being built upon the same foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, by receiving the same Sacraments, by performing the same Devotions.

*Acts 2. 41, 42. 44, 47.*

From whence it appeareth that the first unity of the Church considered in it self, beside that of the head, which is one Christ, and the life communicated from that head, which is one Spirit, relieth upon the original of it, which is one; even as an house built upon one foundation, though consisting of many rooms, and every room of many stones, is not yet many, but one house. Now there is but one foundation upon which the Church is built, and that is Christ: for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. And though the Apostles and the Prophets be also termed the foundation, yet even then the unity is preserved, because as they are stones in the foundation, so are they united by one Corner-stone; whereby it comes to pass that such persons as are of the Church, being fellow-Citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God, are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy Temple in the Lord. This stone was laid in Zion for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: there was the first Church built, and whosoever have been, or ever shall be converted to the true Christian Faith, are and shall be added to that Church, and laid upon the same foundation, which is the Unity of \* Origination. 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.*

*Ephes. 2. 19, 20. 21.*

*Isa. 28. 16.*

\* *Tertullian speaking of the Apostles, Ecclesias apud unamquamq; civitatem con-diderunt, à quibus traducem fidei & seipsam doctrinæ ceteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuaturæ sunt, & quotidie mutantur, ut Ecclesiæ fiant: ac per hoc & ipsæ Apostolicæ, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad Originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot & tantæ Ecclesiæ una est illa ab Apostolis prima ex qua omnes. Sic omnes prima & Apostolicæ, dum una omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis, & confederatio hospitalitatis*

bus traducem fidei & seipsam doctrinæ ceteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuaturæ sunt, & quotidie mutantur, ut Ecclesiæ fiant: ac per hoc & ipsæ Apostolicæ, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad Originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot & tantæ Ecclesiæ una est illa ab Apostolis prima ex qua omnes. Sic omnes prima & Apostolicæ, dum una omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis, & confederatio hospitalitatis

tatis : quæ jura non alia ratio regit quam ejusdem Sacramenti unâ traditio. De *Præscript. Hæret.* c. 20. *This is the Unitas originis which S. Cyprian so much insists upon, Ecclesia una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis 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 copiarum 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 idem 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 autoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique & cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi, & honoris & potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstraretur, Ibid. Ἐνὸς ὄντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, διὰ τὸ τοῦ καὶ τὸ ἀκρῶς τιμίον καὶ τὴν μόνωσιν ἑπαινεῖται, μίμημα οὐ ἀρχῆς τῆς μιᾶς. Clem. Alex. Stromat. l. 7. *This is very much to be observed, because that place of S. Cyprian is produced by the Romanists to prove the necessity of one Head of the Church upon earth, and to shew that the Bishop of Rome is that one Head by virtue of his succession to S. Peter, whereas S. Cyprian speaketh nothing of any such one Head, nor of any such succession, but only of the Origination of the Church, which was so disposed by Christ, that the Unity might be expressed for whereas all the rest of the Apostles had equal power and honour with S. Peter, yet Christ did particularly give that power to S. Peter, to shew the Unity of the Church which he intended to build upon the foundation of the Apostles.**

Ephes. 4. 5.  
Jude 3.

Secondly, The Church is therefore one, though the members be many, because they all agree in one Faith. There is *one Lord, and one Faith*, and that Faith *once delivered to the Saints*, which whosoever shall receive, embrace, and profess, must necessarily be accounted one in reference to that profession. For if a company of Believers become a Church by believing, they must also become one Church by believing one Truth. If they be one in respect of the foundation, which is ultimately one, if we look upon *Christ*, which is mediately one, if we look upon the Apostles united in one Corner-stone; if those which believe be therefore said to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles, because they believe the Doctrine which the Apostles preached, and the Apostles be therefore said to be of the same foundation, and united to the Corner-stone, because they all taught the same Doctrine which they received from *Christ*, then they which believe the same Doctrine delivered by *Christ* to all the Apostles delivered by all the Apostles to Believers, being all Professours of the same Faith, must be Members of the same Church. And this is the † Unity of Faith.

† Of this doth Irenæus speak, delivering the sum or brief

Abstract of the material Object of Faith, Τὸ κήρυγμα παρεληφθῆα, καὶ ταύτῳ πῶς πίσει ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καὶ ὅσον ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διαπαρῶν ὁπμὲλῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἓνα αἶκον κίχουσα, καὶ ὁμοίως πισθεῖ τέτοις, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κηρύσσει καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παρεδίδωσιν ὡς ἐν ὅλῳ κεκλήρωται. Advers. Hæret. l. 1. Καὶ ἅ τε ἐν ὑπόστασιν, καὶ ἅ τε ὁπνοίαν, καὶ ἅ τε ἀρχὴν, κατὰ τε ἐξοχὴν, μόνον ἑνὰ φανερὴ τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν εἰς ἐνότητά πείσει: μιᾶς τῆς καὶ τῆς ἰδέας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφέρει τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βυλευματι, δι' ἐνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου (σωτήρα) κατὰ τεταγμένως, ὅς περὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεός, δίκαιος ἐσομένως περὶ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς. Clem. Alex. Stromat. l. 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 prædicationi fundameta possideat. deferenda est, Petra tua Christus est, S. Amb. in Luc. lib. 2. cap. 9. Ἡ γὰρ σωτήρα τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ποιμὴν, ἀρετὴ ἢ πίστις ὄσιν, Clem. Alex. Stromat. l. 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.*

Matth. 28. 19.  
Ephes. 4. 4.

Thirdly, Many Persons and Churches, howsoever distinguished by time or place, are considered as one Church, because they acknowledge and receive the same Sacraments, the signs and badges of the people of God. When the Apostles were sent to found and build the Church, they received this Commission, *Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now as there is but *one Lord, and one Faith*, so also is there but *one Baptism*; and consequently they which are admitted to it, in receiving it are one. Again, At the institution of the Lord's Supper *Christ* commanded, saying, *Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this*, and all by communicating of one, become as to that communication one. For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread. As therefore the Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, and thereby appeared to be the one People of God; so all believing persons, and

1 Cor. 10. 17.

5 Cor. 10. 2, 3, 4.

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.

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 eternal life is promised unto every person, and we all through the Spirit wait for the hope of Righteousness by faith. They therefore which depend upon the same God, and worship him all for the same end, the hope of eternal life, which God that cannot 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.

Ephes. 4. 4.  
Gal. 5. 5.

Fifthly, They which are all of one mind, whatsoever the number of their persons be, they are in reference to that mind but one; as all the members howsoever different, yet being animated by one soul, become one body. Charity is of a fastning 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.

Ephes. 4. 3.  
John 13. 35.

Lastly, All the Churches of God are united into one by the unity of Discipline and Government, by vertue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastoral guides appointed, authorized, sanctified and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternal salvation: as therefore there is \* no Church where there is no order, no Ministry: so where the same Order and Ministry is, there is the same Church. And this is the †† Unity of Regiment and Discipline.

† Unus Deus enim & Christus unus, Ecclesia ejus una fides, una & plebs in solidam corporis unitatem concordiaë glutine copulata, S. Cyp. de Unitate Eccles.  
\* Ecclesia non est quæ non

habet Sacerdotes, S. Hier. adv. Lucifer. Πάντες ἀνδρπέδωσαν τὰ Διακόνους ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ τὸν Ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Πατέρα, καὶ ἡ Πρεσβυτέρους ὡς Συνέδριον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς Συνδεδεσμένον Ἀποστόλων· χαρὴς τέτων ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκαλεῖται, Ignat. ad Trall. Τὸ γε μὴ ἴδιον Ἐκκλησίας ὄνομα τὴν ἑπὶ εἰς Χριστόν πιστῶσάντων ὑφαίνει πληθὺν ἱερωγῶν τε καὶ λαῶν ποιμνῶν καὶ διδασκάλων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ χεῖρα κατεζωγισμένων, S. Cyril ad cap. 45. ubi interpret. ὑφαίνει, male translulit declarat, quod est ὑποφαίνει; cum reddere oportuerit, connedit, aut contextit. †† Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur? Ecclesia una est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur, S. Cyp. ibidem. So he joins these two together, Cum sit à Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus Episcoporum multorum concordia numerositate diffusus. Ep. ad Antonianum.

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 several places of the World for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforesaid. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the true notion of the Church as such, which is here the object of our Faith; it remaineth therefore that we next consider the existence of the Church; which is acknowledged in the Act of Faith applied to this object. For when I profess and say, I believe a Church, it is not only an acknowledgment of a Church which hath been, or of a Church which shall be, but also of that which is. When I say, I believe in Christ dead, I acknowledge that death which once was, and now is not: for Christ once died, but now is not dead. When I say, I believe the resurrection of the body, I acknowledge that which never yet was, and is not now, but shall hereafter be. Thus the act of Faith is applicated to the object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, as past; to what is to come, as still to come; to that which is present, as it is still present. Now that which was then past, when the Creed was made, must necessarily be always past, and so believed for ever; that

\*\* 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, & disciplina unitate & spei fœdere, Apolog. cap. 39.

which

which shall never come to pass until the end of the World, when this publick profession of Faith shall cease, that must for ever be believed as still to come. But that which was when the Creed began, and was to continue till that Creed shall end, is proposed to our belief in every Age as being; and thus ever since the first Church was constituted, the Church 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 actual being, from the first collection in the Apostles times unto the consummation of all things. And therefore to make good this explication of the Article, it will be necessary to prove that the Church which our Saviour founded and the Apostles gathered was to receive a constant and perpetual accession, and by a successive augmentation be uninterruptedly continued in an actual existence of believing Persons and Congregations in all Ages unto the end of the World.

Now this indeed is a proper object of Faith, because it is grounded only upon the promise of God; there can be no other assurance of the perpetuity of this Church, but what we have from him that built it. The Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve 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 been wholly lost, many Candlesticks have been removed; neither is there any particular Church which hath any power to continue it self more or longer than others; and consequently, if all particulars be defectible, the Universal 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 powerful promise of perpetuity, saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* When he spake generally to all the rest of the Apostles to the same purpose, *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;* he added a promise to the same effect, *and loe I am with you always, even to the end of the world.* 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 doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.* 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. The † latter of these promises giveth not only an assurance of the continuance of the Church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of *Christ*. *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 unto the end of the World, he doth thereby assure us of the existence of the Church, until that time, of which his presence is the cause. Indeed, this is *the City of the Lord of hosts, the City of our God, God will establish it for ever*, as the great Prophet of the Church hath said.

† Non deserit Ecclesiam suam Divina protectio, dicente Domino, Ecce ego vobiscum omnibus diebus, &c. Leo Epist. 31 S. August. upon these words of the Psal. 101. Exiguitatem dierum meorum annuncia

mihî, maketh the Church to speak these words. Quid est quod nescio qui recedentes à me murmurant contra me? Quid est quod perditî me perisse contendunt? Certe enim hoc dicunt, Quia sui & non sum. Annuncia mihî exiguitatem dierum meorum.



*meorum. Non à te quæro illos dies æternos; illi sine fine sunt, ubi ero, non ipsos quæro; temporales quæro, temporales dies mihi annuncia. Exiguitatem dierum meorum non æternitatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi. Quamdiu ero in isto sæculo, annuncia mihi, propter illos qui dicunt, Fuit & jam non est: propter illos qui dicunt, Impletæ sunt Scripturæ, crediderunt omnes gentes, sed apostatavit, & perit Ecclesia de omnibus gentibus: Quid est hoc, Exiguitatem dierum meorum annuncia mihi? Et annuciavit, nec vacua fuit vox ista. Quis annuciavit mihi nisi ipsa via? Quomodo annuciavit? Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi. Concione secunda in Psal. 101. Psal. 48. 8. Forte ista Civitas, quæ mundum renuit, aliquando evertetur. Absit. Deus fundavit eam in æternum. Si ergo Deus fundavit eam in æternum, quid times ne cadat firmamentum? S. Aug. ad locum.*

Upon the certainty of this truth, the existence of the Church hath been propounded as an object of our Faith in every Age of Christianity; and so it shall be still unto the end of the world. For those which are Believers are the Church, and therefore if they do believe, they must believe there is a Church. And thus having shewed in what the nature of a Church consisteth, and proved that a Church of that nature is of perpetual 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 several respects, and for several reasons; First, In reference to the Vocation by which all the members thereof are called and separated from the rest of the World to God; which separation in the Language of the Scriptures is a signification: and so the calling being holy, (for *God hath called us with an holy calling*) the body which is separated and congregated thereby, may well be termed *holy*. Secondly, In relation to the Offices appointed, and the powers exercised in the Church, which by their institution and operation are holy; that Church for which they were appointed, and in which they are exercised, may be called *holy*. Thirdly, Because whosoever is called to profess faith in Christ, is thereby engaged to holiness of life, according to the words of the Apostle, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity*: for those namers of the name, or named by the name of Christ, are such as called on his name, and that was the description of the Church; as when *Saul* did persecute the Church, it is said he had *authority from the chief Priests to bind all that called upon the name of Christ*, and when he preached *Christ in the Synagogues, all that heard him said, Is not this he who destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem?* Being then all within the Church are by the profession obliged to such holiness of life, in respect of this obligation, the whole Church may be termed *holy*. Fourthly, In regard the end of constituting a Church in God, was for the purchasing an holy and a precious people; and the great design thereof was for the begetting and increasing holiness, that as God is originally holy in himself, so he might communicate his sanctity to the sons of men, whom he intended to bring unto the fruition of himself, unto which without a previous sanctification they can never approach, because *without holiness no man shall ever see God.*

2 Tim. 1. 9.

2 Tim 2. 19.

Acts 9. 14, 21. vide 1 Cor. 1. 2. Ὅτι ᾧ τὸ ἅθροισμα τῶν ἁγίων τὸ ἐξ ὀρθῆς πίστεως καὶ πολιτείας αἰείσης συγκαταστήσαντων Ἐκκλησία ὅτι, δῆλον ὅτι τοῖς σοφίας γευσάμενοι. Isid. Peleus. Epist. 246. l. 2.

For these four reasons the whole *Church of God*, as it containeth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the Faith of *Christ*, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed *holy*. But the Apostle hath delivered another kind of holiness which cannot belong unto the Church taken in so great a latitude. For, saith he, *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might 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.*

Eph. 5. 25, 26, 27.

Now

No w though it may be conceived that *Christ* did love the whole Church as it did any way contain all such as ever called upon his name, and did give himself for all of them : yet we cannot imagine that the whole body of all men could ever be so holy, as to be without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing. It will be therefore necessary, within the great complex body of the Universal Church, to find that Church to which this absolute holiness doth belong : and to this purpose it will be fit to consider both the difference of the persons contained in the Church, as it hath been hitherto described, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death ; whereby we shall at last discover in what persons this holiness is inherent really, in what condition it is inherent perfectly, and consequently in what other sense it may be truly and properly affirmed that the Church is *holy*.

Where first we must observe that the Church, as it embraceth all the professors of the true Faith of *Christ*, containeth in it not only such as do truly believe and are obedient to the Word, but those also which are hypocrites, and prophane. Many profess the Faith, which have no true belief : many have some kind of Faith, which live with no correspondence to the Gospel preached. Within therefore the notion of the Church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both professing the same Faith. For the *Kingdom of heaven is like unto a field in which wheat and tares grow together unto the harvest ; like unto a net that was cast into the Sea, and gathered of every kind ; like unto a floor in which is laid up wheat and chaff ; like unto a marriage-feast, in which some have on the wedding garment, and some not.* This is that Ark of *Noah* in which were preserved beasts clean and unclean. This is that *great house* in which there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood, and of earth, and some to honour, and some to dishonour, There are many called of all which the Church 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 external communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and here after saved ; and together with them other persons void of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned : and that Church containing these of both kinds may well be called *holy*, as *S. Matthew* called *Jerusalem the Holy City*, even at that time when our Saviour did but begin to preach, when we know there was in that City a general Corruption in Manners and Worship.

Matt. 13. 24.  
30, 47.

Matt. 3. 12.  
Firmissime te-  
ne & nulla-  
tenus dubites  
aream Dei esse  
Ecclesiam Ca-  
tholicam, & in-  
tra eam usq;  
in finem sæcu-  
li frumento  
mixtas paleas  
contineri, hoc  
est, bonis ma-  
los sacramen-  
torum commu-  
nione misceri,  
Fulgent. ad Pe-  
trium, c. 43.  
Mat. 22. 10.  
2 Tim. 2. 20.

S. Jerom joins these two together, Arca Noë Ecclesie 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, Dial. contra Luciferianos. † The opinion of the Donatists confuted by the Catholicks is to be seen in S. Augustin's Book, entitled, Breviculum Collationum. Upon which reflecting in his Book, Post Collationem, he observes how they were forced by the Testimony of those Scriptures which we have produced, to acknowledge that there were mingled with the good such as were occultly bad, Ecce etiam ipsi veritate Evangelica non aliud coacti sunt confiteri quam malos occultos vult 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 enforceth from their acknowledgment, that those which are apparently evil, are contained in the same Church. Si enim propterea ritibus bonos & malos congregantibus Ecclesiam comparavit, quia malos in Ecclesia non manifestos sed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita nesciunt sacerdotes, quemadmodum sub fluctibus quid acceperint reria nesciunt Piscatores. Propterea ergo & arca comparata est, ut etiam manifeste mali cum bonis in ea prænunderentur futuri. Neque enim palea quæ in arca est permixta frumentis, etiam ipsa sub fluctibus later, 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 contained in the Church, such as are void of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the Church, and when they pass out of this life, die in their sins, and remain under the eternal wrath of God ; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the Church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto

unto which they were called, and being by death separated from the external Communion of the Church, and having no true internal communion with the members and the head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the Church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are efficaciously called, justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they die are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the Church, but remain united still by virtue of that internal union by which they were before conjoined both to the members and the head. As therefore the Church is truly holy, not only by an holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these Saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy, in relation to the same Saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from 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 contained in it, by a real infused sanctity; the same is farther yet at the same time perfectly holy in reference to the Saints departed and admitted to the presence of God; and the same Church shall hereafter be most completely holy in the world to come, when all the members actually belonging to it, shall be at once perfected in holiness and compleated in happiness. And thus I conceive the affection of the sanctity sufficiently explicated.

*Ephes. 2. 27.*

† *This was in which the Catholics answered to the Donatists, objecting that they made two distinct Churches. De duabus etiam ecclesiis calumniam corum Catholici refutarunt, identidem expressius ostendentes quid dixe-*

*rint, 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. August. Collat. 3. diei.*

The next affection of the Church is that of Universality, *I believe the holy CATHOLICK Church*. Now the word *Catholic*, as it is not read in the Scriptures, so was it not anciently in the Creed, (as we have already 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 several intents. For, first, they called the Epistles of *S. James, S. Peter, S. John, S. Jude*, the † *Catholic* Epistles, because when the Epistles written by *S. Paul* were directed to particular Churches congregated in particular Cities, these were either sent to the Churches dispersed through a great part of the World, or directed to the whole Church of God upon the face of the whole earth. Again, We observe the Fathers to use the word *Catholic* for nothing

\* *It was the ordinary Objection of the Schismatical Novatians, that the very name of Catholics was never used by the Apostles, and the answer to it by the Catholics was by*

*way of concession. Sed sub Apostolis, inquit, 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 S. Jude, Judas frater Jacobi parvam*

parvam quidem, quæ de septem Catholicis est, Epistolam reliquit. This therefore was the common Title of these Epistles in St. Jerom's time among the Latines, and before among the Greeks, as appeareth by Eusebius. Τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸ Ἰακώβου, ἢ ἡ πρώτη τῆς ὀνομαζομένης καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἔτι λέγεται, ἵστέον ὡς νοθεύεται καὶ ἔτι πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς ἐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰδαμίας καὶ αὐτῆς ἕως τῆς ἐπὶ τὰ καθολικῶν. Hist. l. 2. 23. The same was in use before the time of Eusebius, as appeareth by Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, Ὁ δὲ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς περὶ ἑξαφῆεν αὐτὰ τὸ ὄνομα, Euseb. Hist. l. 7. c. 25. And afore him as appeareth by Origen, Δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγῆσαι αὐτῶ ποιήσαντα, ὃν καὶ ἔδον ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ διὰ τῶν ὁμολογήσας, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25. Thus anciently Epistola Catholica was used for a General Epistle, καθολικαὶ δὲ ἐκλήθησαν, ἐπειδὴ ἀνὰ πρὸς ἐν ἔθνεσσι ἐγράφησαν ὡς αἱ τῆς Παύλου, ἀλλὰ καθόλου πρὸς πάντας. Leontius de Sectis : and so continued, not only in relation to the Scriptures, but to the Epistles of others, as Eusebius of Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, Χρησιμώτατον ἄπασιν ἑαυτὸν καθιστᾷ ἐν αἷς ὑπερῦπαντο καθολικαῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας Ἐπιστολαῖς, Hist. lib. 4. cap. 23.

\* So Justine Martyr. καὶ ταῦτα τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ (συνελεύσει φάναι) αἰωνίαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀμα πάντων ἀνάστασιν ἡγήσασιν καὶ κρίσιν. Dial. adv. Tryph. ὁ Θεοφίλιος Ἀντιοχένους, ὅτι δυνάτως ὄσιν ὁ Θεὸς ποιῆσαι τὴν καθολικὴν ἐνάστασιν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων, Ad Autol. l. 1. So Tertullian uses Catholicicè 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. Hæc. c. 26. Hæc itaque dispecta totum ordinem Dei Judicis operarium & (ut dignius dixerim) protectorem Catholicæ & summæ illius bonitatis ostendunt, l. 2. adv. Marcion. So he calls Christ, Catholicus patris Sacerdotem, l. 4. Origen of Celsus, καθολικῶς ὑποσημαίνουσι Θεὸν οὐδένα πρὸς ἀνθρώπους καλεηλυθέναι, ἢ Θεὸν παῖδα, l. 5. which he expounds immediately by καθόλου λελεγμένον. So he speaks of καθολικὸν κέλευσεν ἑῷ δόξας, & ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ καὶ πάντων τῶν πατέρων τῶν τρεῶν ἐπάνω. So Justin Martyr, ἀμνηστῆσαν τοῖς μετ' αὐτῶ τῆς καθολικῆς δόξης ἐνέλαβον. De Monarch. Dei. † We read in the old Glossary, καθολικὸς Rationalis; that is the Receiver of the Imperial Revenue; not that it signifies so much of it self, but because he was the General Receiver, and so not from receiving or accounting, but for the Generality of his accounts in respect of others, who were inferior, and whose receipts and accounts were more particular; therefore he was called Catholicus, who by the Latines was properly styled Procurator summæ rei, or Rationalis summarum. Thus Constantine signified to Cæcilianus Bishop of Carthage, that he had written to his Procurator General to deliver him monies, Ἐδωκα γράμματά περὶ οὐδ' ἔσον τῆς διασημώτατον καθολικὸν τῆς Ἀφρικῆς, καὶ ἐδήλωσα αὐτῶ ὅπως τελικῶς φόλους τῆ σῆ σερρότητι ἀπαειθμησά φροντίσει, Euseb. Hist. l. 10. c. 6. And in the same manner to Eusebius, Ἀπέσταλται δὲ γράμμα τα παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἡμερῶν τῆς πρὸς τῆς διοικήσεως καθολικὸν ὅπως ἀνὰ πάντα τὰ πρὸς τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν αὐτῆς ἐπιτήδεια παρεχέειν φροντίσειεν, Idem de vita Constant. l. 4. c. 36. ὁ Socr. Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 9. So Suidas. Ἐπιστολὴ Ἰβλιανῆ τῆς πρὸς βασιλέως πρὸς πορφυρίου καθολικὸν, which is the 36. of his Epistles extant. This Rationalis summarum, was by the Greeks expressed thus either by one word, καθολικὸς, or by more to the same purpose. So Dio Cocceianus speaketh of Aurelius Eubulus, Τὸν γὰρ δὴ καθόλου λόγους ὅτι τε γράμματα ἐδέν ὅτι ἐκ ἐδήμειεν. in Excerpt. l. 79. So Porphyrius, Ὡς ἐπὶ Θαυμασίῳ τινὸς τὸ ὄνομα ἐπεισελθόντῳ τῶ καθόλου λόγους πρὸς τὸν, in Vita Plotin. So Dionysius of Alexandria speaketh of Macrianus, who was Procurator summæ rei to the Emperour Valerianus. Ὁς πρὸς τὸν μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς καθόλου λόγων λεγομένης (ἢ) βασιλέως, ἐδέν εὐλογον (alluding to λόγων) ἐδὲ καθολικὸν (alluding to καθόλου) ἐφρόνησεν, ἀλλ' ὑποπέπτωκεν ἀρὰ πρὸς τῆ τῆς λεγόμενης ἑαυτῶ πρὸς τῆς ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ καθόλου μὴ βλέπειν, ἢ γὰρ σωήκει τὴ καθόλου πρὸς τὸν, ἐδὲ τὴ κείσιν ὑπέδειξε τὸ πρὸ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι. διὸ καὶ καθολικῶς αὐτὸ ἐκκλησίας γέγονε πολέμιος. Euseb. Hist. l. 7. c. 10.

else but general or universal, in the ordinary or vulgar sense; as the Catholick resurrection is the resurrection of all men, the Catholick \*opinion, the opinion of all men. Sometimes it was used as a word of state, signifying an Officer which collected the Emperour's Revenue in several Provinces, united into one Diocess; who, because there were particular Officers belonging to the particular Provinces, and all under him, was therefore called the † *Catholicus*, as general Procurator of them all, from whence that title was by some transferred upon the Christian Patriarchs.

\* This Ἐκκλησία καθολικὴ is ostento be understood, especially in the latter Greeks, for the common or Parochial Church. As we read in Codinus de Officiis Constant. Ὁ Σακελλίης τῶν ἐνοχλῶ ἔχων τῆς καθολικῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, And again, Ὁ Ἀρχὼν τῆς Ἐκκλησιῶν ἔχων τὴν ἐνοχλῶ τῆς καθολικῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν μετὰ πρὸς τῆς Σακελλίης. So likewise Balsamon. λέγεται Σακελλίης ὁ τῶ μοναστείων διοικητῆς, ὡς ὁ Σακελλίης ὑποκοιτικῶς ὁ τῆς καθολικῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν φροντιστῆς, 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 Chapels, and avoided the common Churches, describing those persons in this manner, Πατερικῶς σαυροπηγίους ἢ καὶ ἐπισκοπικῶς διαρρῆντες, τὰς καθολικὰς παρατεταμένους, καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ ταῦταις (ἢ) ἀξίω καὶ ἀφρονῶν. lib. 4. Juris Græc.

When this title is attributed to the Church it hath not always the same notion or signification; For when by the Church is understood the house of God, or place in which the worship of God is performed, then by the *Catholick Church* is meant no more than the common Church, into which all such persons as belonged to that Parish in which it was built were wont to congregate. For were 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 received them both, and therefore called \* *Catholick*.

Again, When the Church is taken for the persons making profession of the Christian Faith, the *Catholick* is often added in opposition to Hereticks and Schismaticks, expressing a \* particular Church continuing in the true Faith with the rest of the Church of God, as the *Catholick Church in Smyrna*, the *Catholick Church in Alexandria*.

\* As the Smyrneans spake in Eusebius of Polycarpus, Γενόμενος οπίσκοπος οπίσκοπος.

πος ἢ ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, lib. 4. cap. 15. So Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἢ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, in Epiphanius. Thus Gregory Nazianzen begins his own last Will. Γρηγόριος ὁπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, in which he bequeaths his estate τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐν Ναζιανζῶ, and subscribes it after the same manner in words in which he began it, and so the rest of the Bishops which subscribed, as witnesses, Ἀμφιλόχιος ὁπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἰκονίῳ. Ὀπίμιμος ὁπίσκοπος τῆς καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Θεοδοῖσιος ὁπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ὑδῆ. Θεόδωλος ὁπίσκοπος τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς καὶ Ἀπάμειαν. Θεμιστοῖος ὁπίσκοπος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς καὶ Ἀδριανούπολιν. In the same manner speak the Latines, Eodem itaque tempore in Ecclesia Hipponeusi Catholica Valerius Sanctus Episcopatum gerebat. Possidius de Vita Aug. c. 4. Thus any particular true Church is called the *Catholick Church* of the place in which it is, and all Churches which retain the *Catholick Faith*, are called *Catholick Churches*. As when the Synod of Antioch concluded their sentence against the Samosatensians thus, καὶ πάσαι αἱ καθολικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι συμφωνῶσιν ἡμῖν. According to which notion we read in Leo the Great, Ad venerationem Pentecostes unanimiter incitemur exultantes in honorem S. Spiritus, per quem omnis Ecclesia Catholica sanctificatur, omnis anima rationalis imbuitur, Serm. 1. de Pentec. Whence where we read in the Synod of Ariminum, εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πάντες ὁπίσκοποι συνήλθομεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ πίστις τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας γνωριεθῆ, καὶ οἱ τάναντία φερρόντες ἕκαστοι γένοινται, although in Athanasius, Theodoret and Socrates, it be constantly written, τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας; yet S. Hilary did certainly read it, τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, for it is thus translated in his Fragments, Ut fides claresceret omnibus Ecclesiis Catholicis, & hæretici noscerentur. From whence it came to pass that in the same City Hereticks and Catholics having their several Congregations, each of which was called the Church, the Congregation of the Catholics was by way of distinction called the *Catholick Church*. Of which this was the old advice of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ἄν ποτὶς ὁπίσκοπος ἐν πόλεσι, μὴ ἀπλῶς ἐξέταζε πῶς τὸ Κνεριακόν ὄντι καὶ γὰρ αἱ ληπταὶ τῆς ἀσεβῶν αἰρέσεων Κνεριακὰ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἀσῆλμα καλεῖν ὀπίχειρῶσι καὶ μὴ πῶς ὄντι ἀπλῶς ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ πῶς ὄντι ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία; Catech. 18. Ego forte ingressus 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? Pacian. ad Symp. Ep. 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. Aug. cont. 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 several parts of the earth, containing within it numerous congregations, all which were truly called Churches, as members of the same Church; that Church, I say, was after some time called the *Catholick Church*, that is to say, the name *Catholick* was used by the Greeks to signify the whole. For being every particular congregation professing the name of *Christ*, was from the beginning called a Church; being likewise all such Congregations considered together were originally comprehended under the name of the Church; being these two notions of the word were different, it came to pass that for distinction sake at first they called the Church, taken in the large and comprehensive sense, by as large and comprehensive a name, the † *Catholick Church*.

\* Nonne appellatione propria decuit caput principale signari? Pacianus ibid.

† I conceive at first there was no other mean-

ing in the word καθολικὴ than what the Greek language did signify thereby, that is, tota or universa, as S. Austin, Cum dixisset de super contexta, addidit per totum. Quod si referamus ad id quod significat, nemo ejus est expertus qui pertinere invenitur ad totum: à quo toto sicut Græca indicat lingua, Catholica vocatur Ecclesia. Tracl. in Joh. 118. The most ancient Author which I find it in, (except Ignatius Ὁπερ ἀνφανῆ ὁ ὁπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔσα, ὡς περ ὅπερ ἀν ἡ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Ep. ad Smyrnaeos) is Clemens Alexandrinus, μόνον εἶναι φανερὴν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Strom. 1. 7. But the Passion of Polycarpus written in the name of the Church of Smyrna, may be much ancienter, in which the Original notion seemeth most clear, Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆς Θεῆς ἢ παροικῶσα Σμύρναν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν Φιλομυλίῳ, καὶ πάσαις καὶ πάντα τόπων τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίαις, i. e. omnibus totius Ecclesiæ parœciis, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 1. 4. 6. 15. It was otherwise called in the same notion ἡ καθόλου. As Apollinarius Bishop of Hierapolis, Τὴν ἡ καθόλου καὶ πάσαν ἢ ὑπὸ τῆς βραβύων ἐκκλησίαν βλασφημεῖν διδάσκοντες τῆς ἀπὸ πνεύματος πνεύματος, apud Euseb. 1. 5. c. 16. And Eusebius, Προῖει ἢ εἰς αὐξήσιν καὶ μέγεθος αἱ καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσα ἢ τῆς καθόλου καὶ μόνης ἀληθῆς ἐκκλησίας λαμπρότης, Hist. 1. 4. c. 7. Καθολικὴ θίησιν ἀπὸ ἡ καθόλου ἰσθὲς ἡσθὲς, the whole, general, or universal.

Although this seem the first intention of those which gave the name *Catholick* to the Church, to signifie thereby nothing else but the whole or universal 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 than the universal Church; but having used that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the Church was to be universal, and in what that universality did consist.

As far then as the ancient Fathers have expressed themselves, and as far as their expressions are agreeable with the descriptions of the Church delivered in the Scriptures, so far, I conceive, we may safely conclude that the Church of *Christ* is truly *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 general notion of this Catholicism consisteth in the diffusiveness of the Church, grounded upon the commission given to the builders of it, *Go, teach all Nations*, whereby they and their successors were authorized and impowred to gather Congregations of Believers, and so to extend the borders of the Church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The Synagogue of the *Jews* especially consisted of one Nation, and the publick worship of God was confined to one Country, *In Judah was God known, and his name was great in Israel; in Salem was his Tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Sion. He shewed his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation.* The temple was the only place in which the Sacrifices could be offered, in which the Priests could perform their office of Ministration; and so under the Law there was an inclosure divided from all the World besides. 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, *Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature: that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* Thus the Church of *Christ*, in its primary institution, was made to be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend it self, from the City of *Jerusalem*, where it first began, to all the parts and corners of the earth. From whence we find them in the *Revelation*, crying to the Lamb, *Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.* 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.

Rev. 5. 9.  
\* 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, ἡ ὑπὸ πλεόντων ἕως πλεόντων.* S. Cyril of Jerusalem gives this as the first importance of the word. *Καθολικὴ ὡς ἐν καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ πλεόντων γῆς ἕως πλεόντων.* Catech. 18. *Ubi ergo erit proprietates Catholici nominis, cum inde dicta sit Catholica, quod sit rationalis & ubique diffusa?* Optatus, l. 2. *Ipsa est enim Ecclesia Catholica: unde Καθολικὴ Græcè 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 copiose diffunditur, quæ usque ad ultimas gentes crescendo porrigitur.* Idem Epist. 30. *Si autem dubitas quid Ecclesiam quæ per omnes gentes numerositate copiosa dilatatur, S. Scriptura commendat, multis & manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem autoritate prolatis onerabo.* Idem contra Crescon. l. 1. c. 33. *Sancta Ecclesia ideo dicitur Catholica, pro eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa.* Isidorus de Summo Bono, Lib. 1. Cap. 9.

Secondly, they call the Church of *Christ* the *Catholick* Church, because it teacheth all things which are necessary for a Christian to know, whether they be things in Heaven or things in Earth, whether they concern the condition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the Holy Ghost did lead the Apostles *into all truth*, so did the Apostles leave all truth unto the Church,

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 ἀνελλιπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἔλθειν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα ἴσαί τε ὁμοίῃ καὶ ἀρετῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιτηδίων τε καὶ ὀπιγείων. 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 univrsium mundum est constituta, vel quoniam Catholica, hoc est, generalis in eadem doctrina est ad instructionem, In Decret. Ivo lib. 2.

Thirdly, The Church hath been thought fit to be called *Catholick* in reference to the universal obedience which it prescribeth; both in respect of the persons, obliging men of \* all conditions; and in relation to the precepts, requiring the performance of all † the Evangelical commands.

\* This is the third interpretation of S. Cyril,

Fourthly, || the Church hath been yet further called or reputed *Catholick*, by reason of all graces given in it, whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spiritual virtues are disseminated, all the works, and words, and thoughts of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in *Christ Jesus*.

Καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων εἰς εὐσεβείαν ὑποτάσσειν ἀρχόντων τε καὶ ἀρχουδίων, λογίων τε καὶ ἰδιότητων, Cat. 18.

In all these four exceptions 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 Catholicism, or second affection of the Church, consisteth generally in Universality, as imbracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all Nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kind of obedience, as curing all diseases, and planting all graces, in the souls of men.

† Si reddenda Catholici vocabuli ratio est, & exprimens 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 iusti constituentur multi, Ergo qui Catholicus, idem iusti obediens, Pacianus Epist. 1. ad Sympron. Acutum aliquid videris dicere cum Catholica nomen non ex orbis totius communiōne interpretaris, sed ex observatione præceptorum omnium divinatorum atque omnium Sacramentorum: quasi nos etiam, si forte hinc sit appellata Catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat, cuius 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 divinatorum 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 Ecclesie toto orbe diffusæ, cui testimonium 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 collat. 3. diei c. 2. || This is the fourth and last explication given by S. Cyril. Διὰ τὸ καθολικῶς ἰαρυέναι καὶ θεραπεύειν ἅπαν τὰ ἢ ἀμαρτιῶν εἶδος ἢ διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐπιτελεσθέντων κερτηθῆναι τε ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ὀνομαζομένης ἀρετῆς ἐν ἔργοις τε καὶ λόγοις καὶ πνευματικαῖς παντοῖς χαρίσμασι, Catech. 18.

The necessity of believing the *Holy Catholick Church*, appeareth first in this, that *Christ* hath appointed it as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first; that the *Lord* added to the Church daily such as should be saved; and what was then daily done, hath been done since continually. *Christ* never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did he build a Church to save some, and make another institution for other mens salvation. There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, but the name of *Jesus*; and that name is no otherwise given under heaven than in the Church. As none were saved from the deluge but such as were within the Ark of *Noah*, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first-born of *Egypt* lived, but such as were within those habitations whose door posts were sprinkled with Blood by the appointment of God for their preservation; as none of the inhabitants of *Jericho* could escape the fire or sword, but such as were within the house of *Rahab*, for whose protection a Covenant was made:

Act 2. 47.

Act 4. 12. Καθάρως ἐν θαλάσῃ νησὶ εἰσιν αἱ ἢ οἰκηταὶ καὶ δύουδρι καὶ καρποφόροι ἔχουσαι ὄρυς καὶ λιμένας περὶ τὸ πύχειμα ζουμένης ἔχεν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καταφυγὰς ἕτω δὲ δακεν ὁ Θεός

τὸ κῶσω κωμανοῦν καὶ χειμαζομένην ὑπὸ τῶ ἀμαρτημάτων τὰς ζωαγωγὰς λεγομένης Ἐκκλησίας, ἐν αἷε καθάρως λιμέσιν εὐρύμοι ἐν νησοῖς αἰδιδάκαλαί τε ἀληθεῖς εἰσι, πρὸς αἰ καταφεύγουσιν οἱ θέλοντες σάζεσθαι. S. Theophil. Antioch. Autol. 1. 2. Μιὰ ὃ προσήκειν ἐκκλησία ἢ σωτηρίαν ταύτην ὀπίσμεθα καὶ μηδένα τὴ καθολικῆς ἔξωθεν ἐκκλησίας καὶ πίστεως μετέχεν. Χειρὶ δὲ δωάμενον μηδὲ σάζεσθαι. S. Chryl. in Pascha Hom. 1.

so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God. This is the Congregation of those persons here on earth which shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the Vessels of the Tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into, and fixed in the Temple.

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 do belong to it; for if any *neglect to hear the Church*, saith our Saviour, *let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a Publican*. By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanours, we may incur the censure of the Church of God, and while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of heaven. For our Saviour said to his Apostles, upon whom he built his Church, *Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained*. Again, a man may not only passively and involuntarily be rejected, but also may by an act of his own, cast out or reject himself, not only by plain and complete Apostasy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable Heresie, or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the Catholick Church, and falling into an irrecoverable Schism.

Thirdly, It is necessary to believe the Church of *Christ* to be holy, lest we should presume to obtain any happiness by being of it, without that holiness which is required in it. It is enough that the end, institution and administration of the Church are holy: but, that there may be some real and permanent advantage received by it, it is necessary that the persons abiding in the communion of it should be really and effectually sanctified. Without which holiness the privileges of the Church prove the greatest disadvantages, and the means of salvation neglected, tend to a punishment with aggravation. It is not only vain but pernicious to attend at the marriage-feast without a wedding garment, and it is our Saviour's description of folly to cry, *Lord, Lord, open unto us*, while we are without Oyl in our Lamps. We must acknowledge a necessity of holiness, 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 containeth within it all which are truly 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 always embraceth *the faith once delivered to the Saints*. Whatsoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new Churchdom, and whatsoever is so new is none. So necessary it is to believe the *holy 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 profess to believe *the Holy Catholick Church*. For thereby every one is understood to declare thus much; I am fully persuaded, and make a free confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that *Christ* by the preaching of the Apostles, did gather unto himself a Church consisting of thousands of believing persons and numerous Congregations, to which he daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add unto the same unto the end of the World: so that by the virtue of his all-sufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, and

now

Sola Catholica Ecclesia est quæ verum cultum retinet. Hic est fons veritatis, hoc est domicilium fidelium, hoc templum Dei: quo si quis non intraverit, vel à quo si quis exierit; à spe vitæ ac salutis æternæ alienus est. *Lactant.* l. 4. c. 30.



now is, and hereafter shall be so long as the Sun and Moon endure, a Church of *Christ* one and the same. This Church I believe in general holy in respect of the Author, End, Institution and Administration of it; particularly in the members, here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly holy. I look upon this Church not like that of the *Jews*, limited to one people, confined to one Nation, but by the appointment and command of *Christ*, and by the efficacy of his assisting power, to be diffeminated through all Nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all Ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of *Christ*, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well-pleasing in the sight of God. And thus I believe the holy *Catholick Church*.

### The Communion of Saints.

**T**His part of the Article beareth something a † later date than 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.

† These words *Communio-nem Sancto-rum*, were not in the *Aquilei-an Creed* expounded by *Ruffin*; they were not mentioned by him, as being either in the

*Oriental or the Roman Creed.* They were not in the *African Creed* expounded by *S. Austin De Fide & Symbolo*; not in the Creed delivered by *Maximus Turonensis*; 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*, not in the *Old Latin Creed* in the *Oxford Library*, not in that produced by *Elipandus*. We find them not in the *old Greek Creeds*, not in that of *Eusebius* given in 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 later date, and is found in the *Latin and Greek Copy* in *Bennet College Library*, and is expressed and expounded in the 115. and 181 *Serm. De Tempore*, attributed to *S. Austin, v. Paschasi Symbolum*.

If we look upon the first institution of the Church, and the original condition of those persons which received the Gospel, how they were all together, and had all things common; how they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need; how *S. Paul* urged an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, as it was written, *He that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack*: we might well conceive that the communion, (which word might be taken for communication) of the Saints, may signify the great \* charity, bounty and community, among the people of God.

Acts 2.44, 45.

2 Cor. 8. 14, 15.

\* Grotius upon that place of the *Corinthians* observes, *Spectat & huc ea quam in Symbolo profite-mur Sanctorum communionem.*

But being that community precisely taken, was not of eternal obligation, nor actually long continued in the Church; being I conceive this Article doth not wholly look upon that which is already past; and especially, being I think neither that custom, nor that notion was then generally received in the Church, when this communion of Saints was first inserted, I shall therefore endeavour to shew that communion which is attributed to the Saints both according to the Fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures from whence they derived it.

Now all communion being between such as are some way different and distinct, the communion of the Saints may either be conceived between them and others, or between themselves; between them and others as differing from them either in their nature or their sanctity, between themselves, as distinct

stinct in person only, or condition also. Wherefore if we can first understand who, or what kind of persons these are which are called *Saints*, with whom beside themselves, and how among themselves, in this relation as they are the *Saints*, they have communion, and lastly in what the nature of that *Communion* in each respect consisteth; I know not what can be thought wanting to the perfect explication of *the Communion of Saints*.

That we may understand what *Communion* the *Saints* have with others, it would be necessary first to consider what it is to be a *Saint*, in what the true nature of *Saint-ship* doth consist, by what the *Saints* are distinguished from others. Again, that we may understand what *Communion* the *Saints* have with or among themselves, it will be farther necessary to consider who are those persons to which that title doth belong, what are the various conditions of them, that we may be able to comprehend all such as are true *Saints*, and thence conclude the *communion* between them all.

I take it first for granted, that though the Greek word which we translate *Saints* be 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 contained in it. Thirdly, I take it farther for granted that the word in this Article, which we translate *Saints* is not taken in the Original of the *Creed*, as it is often taken in the Translation of the *Old Testament*, for the † *Sanctuary*, as if the communion were nothing else but a right of communicating or participating of the holy things of God. Lastly, I take it also for granted that although the blessed and holy *Angels* are sometimes called in the *Scriptures* by the name of \* *Saints*, yet they are not those *Saints* who are here said to have the communion, though the *Saints* have communion with them.

† Κοινωνία ἁγίων may be as well understood in the neuter as the Masculine, as Exod. 28. 28. Ἐξορᾷ Ἄαρρον τὰ ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things. So Levit. 5. 15. Καὶ ἀμάρτη ἀκροσῶς ἀπὸ ἁγίων Κυρίου. 22. 2. Καὶ προσέχρησεν σου ἅπασαν τὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν

† Κοινωνία ἁγίων the Governours of the Sanctuary, of which notion afterwards. \* This is one of the common names of God in the Old Testament. קדוש ישראל, which is also sometimes translated plurally by the Lxx. as Esay 41. 22. בקדוש ישראל ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις Ἰσραήλ Jer. 51. 5. מקדוש ישראל ἀπὸ ἁγίων Ἰσραήλ. and if it were so taken, then κοινωνία ἁγίων, would be the communion of God, as τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἰσ. † Τα ἅγια frequently used in the *Scriptures* for the *Sanctuary*; and then κοινωνία ἁγίων might be taken for the communion in all those things which belonged to the worship of God as, ἀκροσῶν ἰσ. was a man excluded from all such communion. \* The *Angels* are not only called holy in the *Scriptures* by way of addition or Epithete, as πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι, Mat. 25. 31. μετὰ τῶν ἁγγέλων ἁγίων, Mark 8. 38. Luke 9. 25. ἐξουσιασθέντες ὑπὸ ἁγγέλων ἁγίων, Acts 10. 22. ἐνώπιον ἁγίων ἁγγέλων Rev. 14. 10. But also the ἅγιοι holy ones, or *Saints* taken substantively or singly signifie sometimes the *Angels*, as Deut 32. 2. ואתה מרננת קדש ואתה came with ten thousands of *Saints*, which the *Jerusalem Targum* renders ועמיה רננו מלאכי קדישין and with him came ten thousands of holy *Angels*; and Jonathan, ועמיה רננו מלאכי 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 σω μυριάσι Κάδης [Hesych. Κάδης ἁγιασμός] ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτῶ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτῶ. So Job 5. 1. To which of the *Saints* wilt thou turn? ἄτινα ἁγγέλων ἁγίων ὀψή, 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 Testament*, 1 Thess. 3. 13. ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῶ. in correspondence to that 2 Thes. 1. 17. ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' ἑρανοῦ μετ' ἁγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτῶ. These are the μυριάδες ἁγίων in S. Jude קדש רננו 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 profess to believe the *Holy Church*; which Church is therefore holy, because those persons are such, or ought to be, which are within it, the Church it self being nothing but a Collection of such persons. To that Confession is added this *Communion*; but because though the Church be holy, yet every person contained in it is not truly so, therefore is added this part of the Article which concerneth those who are truly such. There is therefore no doubt but the *Saints* mentioned here, are members of the Church of Christ, as we have described it, built upon the *Apostles*, laid upon the foundation of their doctrine

doctrine, who do not only profess the Gospel, but are sanctified thereby.

The only question then remaining is, in what their sanctity or Saintship doth consist, and (because though they which are Believers since our Saviour's death, be truly and more highly sanctified, yet such as lived before and under the Law, the Patriarchs, the Prophets and the Servants of God were so called, and were truly named the Saints of God) who were the persons which are capable of that denomination?

Now being God himself hath given a rule unto his people, which is both in the nature of a precept and of a pattern: (*Be ye holy as I the Lord your God am holy: be ye holy,* there'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 holiness 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 holiness*; such are the persons understood in this Article, which is the communion of men of holiness. Now holiness in the first acception of it signifieth Separation, and that with the relation of a double term, of one from which the separation is made, of the other to which that which is separated is applied. Those things which were counted holy under the Law were separated from common use, and applied to the service of God, and their sanctity was nothing else but that separation from and to those terms, from an use and exercise profane and common, to an use and exercise peculiar and divine. Thus all such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God, are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of *Saints*. The Pen-men of the Old Testament do often speak of the people of *Israel* as of an holy Nation, and God doth speak unto them as to people holy unto himself; because he had chosen them out of all the Nations of the world and appropriated them to himself. Although therefore most of that Nation were rebellious to him which called them, and void of all true inherent and actual sanctity, yet because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to the separation, called holy. In the like manner those of the New Testament writing to such as were called, and had received, and were baptized in the faith, give unto them all the name of *Saints*, as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For being Baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being, though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect, therefore all such as have been received into the Church, may be in some sense called holy.

But because there is more than an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption, necessary to make a man holy; therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not only by an extrinsecal Denomination, but by a real and internal Affection. What this Sanctity is, and who are capable of this Title properly, we must learn out of the Gospel of *Christ*, by which alone, ever since the Church of *Christ* was founded, any man can become a Saint. Now by the tenure of the Gospel we shall find that those are truly and properly Saints which are *sanctified in Christ Jesus*; first, in respect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated for *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*; by which they are purged, God himself *purifying their hearts by*

Exod. 22. 31.

קדש קדש

1 Cor. 1. 2.

1 John 5. 1.

אש, 1 2.

1 Cor. 6. 11.  
Ephes. 1. 13.  
2 Pet. 1. 15.  
2 Pet. 1. 9.

faith, whereby they are washed, sanctified, 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 holy in all manner of conversation: adding to their faith vertue, and to vertue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity, that they may neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such Persons then as are called by a holy calling, and not disobedient unto it, such as are endued with a holy faith, and purified thereby, such as are sanctified by the holy Spirit of God, and by vertue thereof do lead a holy life, perfecting holiness 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.

1 Cor 14. 33.

Psal. 89. 5, 7.  
149. 1. **בְּקִרְבֵּי קְדוֹשִׁים**  
LXX. ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀγίων.  
**בְּמִסְכָּנֵי קְדוֹשִׁים**

ἐν βελῆ ἀγίων  
Vulz. Latin. in Ecclesia & in consilio sanctorum. Deut. 33. 3. Dan. 7. 18, 21, 22, 25. Matth. 27. 52. Quis ignorat sub altera dispensatione Dei omnes retro Sanctos ejusdem fuisse meriti cujus nunc Christiani sunt? S. Hier. adv. Jovinian. 1 Psal. 106. 16. 2 Psal. 116. 2, 3. 3 1 Cor. 6. 2.

Now as these are the Saints of the Church of Christ, 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 Psalms of 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 Saviour's death the bodies of such Saints which slept arose. Where again we may observe that they were Saints while their bodies were in the Grave; as Aaron in the time of David kept the name of Saint of the Lord. Such as are holy in their lives do not lose their sanctity but improve it at their deaths, nor can they lose the honour of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection.

Hence grows that necessary distinction of the Saints on earth, and the Saints in Heaven; the first belonging to the militant, the second to the triumphant Church. Of the first the Prophet David speaketh expressly, Thou art my Lord, my goodness extendeth not to thee, but to the Saints that are in the earth: of these do we read in the Acts of the Apostles, to these did 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 the earth, if truly such, and departed so, are now, and shall for ever continue, Saints in Heaven.

Having thus declared what is the sanctity required to make a Saint, that is, a man of holiness; having also distinguished the Saints before and under the Gospel, (which difference is only observable as to this Exposition of the Creed,) and again distinguishing the same Saints while they live here with men on earth, and when after death they live with God in Heaven; having also shewed that of all these, those Saints are here particularly understood who in all ages lived in the Church of Christ; we may now properly descend to the next consideration, which is, Who are those persons with whom those Saints have this communion, and in what the communion which they have consists.

1 John 1. 3.  
Κοινωνία μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς.

First then, the Saints of God living in the Church of Christ, have communion with God the Father; for the Apostles did therefore write that they to whom they wrote might have communion with them, (that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us, saith 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

partake of his care and inspection. As *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God*, so all which are heirs of the faith of *Abraham* are made partakers of the same relation. Nor are we only friends, but also sons; for *behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God*. Thus must we acknowledge that the Saints of God have communion with the Father, because by the *great and precious promises* given unto them, they become partakers of the divine nature.

Jam. 2. 23.

1 John 3. 1.

2 Pet. 1. 4.  
Θεὸς κοινῶν  
φύσεως.

1 John 1. 3.

2 John 9.

John 17. 20,  
21, 23.

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 sins, and the curse due unto them; while we all have received of his fulness grace for grace; and are all called to the fellowship of his sufferings, that we may be conformable to his death. What is the fellowship of brethren and coheirs of the Bridegroom and the Spouse: what is the communion of members with the head, of branches with the vine, that is the communion of Saints with Christ. For God hath called us unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

John 1. 16.

Phil. 3. 10.

1 Cor. 1. 9.  
κοινωνία τῆ  
'ΥΙῦ.

Thirdly, The Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the Holy Ghost: and the Apostle hath two ways assured us of the truth thereof, one rhetorically, by a seeming doubt, *if there be any fellowship of the Spirit*; the other devoutly, praying for it, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all*. 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 do we become co-heirs with Christ, in that because we are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father*; so that we are no more servants, but sons; and if sons, then heirs of God through Christ. This is the communion which the Saints enjoy with the three Persons of the blessed Trinity: this is the heavenly Fellowship represented unto entertaining Abraham, when the Lord appeared unto him, and three men stood by him; for our Saviour hath made us this most precious promise, *If any man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him*. Here is the soul of man made the habitation of God the Father and of God the Son; and the presence of the Spirit cannot be wanting where those two are inhabiting: for *if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his*. The Spirit therefore with the Father and the Son inhabiteth in the Saints; for *know ye not, saith the Apostle, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?*

Phil. 2. 1.

κοινωνία  
Πνεύματος.

2 Cor. 13. 14.

Gal. 4. 6, 7.

Gen. 18. 1, 2.

John 14. 23.

Rom. 8. 9.

1 Cor. 3. 16.

Fourthly, The Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the holy Angels. They who did foretel the birth of John the fore-runner of Christ, they who ~~and~~ annunciate unto the blessed Virgin the conception of the Saviour of the world, they who sung a glorious hymn at the Nativity of the Son of God, they who carried the soul of Lazarus into Abraham's bosom, they

Heb. 1. 14.

Luke 15. 10.

Matth. 18. 10.

they who appeared unto *Christ* from Heaven in his agony to strengthen him, they who opened the prison doors and brought the Apostles forth, they who at the end of the world shall sever the wicked from among the just, and gather together the elect of God, certainly they have a constant and perpetual relation to the children of God. Nay, *Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?* They have a particular sense of our condition, for *Christ* hath assured us that *there is joy in the presence of the Angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.* And upon this relation the Angels, who are all the Angels, that is, the Messengers of God, are yet called the Angels of men, according to the admonition of *Christ*, *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, That in heaven their Angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

Thus far have we considered the *Communion of Saints* with such as are distinguished from them by nature as they are men; the fellowship which they have in heaven with God, and his holy Angels, while they are on earth. Our next consideration will be, what is the communion which they have with those who are of the same nature, but not partakers of the same holiness with them.

Fifthly therefore, the Saints of God, while they are of the Church of *Christ* on earth, have some kind of communion with those men which are truly Saints. There were not hypocrites among the *Jews* alone, but in the Church of *Christ* many cry, Lord, Lord, whom he knoweth not. The Tares have the privilege of the field, as well as the wheat, and the bad fish of the net, as well as the good. The Saints have communion with hypocrites in all things with which the distinction of a Saint and Hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both externally baptized alike; they communicate in the same Creed, both make the same open profession of Faith, both agree in the acknowledgment of the same principles of Religion; they communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine preached; they communicate at the same table, both eat the same bread, and drink the wine, which *Christ* hath appointed to be received; but the Hypocrite doth not communicate with the Saint in the same saving grace, in the same true faith working by love, and in the same renovation of mind and spirit, for then he were not an hypocrite but a Saint: a Saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sins, in the same lurking infidelity, in the same unfruitfulness under the means of grace, in the same false pretence and empty form of Godliness, for then he were not a Saint but an hypocrite. Thus the saints may communicate with the wicked, so they communicate not with their wickedness, and may have fellowship with sinners, so they have no fellowship with that which makes them such, that is, their sins. The Apostles command runneth thus, *Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness;* and again, *Be not partakers of other mens sins;* and a voice from heaven spake concerning *Babylon*; *Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins.* To communicate with sin is sin, but to communicate with a sinner in that which is not sin, can be no sin; because the one defileth, and the other cannot, and that which defileth not is no sin.

Ephes. 5. 11.  
Μη κοινωνή-  
σατε τοῖς ἔρ-  
γοῖς.

1 Tim. 5. 22.

Μη κοινωνή-  
σαι ἀσάρκως.

Rev. 18. 4.

Ἴνα μὴ συγ-  
κοινωνήσατε τῷ ἁμαρτίῳ.

Duo bus modis non te maculat malus, si ei non consentias, & si redarguas. Communicatur enim quando factio ejus consortium voluntatis vel approbationis adjungitur. Hoc ergo admonens Apostolus ait, *Nolite communicare operibus infructuosus tenebrarum, magis autem & redarguite,* S. Aug. de Verbis Dom. Serm. 18.

Having thus considered those who differ from the Saints of God; first, in respect of their humanity, as they are men; secondly, in reference to their sanctity, as they are men of holiness; we are now to consider such as differ either only in person, as the Saints alive, or in present condition also, as the Saints departed.

Sixthly

Sixthly, therefore, the Saints of God living in the Church of *Christ*, have communion with all the Saints living in the same Church. *If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another*: we all have benefit of the same ordinances, all partake of the same promises, we are all endued with the graces of the same mutual love and affection, keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, all engrafted into the same flock, and for 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, increaseth with the increase of God*. For in the Philosophy of the Apostle the nerves are not only the instruments of motion and sensation, but of nutrition also; so that every member receiveth nourishment by their intervention from the head: and being the head of the body is *Christ*, and all the Saints are members of that body, they all partake of the same nourishment, and so have all communion among themselves.

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 unto mount Sion, and unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of Angels, to the general Assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new Covenant*. Indeed, the Communion of Saints in the Church of *Christ* with those which are departed is demonstrated by their Communion with the Saints alive. For if I have communion with a Saint of God, as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death. The mystical union between *Christ* and his Church, the spiritual conjunction of the members to the head, is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and increasing by the same influence which they receive from him. But death, which is nothing else but the separation of the soul from the body, maketh no separation in the mystical union, no breach of the spiritual conjunction, and consequently, there must continue the same communion, because there remaineth the same foundation. Indeed, the Saint departed, before his death had some communion with the hypocrite, as hearing the Word, professing the Faith, receiving the Sacraments together; which being in things only external, as they were common to them both, and all such external actions ceasing in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining loseth all communion with the Saint departing, and the Saints surviving cease to have further fellowship with the hypocrite dying. But the true and unfeigned holiness of man wrought by the powerful influence of the Spirit of God not only remaineth, but also is improved after death; being the correspondence of the internal holiness was the communion between their persons in their life, they cannot be said to be divided by death, which had no power over that sanctity by which they were first conjoined.

This Communion of the Saints in heaven and earth, upon the mystical union of *Christ* their head, being fundamental and internal, what acts or external operations it produceth is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happiness which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity is

1 John 1. 7.  
Κοινωνία μετ'  
ἀλλήλων.

Coloss. 2. 19.

|| This is that part of the Communion of Saints which those of the Ancients especially insisted upon who first took notice of it in the Creed. Sanctoꝝ Communionem, i.e. cum illis Sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt societate & spei communionem tenemur, *Sermo* 181. de Tempore. Et qui nunc cognoscitis per auditum communionem habere cum Sanctis Martyribus, & per illos cum Domino Jesu Christo. *Præf. Pass. S. Perpetuæ.*  
1 Heb. 12. 22.  
23.

certain.

certain. But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly considered, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverential respect, and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity. They which first found this part of the Article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this Communion, as to the Saints of heaven, and 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.

\* We have already produced the words of the 131 Sermon de Tempore, concerning hope. In the same we find also that of imi-

tation, *St 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, ib. 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 securo, adhuc de nostra salute sollicita, ib. Of the venerable 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 which 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 Ecclesie quæ est in Purgatorio, & Ecclesia quæ est in cœlis communicat orationes, & merita sua cum Ecclesia quæ est in terris Bellar. in Symb. Where the communication of the Suffrages of the Saints alive to the Church in Purgatory, and the communication of the merits of the Saints in heaven to the Saints on earth, are novel expositions of this Article, not so much as acknowledged by Thomas Aquinas in his explication of the Creed, much less 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 holiness of life. *If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another. But if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lye, and do not the truth. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? 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 forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Christ.* Except we be turned from darkness, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of sin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them who are sanctified, we cannot be thought meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light. 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 chearful acknowledgment of so great a benefit. We cannot but acknowledge that they are exceeding great and precious promises, by which we become partakers of the divine nature. *What I am? said David, and what is my life that I should be son in law to the King? What are 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; whereas he hath not only 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 on 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



spect towards those which are departed and are now with God. Nearness of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnatural who loveth not those persons which nature hath more immediately conjoined to him. Now no conjunction natural can be compared with that which is spiritual, no temporal relation with that which is eternal. If similitude of shape and feature will create a kindness, if congruity of manners and disposition will conjoin affections, what should be the mutual love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them, of those who are indued 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 been blessed with a sight of God, and rewarded with a Crown of Glory, they may challenge respect from us who are here to wait upon the will of God expecting when some such a happy change shall come.

Fourthly, This tendeth to the directing and enlarging our acts of charity. We are obliged to be charitable unto all men, because the love of our Brother is the foundation of our duty towards man, and in the language of the Scriptures whosoever is another is our Brother; but we are particularly directed to them that are of the household of Faith. And as there is a general reason calling for our mercy, and kindness unto all men, so there is a more special reason urging those who are truly sanctified by the Spirit of God to do good unto such as appear to be led by the same Spirit: for if they communicate with them in the everlasting mercies of God, it is fit they should partake of the bowels of mans compassion; \*if they communicate with them in things spiritual and eternal, can it be much that they should partake with them of such things as are temporal and carnal?

To conclude, every one may learn from hence what he is to understand by this part of the Article, in which he professeth to believe *the Communion of Saints*; for thereby he is conceived to express thus much, I am fully persuaded of this as of a necessary and infallible truth, that such persons as are truly sanctified in the Church of *Christ*, while they live among the crooked generations of men, and struggle with all the miseries of this world, have fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them: that they partake of the care and kindness of the blessed Angels, who take delight in the ministrations for their benefit: that beside the external fellowship which they have in the Word and Sacraments with all the members of the Church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the Saints on earth as the living members of *Christ*; nor is this union separated by the death of any, but as *Christ* in whom they live, is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the World, so have they fellowship with all the Saints which from the death of *Abel* have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. And thus I believe *the Communion of Saints*.

† Κοινωνήσασθε  
 ἐν πάσι τοῖς  
 ἁγίοις οὗ ἐκ  
 ἑρέως ἰδία· εἰ  
 γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἀ-  
 ρθάρτοις κοι-  
 νωνοῦσθε, πόσω  
 μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς  
 ὀρθοῖς;  
*Barnaba Epist.*  
*part. 2. cap. 10*

## ARTICLE X.

## The Forgiveness of Sins.

\*Therefore Carolus Magnus in his Capitular l. 3. c. 6. inveighs against Basilus 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 collatione 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 illius Symboli brevitatis, quam exposcebat sacræ fidei integritas, tantiq; doni veneranda sublimitas. † Concordant autem Angeli nobiscum etiam tunc cum remittantur 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. Enchir. c. 64. And to this purpose it is that in his Book De Agone Christiano, passing from one Article to another with this general transition; after that of the Church, he proceedeth with these words, Nec eos audiamus qui negant Ecclesiam Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere, cap. 31. So it followeth also in Venantius Fortunatus, and in such other Creeds as want that part of the former Article of the Communion of Saints. †† Orig. Hom. 2. in Genesim. 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. c. 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 Homil. 119. de Tempore Quia singuli quique cœtus Hæreticorum se potissimum Christianos, & suam esse Catholicam Ecclesiam putant; sciendum est illam esse veram, in qua est religio, confessio, & pœnitentia, quæ peccata & vulnera, quibus est subjecta imbecillitas carnis salubriter curat. Lactant. l. 4. c. 30. \*\* These are the words of the Constantinopolitan Creed, Ὁμολογῶ ἐν βάντισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Before which Epiphanius in his lesser Creed, Ὁμολογῶ ἐν βάντισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in the larger, Πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς βάντισμα μελανόσας, in Ancorato. S. Cyril both these together, Εἰς ἐν βάντισμα μελανόσας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Pelegrinus Laureac. Episc. Credo unum Baptisma in remissionem omnium peccatorum. Symbolum Æthiopicum. Credimus unum Baptisma in remissionem omnium peccatorum in æcula seculorum.

Looking thus upon this Article, with this relation, we find the sense of it must be this, that we believe forgiveness of sins is to be obtained in the Church of Christ. For the explication whereof it will be necessary; first to declare what is the nature of remission of sins, in what that action doth consist: secondly, to shew how so great a privilege is propounded in the Church, and how it may be procured by the members of the Church. That we may understand the notion of forgiveness of sins, three considerations are required; first, what is the nature of sin, which is to be forgiven: secondly, what is the guilt or obligation of sin, which wanteth forgiveness; thirdly, what is the remission it self or the loosing of that obligation.

As the power of Sin is revealed only in the Scriptures, so the nature of it is best understood from thence. And though the writings of the Apostles give us few definitions, yet we may find even in them a proper definition of Sin. Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law, saith S. John, and then addeth this reason of that universal assertion, for sin is the transgression of the law. Which is an argument drawn from the Definition of sin; for he saith not, Every sin is the transgression of the law, which had been necessary, if he had spoken by way of proposition only, to have proved the Universality of his Assertion, but produceth it indefinitely, Sin is the transgression of the Law, which

1 John 3. 4.

which is sufficient, speaking it by way of † definition. And it is elsewhere most evident that every sin is something prohibited by some Law, and deviating from the same. For the Apostle affirming, that *the law worketh wrath*, that is, a punishment from God, giveth this as a reason or proof of his affirmation, *for where no law is, there is no transgression*. The Law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is \* sin: the Law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to that Law is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man, having any contrariety or opposition to the Law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought against the Law is a sin of commission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary to the prohibition of the Law, or a negative Precept. Every omission of a duty required of us, is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the Law, or an affirmative Precept. Every evil habit contracted in the Soul of man by the actions committed against the Law of God, is a sin constituting a man truly a sinner, even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul, to do that which God forbiddeth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that soul, whether by an act of his own will, or by an act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the Law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the nature of Sin.

† The manner of the Apostles speech is also to be observed, having an Article prefixed both to the subject and the predicate; as if thereby he would make the proposition convertible, as all definitions ought to be, *Hæreticæ doctrinæ hæreticæ sunt*.

† Rom. 4. 15.

\* Quid est peccatum nisi prævaricatio legis divinæ, & cœlestium inobedientia peccatorum? S. Ambros. de Paradiso. c. 3. Peccatum est factum vel dictum vel concupitum ali-

quid contra æternam legem, S. August. 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.

The second particular to be considered is the obligation of sin, which must be presupposed to the solution or remission of it. Now every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person: which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the sin. It is the nature of Laws in general to be attended with these two, punishments, and rewards; the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatned upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penal denunciations accompanying the Laws of God, yet the transgression of them would nevertheless make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed. Sins of commission pass away in the acting or performing of them, so that he which acteth against a negative Precept, after the act is passed, cannot properly be said to sin. Sins of omission, when the time is passed in which the affirmative Precept did oblige unto performance, pass away: so that he which did then omit his duty when it was required, and in omitting sinned, after that time cannot be truly said to sin. But though the sin it self do pass away together with the time in which it was committed, yet the guilt thereof doth never pass which by committing was contracted. He which but once committeth adultery, at that one time sinneth, and at no time after can be said to commit that sin; but the guilt of that sin remaineth on him still, and he may be for ever said to be guilty of adultery, because he is for ever subject to the wrath of God, and † obliged to suffer the punishment due unto adultery.

† This Obligation unto punishment, remaining after the act of sin, is that peccati Reus

of which the Schools, and before them the Fathers speak. The nature of this Reus is excellently declared by S. Austin, delivering the distinction between actual and original Sin. In eis qui regenerantur in Christo cum remissionem accipiunt prorsus omnium peccatorum; utique necesse est ut reus etiam hujus licet adhuc manentis Concupiscentiæ remittatur, ut in peccatum non imputetur. Nam sicut peccatorum quæ manere non possunt, quoniam cum sunt prætereunt, reus tamen manet, & nisi remittatur, in æternum manebit; sic illius concupiscentiæ, quando remittitur, reus auferretur. Hoc est





*Heb. 10. 12.* Apostle, offered one sacrifice for sins; that the sins for which he suffered were not his own, for *Christ hath once suffered from sins, the just for the unjust*, he was *holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners*, and therefore had no sin to suffer for; that the sins for which he suffered, were ours, for *he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; He was delivered for our offences, he gave himself for our sins, he died for our sins according to the Scriptures*; that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a punishment taken upon himself, to free us from the punishment due unto our sins; for God *laid on him the iniquity of us all, and made him to be sin for us who knew no sin: he hath born 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 pass that our sins are forgiven, for, *This is my blood, faith our Saviour, of the New Testament, (or Covenant) which is shed for many for the remission of sins. In Christ we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.*

In which deduction or series of truths we may easily perceive that *the forgiveness of sins*, which is promised unto us, which we upon that promise do believe, containeth in it a Reconciliation of an offended God, and a Satisfaction unto a just God; it containeth a Reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a Satisfaction, as without which God was resolved not to be reconciled.

For the first of these, We may be assured of forgiveness of sins, because *Christ* by his death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that he hath done so, we are assured; because he which before was angry with us, upon the consideration of *Christ's* death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordain *Christ's* death to be a propitiation for us. For we are *justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. We have an advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins. For God loved us and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins.* It is evident therefore that *Christ* did render God propitious unto us by his blood, (that is, his sufferings unto death) who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is, a kindness after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before he determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in him upon the lapse of man, is wrath and indignation. God therefore was most certainly offended before he gave a Redeemer, and though it be most true, that he *so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son*; yet there is no incongruity in this, that a Father should be offended with that Son which he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore that God loved men whom he created, yet he was offended with them when they sinned, and gave his Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them.

This Reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by *Christ*; For *all are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ*; and that by virtue of his death, for *when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, making peace through the blood of his cross, and by him reconciling all things unto himself.* In vain it is objected that the Scripture faith 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

*2 Cor. 5. 18.*

*Rom. 5. 10.*

*Col. 1. 20.*

*Mat. 26. 28.*

*Ephes. 1. 7.*

*Isa. 53. 6.*

*2 Cor. 5. 21.*

*Isa. 5. 35.*

*Isa. 53. 5.*

*Rom. 4. 25.*

*Gal. 1. 4.*

*1 Cor. 15. 3.*

*1. Pet. 3. 18.*

*Heb. 7. 26.*

*Heb. 10. 12.*

cause him who before was angry and offended with him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the Princes of the *Philistines* spake of *David*, *Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his Master? should it not be with the heads of these men?* wherewith shall he reconcile *Saul* who is so highly offended with him, wherewith shall he render him gracious and favourable but by betraying these men unto him; As our Saviour adviseth, *If thou bring thy gift before the Altar, and there remembreth that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the Altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother,* that is, reconcile thy Brother to 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 obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, when he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favour. Thus *when we were enemies we were reconciled to God,* that is, 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 διαλλάξῃσιν οὐ τοῖς κεφαλαῖς αὐτῶν ἐχθρῶν ταῖς κεφαλαῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων; Ἰ. 11.  
 acceptum se reddet, ita se geret ut Saul eum in gratiam recipere velit.  
 1 Mat. 5. 23, 24.  
 Πρῶτον διαλλάξῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου.  
 2 1 Cor. 7. 11.

Rom. 5. 10.

Whence appeareth the weakness of the *Socinian* exception, that in the Scriptures † we are said to be reconciled unto God: but God is never said to be reconciled unto us. For by that very expression, it is to be understood, that he which is reconciled in the Language of the Scriptures, is restored unto the favour of him who was formerly offended with that person which is now said to be reconciled. As when *David* was to be reconciled unto *Saul*, it was not that *David* should lay down his enmity against *Saul*, but that *Saul* should become propitious and favourable unto *David*: and therefore where the Language is that *David* should be reconciled unto *Saul*, the sense is, that *Saul*, who was exasperated and angry, should be appeased and so reconciled unto *David*.

† Ad hæc vero quod nos Deo reconciliari quid asserit? Primum, nusquam Scripturam asserere, Deum nobis à Christo reconciliari, verum id tantum quod nos per Christum aut mortem ejus sumus reconciliati, vel

Deo reconciliati; ut ex omnibus locis quæ de reconciliatione agunt videre est, *Cat. Rac. c. 8.* To this may be added the observation of *Socinus*. Ita communem ferre loquendi consuetudinem, ut scilicet is reconciliatus fuisse dicatur, per quem stabat ne amicitia aut denuo existeret, aut conservaretur: de Christo Servatore, p. 1. c. 8. Which observation is most false, as appeareth in the case of *Saul* and *David*, and in the person mentioned in the Gospel, who is commanded to be reconciled unto him whom he had offended, and who had something against him.

Nor is it any wonder God should be thus reconciled to sinners by the death of Christ, who while we were yet sinners died for us, 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 ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.* Now a ransom is a price given to redeem 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. All sinners were obliged to undergo such punishments as are proportionate to their sins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and Christ did give his life a ransom for them, and that a proper ransom, if that his life were of any price, and given as such. For a ransom is properly nothing else but something of \* price given by way of redemption, to buy or purchase that which is detained, or given for the releasing of that which is enthralled. But it is most evident that the life of Christ was laid down as a price, neither is it more certain that he died, than that

1 Mat. 20. 28.  
 Δίδωται τὴν ψυχὴν ἀντὶ πολλῶν. What is the true notion of οὗτον will easily appear, because both the origination and use of the word is sufficiently known. The Origination is from λύειν solvere to lose, λύειν

quasi λύσιον. Etym. Ὁρέπτεα τὰ δρεπτήεα, ὡσπερ λύτρεα τὰ λυθήεα. Eustath. λέγει ὁ Ὁρέπτεα (ita leg.) τὰ τεροῦεα καὶ δρεπτήεα καὶ συγκοπὴν ὡς λυθήεα λύτρεα, σωθήεα σωῦεα, Iliad. δ'. Λύτρον igitur quicquid datur ut quis solvatur,

solvatur. Ἐπὶ αἰχμαλώτων ἐξωνέσεως οἰκείον τὸ λύεσθαι· ὅθεν καὶ λύτρα τὰ δῶρα λέγονται τὰ εἰς τὸ τοῦ δειδόμενα, Eustathius upon that of Homer Iliad. α. Λυσιμῶν τε θυγάτηρ. 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 δειδόμενα εἰς ἀνάκτησιν ἀνθρώπων, (so I read it, not ἀνάγκησιν. So that whatsoever is given for such a purpose is λύτρον, and whatsoever is not given for such an end deserveth not the name in Greek. As the City Anrandrus was so called because it was given in exchange for a man who was a captive. Ὅτι Ἀσάννι αἰχμαλώτῳ ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Πελασγῶν καὶ ἀντὶ αὐτῆς πόλιν δέδωκε λύτρα, καὶ ἀπελύθη. Eijm. So that there can be nothing more proper in the Greek Language than the words of our Saviour, δῶναί τ' ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν· δέναι λύτρον for λύτρον is τὸ δειδόμενον, and ἀντὶ πολλῶν, for it is given, ἀντὶ ἀνθρώπων, as that City was called, Ἀντανδρῶν· ἦγον ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς δειδόμενον. And therefore 1 Tim. 2. 6. it is said, ὁδὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. \* Hesych. Λύτρον, τίμημα.

1 Cor. 6. 20. 7. 23. 2 Pet. 2. 1. \* 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. This is sufficiently expressed by two words each of them fully significative of a price: the first simple which is ἀγορεύειν, the second in composition, which is ἐξαγορεύειν. That the word ἀγορεύειν in the New Testament, signifieth properly to buy appeareth generally in the Evangelists, and particularly, in that place of the Revelations 13. 17. ἵνα μὴ τις δώνηται ἀγορεύσαι ἢ πωλῆσαι. In the same signification it is attributed undoubtedly unto Christ in respect of us whom he is often said to have bought, as 2 Pet. 2. 1. ἀγορεύειν αὐτοὺς δεσποτίῳ ἀρνέματι, and this buying is expressed to be by a price, 1 Cor. 6. 20. ἕκ ἑσῆ ἐαυτῶν, ἠγορεύθητε τῷ τιμῆς. Vulg. Non estis vestri, empti enim estis pretio magno, & 1 Cor. 6. 23. Τιμῆς ἠγορεύθητε, μὴ γίνεσθε δούλοι ἀνθρώπων. What this price was is also evident, for the τιμὴ was the τιμίον αἷμα the precious blood of Christ, or the blood given by way of price, Rev. 5. 9. ὅτι ἐσφάγης καὶ ἠγορεύσας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου. Which will appear more fully by the compound word ἐξαγορεύειν. Gal. 3. 13. Χεῖρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρευσεν ἐν τῷ κατὰ τὸ νόμον, ἡγορεύει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ νόμον, and Gal. 4. 4, 5. ἡγορεύειν ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον, ἐξαγορεύσῃ. Now this ἐξαγορασμός is proper redemption, or λύτρωσις, upon a proper price, though not silver or gold, yet as proper as silver and gold, and far beyond them both, ἐφθαστοῖς ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ ἐλυθάθη ἐν τῷ ματαίῳ ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατρὸς περὶ δότου, ἀλλὰ τιμῆν αἵματι ὡς ἀμυνεῖ ἀμῶν καὶ ἀπίλῃ, Χεῖρ. 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. ἥ ἀλύτρον is a certain price given or promised for liberty, so ἀφέναι λύτρον is to remit the price set upon the head of any man or promised for him. As we read in the Testament of Lycon the Philosopher, Δημοτεῖον μὲν ἐλάθερον πάλαι ὄντι ἀφίμη τὰ λύτρα. Demetrius had been his servant, and he had set him free upon a certain price which he had engaged himself to pay for that Liberty, the sum which Demetrius was thus bound to pay, Lycon at his death remits; as also to Criton. Κείτωνι δὲ Κασχιδονίῳ, καὶ τέτῳ, τὰ λύτρα ἀφίμη. Diog. Laert.

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 blood, for \* We are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ. Now as it was the blood of Christ, so was it a price given by way of compensation; and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented, and increaseth, according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it, so the value, price and dignity of that which is given by way of compensation, is raised according to the dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite Majesty, against whom we have sinned, and Christ is of the same divinity who gave his life a ransom for sinners; for God hath purchased his Church with his own blood. Although therefore God be said to remit our sins by which we were captivated, yet he is never said to remit the price without which we had never been redeemed: neither can he be said to have remitted it, because he did require it and receive it.

If then we consider together, on our side the nature and obligation of sin, in Christ the satisfaction made, and reconciliation wrought, we shall easily perceive how God forgiveth sins, and in what Remission of them consisteth. Man being in all conditions under some Law of God, who hath Sovereign Power and Dominion over him, and therefore owing absolute obedience to that Law, 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 Lawgiver and Sovereign, becoming now the party wronged and offended, hath a most just right to punish man as an offender. But Christ taking upon him the nature of man, and offering himself a sacrifice for sin, giveth that unto God for and instead of the eternal death of man, which is more valuable and acceptable to God than that death could be, and so maketh a sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man; which God accepting, becometh reconciled unto us, and for the punishment which Christ endured, taketh off our obligation to eternal punishment.

Thus man who violated by sinning the Law of God, and by that violation offended God, and was thereby obliged to undergo the punishment due unto the sin, and to be inflicted by the wrath of God, is, by the price of the most pre-



cious blood of Christ, given and accepted in full compensation and satisfaction for the punishment which was due, restored unto the favour of God, who being thus satisfied, and upon such satisfaction reconciled, is faithful and just to take off all obligation unto punishment from the sinner; and in this act of God consisteth *the forgiveness of sins*. Which is sufficient for the first part of the explication of this Article, as being designed for nothing else but to declare what is the true notion of *Remission of sins*, in what that action doth consist.

The second part of the explication, taking notice not only of the substance, but also of the Order of the Article, observing the immediate connexion of it with the *Holy Church*, and the relation, which in the opinion of the Ancients it hath unto it, will endeavour to instruct us how this great privilege of *forgiveness of sins* is propounded in the Church, how it may be procured and obtained by the members of the Church.

At the same time when our Saviour sent the Apostles to gather a Church unto him, he foretold that *repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem*; and when the Church was first constituted, they thus exhorted those whom they desired to come into it, *Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, and, Be it known unto you that through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins*. From whence it appeareth that the *Jews and Gentiles* were invited to the Church of Christ, that they might therein receive remission of sins; that the doctrine of remission of all sins 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 ways, gave knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins.

Luke 24. 47.

Acts 3. 29.  
13. 38.

Acts 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 only upon perfect, absolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was only this, *Do this and live*. Some of the greater sins nominated and specified in the Law, had annexed unto them the sentence of death, and that sentence irreversible; nor was there any other way or means left in the Law of *Moses* by which that punishment might be taken off. As for other less and more ordinary sins, there were sacrifices appointed for them, and when those sacrifices were offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences were released. Whatsoever else we read of sins forgiven under the Law, was of some special divine indulgence, more than was promised by *Moses*, though not more than was promulgated unto the people, in the name and of the nature of God, so far as something of the Gospel was mingled with the Law.

Now as to the atonement made by the Sacrifices, it clearly had relation to the death of the *Messias*, and whatsoever virtue was in them did operate through his death alone. As he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so all atonements which were ever made, were only effectual by his blood. But though no sin was ever forgiven but by virtue of that satisfaction, though God was never reconciled unto any sinner but by intuition of that propitiation; yet the general doctrine of remission of sins was \* never clearly revealed, and publicly preached to all Nations, till the coming of the Saviour of the World, whose name was therefore called *Jesus*, because he was to save his people from their sins.

\*Lex peccatorum nescit remissionem; lex mysterium non habet quo occultata purgantur: & ideo quod in lege minus est consummatur in Evangelio. S. Ambr. in Lucan. l. 6, c. 7.

Being therefore we are assured that the preaching Remission of sins be-  
longeth

longeth not only certainly, but in some sense peculiarly, to the Church of *Christ*, it will be next considerable how this Remission is conferred upon any person in the Church.

For a full satisfaction in this particular two things are very observable, one relating to the Initiation, the other concerning the Continuation of a Christian. For the first of these, it is the most general and irrefragable Assertion of all, to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of, are remitted in the Baptism of the same person. For the second, it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after Baptism are remissible, and the person committing those sins, shall receive forgiveness upon true Repentance, at any time, according to the Gospel.

First, It is certain, that *Forgiveness of Sins* was promised to all who were baptized in the name of *Christ*; and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of Baptism, did also receive the benefit of that Ordinance, which is *remission of sins*. *John* did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the Baptism of Repentance for the remission of Sins. 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*. In vain doth doubting and fluctuating \* *Socinus* endeavour to evacuate the evidence of this Scripture: attributing the remission either to Repentance without consideration of Baptism, or else to the publick Profession of Faith made in Baptism; or if any thing must be attributed to Baptism it self, it must be nothing but a declaration of such remission. For how will these shifts agree with that which *Ananias* said unto *Saul*, without any mention either of Repentance or Confession, *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*, and that which *S. Paul*, who was so baptized, hath taught us concerning the Church, that *Christ* doth *sanctifie and cleanse it with the washing of water*. It is therefore sufficiently certain that Baptism as it was instituted by *Christ* after the præadministration of *S. John*, wheresoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was most infallibly efficacious, as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this Sacrament.

Mark 1. 18

Acts 2. 38.

\* Vel Baptismo illi hoc est, ablutioni peccatorum Remissionem, nequaquam tribuit Petrus, sed poenitentia; vel si Baptismi quoque rationem ea in re habuit, aut quatenus publicam nominis Jesu Christi professionem continet eam tantum consideravit; aut si ipsius etiam externæ ablutionis omnino rationem habere voluit, quod ad ipsam attinet remissionis peccatorum nomine non ipsam remissionem verè, sed remissionis declarationem, & obligationem quandam intellexit, Soc. de Baptismo. <sup>1</sup> Acts 22. 16. <sup>2</sup> Ephes. 5. 26.

† *S. Chrysostom* speaking of the power of the Priests, & γὰρ ὅταν ἡμᾶς ἀναγγνώσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἔχουσιν ἕξασίαν ἀμαρτήματα. *De Sacerd.* 3. Excepto baptismatis munere, quod contra originale peccatum donatum est, (ut quod generatione attractum est regeneratione detrahatur, & tamen activa quoque peccata quæcumque corde, ore, opere commissa invenerit tollit) hac ergo excepta magna indulgentia (unde incipit hominis renovatio) in qua solvitur omnis reus & ingeneratus & additus, ipsa etiam vita cætera jam ratione utentis ætatis, quantalibet præpollat fecunditate 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 moribus humanis deficient ad se ipsos & peccent, *S. Aug. Enchir.* c. 44. Οὕτω καὶ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐκκαθαίρεται ἀμαρτήματα μετὰ πόνησιν καὶ καμάτων. Πᾶσαν τοίνυν ὀπίδειξόμεθα ἀπεδίω, ὥστε αὐτὰ ἐξαλεῖψαι ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ ἀρχαίως καὶ ἡ κολάσεως ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ἐσθῆς, καὶ γὰρ μυεῖα ὡς ἡμαρτηκότες ἀν ἐθέλωμεν, δυνισόμεθα ἀπαντα ταῦτα ἀποθῆναι ἢ ἀμαρτημάτων τὰ φορτία. *S. Chrys. Hom. in Pentecost.* 1. Quod autem scriptum, & sanguis Jesu filii ejus mundat nos ab omni peccato tam in Confessione Baptismatis, quam in clementia poenitudinis accipiendum est. *S. Hieron. adv. Pelag.* l. 2.

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 forgiveness of our sins; that as we through the frailty of our nature are always subject unto sin, so we should always exercise the acts of repentance,

and for ever seek the favour of God. This then is the comfort of the Gospel, that as it discovereth sin within us, so it propoundeth a remedy unto us. While we are in this life encompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the stratagems of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our nature betray us to the transgression of the Law of God; we are always subject to offend, (from whence whosoever saith *that he hath no sin is a liar, contradicting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency*) and so long as we can offend, so long we may apply our selves unto God by repentance, and be renewed by his Grace, and pardoned by his Mercy.

And therefore the Church of God, in which *Remission of sin* is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the Laver of Regeneration, but afterwards also upon the Virtue of Repentance; and to deny the Church this power of Absolution is the \* Heresie of *Novatian*.

\* I call this the Heresie of No-

varian rather than of Novatus, because though they both joined in it, yet it is rather sprung from Novatianus the Roman Presbyter, than from Novatus the African Bishop. And he is thus expressed by Epiphanius, λέγων μὴ εἶναι σωτηρίαν, ἀλλὰ μίαν μετένοian\* μετὰ τῆ τοῦ λουτροῦ, μιᾷ τῆ δυνάμει ἐλεῖσθαι πωροπεπρωκότα: that is, he acknowledged but one Repentance which was available in Baptism; after which if any man sinned, here was no mercy remaining for him. To which Epiphanius gives this reply, Ἡ δὲ τελεία μετένοια ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ τυγχάνει· εἰ δὲ τις παρῆψεσεν ἢ ἀποκλύει τῆτον ἢ ἁγία τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία, διδωσι γὰρ καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἀνοσίῳ, καὶ μετὰ τὴν μετένοian τὴν μεταμέλειαν· and again, Λέγεται ἐν ὁ ἁγίου λόγου καὶ ἡ ἁγία Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία πάντοτε τὴν μετένοian· and yet more generally, Τὰ πάντα σαφῶς τετελείωται μετὰ τὴν ἐνσεύθεν ἐκδησίαν, ἔτι ἢ ὄντων ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι πάντων, καὶ μετὰ πᾶσιν ἔτι ἀνάστασις· ἔτι ἐλπίς, ἔτι θεοσωσία, ἔτι ὁμιλοῦνται· καὶ εἰ μὴ τελεσιότατα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ἐκ ἀπηνόρηται ἡ σωτηρία. Har. 59.

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth, first, because there can be no Christian consolation without this persuasion. For we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, nay, God himself hath concluded all under sin, we must also acknowledge that every sinner is a guilty person, and that guilt consisteth in an obligation to endure eternal punishment from the wrath of God provoked by our sins; from whence nothing else can arise but a fearful expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the Devils, *delivered into chains and reserved unto judgment.* 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. 2 Pet. 2. 4.

Secondly, It is necessary to believe *the forgiveness of sins*, that thereby we may sufficiently esteem God's goodness and our happiness. When man was fallen into sin, there was no possibility left to him to work out his recovery; that soul which had sinned must of necessity die, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which should move God not to 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 goodness of our God appear: who dispenseth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who looeth the obligation, who imputeth not the sin. This is God's goodness, this is man's happiness. For *blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no iniquity.* Psal. 31. 1, 2. 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 is rescued from infernal pains, secured from everlasting flames; by this he is made capable of Heaven, by this he is assured of eternal happiness.

Thirdly, It is necessary to believe *the forgiveness of sins*, that by the sense thereof we may be inflamed with the love of God. For that love doth naturally follow from such a sense, appeareth by the Parable in the Gospel, *There was a certain creditor which had two debtors, the one owed him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them* Luke 6. 41, 42.

*both.* Upon which case our Saviour made this question, *Which of them will love him most?* He supposeth both the Debtors will love him, because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionably to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, and our debts are sins, and the creditor is God: the remission of our sins is the frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we are obliged to return our love.

Fourthly, The true notion of *forgiveness of sins* is necessary to teach us what we owe to *Christ*, to whom, and how far we are indebted for this forgiveness. *Acts 13. 38.* *Through this man is preached unto us the forgiveness of sins, and without a surety we had no release.* He rendered God propitious unto our persons, because he gave himself as a satisfaction for our sins. While thus he took off our obligation to punishment, he laid upon us a new obligation of obedience. *1 Cor. 16. 20.* *We are not our own who are bought with a price: we must glorify God in our* *1 Cor. 7. 22, 23.* *bodies and in our spirits, which are Gods. We must be no longer the servants of men, we are the servants of Christ, who are bought with a price.*

Fifthly, It is necessary to believe *remission of sins* as wrought by the blood of *Christ*, by which the Covenant was ratified and confirmed; which bindeth us of a condition required. It is the nature of a Covenant to expect performances on both parts: and therefore if we look for forgiveness promised, we must perform repentance commanded. These two were always preached together, and those which God hath joined ought no man to put asunder. *Acts 5. 31.* *Christ did truly appear a Prince and a Saviour, and it was to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins; He joined these two in the Apostles commission, saying, that Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations.* *Luke 24. 47.*

From hence every one may learn what he is explicitly to believe and confess in this Article of *forgiveness of sins*; for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much, I do freely and fully 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, upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternal punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin, they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternal death, it pleased God to give his Son, and his Son to give himself to be a surety for this debt, and to release us from these bonds; and because without shedding of blood there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a ranfome, even his precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the Will and Justice of God, by which propitiation God, who was by our sins offended, became reconciled, and being so, took off our obligation to eternal punishment, which is the guilt of our sins, and appointed in the Church of *Christ* the Sacrament of Baptism for the first remission, and Repentance for the constant forgiveness of all following trespasses; and thus *I believe the forgiveness of sins.*

ARTICLE XI.

The Resurrection of the Body.

**T**HIS Article was anciently delivered and acknowledged † by all Churches, only with this difference, that whereas in other places it was expressed in general Terms, *the Resurrection of the flesh*, they of the Church of *Aquileia* by the addition of a Pronoun propounded it to every single Believer in a more particular way of expression, *the Resurrection of this flesh*. And though we have translated it in our *English Creed*, *the Resurrection of the body*; yet neither the *Greek* nor *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 celestial and Spiritual bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other. Only 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 a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the Soul. And this we may very well and properly do, because our Church hath already taken care therein, and given us a fit occasion so to declare our selves. For though in the *Creed* it self, used at Morning and Evening Prayer, the Article be thus delivered, [*the Resurrection of the body*] yet in the Form of Publick Baptism, where it is propounded by way of question to the God-fathers in the name of the Child to be baptized, it runneth thus [*Dost thou believe—the Resurrection of the flesh?*] We see by daily experience, that all men are mortal, that the body left by the Soul, the salt and life thereof, putrefieth and consumeth, and according to the sentence of old, returneth unto dust: but these bodies, as frail and mortal as they are, consisting of this corruptible flesh, are the subject of this Article, in which we profess to believe *the Resurrection of the body*.

† Cum omnes Ecclesie ita sacramentum Symboli tradant, ut postquam dixerant peccatorum remissionem, addant carnis resurrectionem: sancta Aquileiensis Ecclesia, ubi tradit carnis resurrectionem, addit unius pronominis syllabam; & pro eo quod ceteri dicunt, carnis resurrectionem, nos dicimus hujus carnis resurrectionem, Ruffin. Apol. adv. Hier. Satis cauta & provida adjunctione fidem Symboli Ecclesia nostra docet quæ in eo quod à cæteris traditur, carnis resurrectionem, uno addito pronomine tradit,

*hujus carnis resurrectionem, Id. in Symb. Sive ergo corpus resurrecturum dicimus, secundum Apostolum dicimus, ( hoc enim nomine usus est ) sive carnem dicimus, secundum traditionem Symboli confitemur. Idem. Prol. in Apolog. Pamphili. || The Greeks always αἴμα & ἀνάστασις, the Latins Carnis Resurrectionem. And this was to be observed, because, being we read of spiritual 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 withal of the words of the Creed. Exempli causa pauca subjiciam, Credimus, inquit, resurrectionem futuram corporum. Hoc si bene dicatur, pura confessio est; sed quia corpora sunt cœlestia, & terrestria, & aër iste & aura tenuis juxta naturam suam corpora nominantur, corpus ponunt, non carnem, ut Orthodoxus corpus audiens carnem putet, Hæreticus spiritum recognoscat. Hæc enim eorum est prima discipula; quæ si deprehensa fuerit, instrunt alios dolos, & innocentiam simulant, & malitiosos nos vacant, & quasi simpliciter credentes aiunt, Credimus resurrectionem carnis. Hoc vero cum dixerint, vulgus indoctum putat, sibi sufficere, maxime quia id ipsum & in Symbolo creditur. Ep. 55. ad Pam. & Ocean.*

When we treated concerning the Resurrection of *Christ*, we † delivered the proper notion and nature of the Resurrection in general, that from thence we might conclude that our Saviour did truly rise from the dead. Being now to explain the Resurrection to come, we shall not need to repeat what we then delivered, or make any addition as to that particular, but referring the Reader to that which is there explained, it will be necessary for us only to consider what is the Resurrection to come, who they are which shall be raised, how we are assured they shall rise, and in what manner all shall be performed. And this Resurrection hath some peculiar difficulties different from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of *Christ's* Resurrection. For the body of the Son of God did never see corruption; all the parts thereof

† Page 254.

continued in the same condition in which they were after his most precious Soul had left them, they were only deposited in the Sepulchre, otherwise the Grave had no power over them. But other mortal Bodies, after the Soul hath deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality; we may  
*Job 17. 14, 16. say to corruption, thou art my Father, to the worm, thou art my Mother and my Sister; our corps go down to the bars of the pit, and rest together in the dust. Our death is not a simple dissolution, not a bare separation of Soul and Body as Christ's was, but our whole Tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust and ashes, scattered, mingled and confounded with the dust of the Earth. There is a description of a kind of Resurrection in the Prophet Ezekiel, in which there is supposed, a valley full of bones, and there*  
*Ezek. 7<sup>h</sup> 1, 7, 8, 10. was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone, the sinews and the flesh came upon them, and the skin covered them above, and their breath came into them, and they lived and stood upon their feet. But in the Resurrection to come we cannot suppose the bones in the Valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts.*

We must therefore undertake 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 general 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 natural and moral grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon Evangelical principles infallibly certain, therefore all Christians must firmly believe it.

First, I confess \*Philosophers of old did look upon the Resurrection of the body as impossible, and though some of them thought the Souls of the dead did live again, yet they never conceived that they were united to the same  
 \* 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, l. 2. c. 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.

Πίστας μὴ ἀν λύσειν, ἔσι τῶδ' ἀκϑ  
 Καὶ κἀα πολλὴ μηχανὴ λυτήειϑ.  
 Ἄνδρες δ' ἐπειδὴν αἰμ' ἀναπάση κόνις  
 Ἄταξ θανόντϑ, ἔτις ἔς' ἀνάστασις.  
 Τέτων ἐπὶ δάσιν ἐποίησεν πατῆρ  
 Οὐμδς, τὰδ' ἄλλα πάντ' ἀνω τε καὶ κάτω.  
 Στρέφω τίθεισιν, ἔδεν ἀδμαίνων μένει.

Æschyl. Eumenid.

Uti anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur: Ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium Philosophorum schola sumitur. Tertull.

bodies, and that their flesh should rise out of the dust that it might be conjoined to the Spirit of a man. We read of *certain Philosophers of the Epicureans and of the 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 only 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 only possible, but performed; so did they think a Resurrection of corrupted, dissolved and dissipated bodies to be as impossible, because they could never observe any action or operation in nature, which did or could produce any such effect; and yet we being not tied to the consideration of nature only; but estimating things possible and impossible by the power of  
 God,

God, will easily demonstrate that there is no impossibility that the dead should rise.

For, if the Resurrection of the dead be impossible, it must be so in one of these respects; either in reference to the Agent, or in relation to the Patient; either because it is a work of so much difficulty that there neither is nor can be any Agent of Wisdom, power, and activity sufficient to effect it; or else because the Soul of man is so far separated by death from the body, and the parts of the body so much dissolved from themselves and altered from their nature, that they are absolutely incapable by any power to be united as they were. Either both or one of these two must be the reason of the impossibility, if the Resurrection be impossible; for if the body be capable of being raised, and there be any Agent of sufficient ability to raise it, the resurrection of it must be possible.

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 ἀδύνατον  
τιμὴ γινώσκει-  
ται κατ' ἀλί-  
θειαν τοῦτου  
ἢ οὐκ ἔστι μὴ γι-  
νώσκειν τὸ  
ἄγνοούμενον, ἢ  
οὐκ ἔστι δύναμιν  
ἀρκῆσαν μὴ  
ἔχειν περὶ τὸ

ποιῆσαι καλῶς τὸ ἐγνωσμένον. Ὁ γὰρ ἀγνοῶν τι ἢ ἄγνοε δέοντων ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐγχειρῆσαι ἢ τε ποιῆσαι τὸ παρῆσαν δυνά-  
θειν ἢ περὶ ἀγνοεῖ ὅτι γινώσκων καλῶς τὸ ποιηθῆσόν μιν καὶ πόθεν γένοιτ' αὐτῶν καὶ πᾶς, δύναμιν ἢ ἢ μὴδ' ὅλως ἔχων περὶ τὸ  
ποιῆσαι τὸ γινωσκόμενον ἢ μὴ ἀρκῆσαν ἔχων ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐγχειρήσειε ἢ ἀρχῆν, εἰ σωθεῖσιν καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐπισκέψεται δύναμιν  
ἐγχειρήσας ἢ ἀπεισκέπτως ἐκ αὐτῶν 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 impossible*; 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 in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them.* Thus every particle in 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 and Tombs, searcheth all the Repositories and Dormitories in the Earth, knoweth what dust belongeth to each body, what body to each soul. Again, As his all-seeing eye observeth every particle of dissolved and corrupted man, so doth he also see and know all ways and means by which these scattered parts should be united, by which this ruined fabrick shall be recompensed, he knoweth how every bone should be brought to its old neighbour bone, how every sinew may be reimbroidered on it; he understandeth what are the proper parts to be conjoined, what is the proper *gluten* by which they may become united. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation to the Agent upon any deficiency of knowledge how to effect it.

Psal. 139. 15  
16.

Mat. 10. 29, 30.

And as the Wisdom is infinite, so the power of this Agent is illimited; for  
God

God is as much Omnipotent as Omniscient. There can be no opposition made against him, because all power is his; nor can he receive a check against whom there is no resistance: All creatures must not only suffer, but do what he will have them; they are not only passively, but actively obedient. There is no atome of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleaseth God, and be applied and make up what and how it seemeth good to him. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in relation unto God upon any disability to effect it, and consequently there is no impossibility in reference to the Agent, or him who is to raise us.

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 a repugnancy, that it rather containeth a rational and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust, becoming dust, should become man again. Whatsoever we lose in death, is not lost to God: as no creature could be made out of nothing but by him, so can it not be reduced into nothing but by the same: though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they lose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are \* laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the Chambers of nature, and it is no more a contradiction that they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, than that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they do. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are † within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnancy by their separation to be reunited when and how he pleaseth. The first dust of which man was made, was as far from being flesh as any ashes now or dust can be; it was only an Omnipotent power which could mould that into a humane body, and breath into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power therefore, which must always be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth, humane bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth: for if it be not easier, it is most certainly as easie || to make that to be again which once hath been, as to make that to be which before was not. When there was no man God made him of the earth, and therefore when he returns to earth, the same God can make him man again. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible, which is our first conclusion.

\* Non sola anima seponitur, habet & caro suos sinus interrim, in aquis, in alitibus, in ignibus, in bestis; cum in hæc dissolvi videtur, velut in vasa transfunditur, *Tertul. de Resurrectione carnis c. 68.*  
Tu perire Deo credis si quid oculis nostris hebetibus subtrahitur? Corpus omne sive arefcit in pulverem, sive in humorem solvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem te-

nuatur, subducitur nobis, sed Deo elementorum custodi reservatur, *Minutius Felix in Octavio.* Omnia quæ discerpuntur, & in favillas quasdam purefcunt, integra Deo sunt, in illa enim elementa mundi eunt unde primo venerunt, *S. Augustin in Psal. enarrat. 62.* † Absit autem ut ad resuscitanda corpora vitæque reddenda non possit Omnipotentia Creatoris omnia revocare quæ vel bestia vel ignis absumpsit; vel in pulverem cineremque 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. Aug. de Civitate Dei, lib. 22. cap. 20.* || 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 evenire? Qui non eras, factus es, cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde, si potes, rationem qua factus es, & tunc require qua fies. Et tamen facilius utique fies quod fuisti aliquando, quia æque non difficile factus es quod nunquam fuisti aliquando, *Tertul. Apol. c. 48.* Utrique idoneus est reficere qui fecit. Quanto plus est fecisse quam refecisse, initium dedisse quam reddidisse; ita restitutionem carnis faciliorem credas institutione, *Idem de Resur. carn. c. 11.* Difficilius est id quod non sit incipere, quam id quod fuerit iterare, *Minutius Felix in Octavio.* Utrique 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 etiam si in nihilum rediremus, facere poterat ut essemus, sicut efficit nos esse, cum antea nunquam fuisset? *S. Aug. de verbis Apost. c. Serm. 19.* To the same purpose the Jews: *לֹא יָשׁוּבְנוּ מֵהַאֲבָדָה*

Secondly, The Resurrection is not only in it self possible, so that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many general considerations highly probable, so that all men may very rationally expect it. If



If we consider the principles of humanity, the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life to be proportionable to our composition. The souls of men as they are immaterial, so they are immortal, and being once created by the Father of Spirits they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his Spirit, and a man born into the World consisteth of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures of a longer duration. Some of the Fowls of the Air, several of the Fishes of the Sea, many of the Beasts of the Field, divers of the Plants of the Earth are of a more durable constitution, and out-live the Sons of men. And can we think that such material and mortal, that such inunderstanding souls should by God and Nature be furnished with bodies of so long permanion, and that our spirits should be joynd unto flesh so subject to corruption, so suddenly dissolvable, were it not that they lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season, and then went soul and body to the same destruction, never to be restored to the same subsistence; but when the soul of man which is immortal is forced from its body in a shorter time, nor can by any means continue with it half the years which many other creatures live, it is because this is not the only life belonging to the sons of men, and so the soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume again.

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 who are above us, and did sin, received their punishment without a death, because being only spirits they were subject to no other dissolution than annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those who continued in their station were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity, and thus all the Angels are incapable of a Resurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedom cannot sin, or act any thing morally either good or evil, they cannot deserve after this life either to be punished or rewarded, and therefore when they die, they continue in the state of death for ever. Thus those who are above us shall not rise from the dead, because they are punished or rewarded without dying; and where no death is, there can be no resurrection from the dead. Those which are below us, are neither capable of reward or punishment for any thing acted in this life, and therefore though they die, yet shall they never rise, because there is no reason for their resurrection. But man by the nobleness of his better part being free to do what is good or evil while he liveth, and by the frailty of his body being subject to death, and yet after that, being capable 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 only 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 pass, \* that one man may commit such sins as all the punishments in this world can no way equalize them. It is just, that he who sheddeth man's blood, by man his blood should be shed; but what death can sufficient retaliate the many murders committed by one notorious Pirate, who may cast many thousands over-board; or the rapines and assassinations of one Rebel or Tyrant, who may destroy whole Nations? It is fit that he who blasphemeth God should die; but what equivalent punishment can he receive in this life, who shall constantly blaspheme the name of God, destroy his Priests and Temples, abolish his Worship, and extirpate his Servants? What is then more proper, considering the providence of a most just God, than to believe

\* Παιήμι γδ λέγειν, ότι σωζουμένης τ' εύσεως εν η νυν έστω, εθ' η δνήτη φύσει ενέσχηεν οία τε τόν σύμμετρον δίκην πλεόνων η βαρυτέρων φερονών πλημμελημάτων. Athenagoras.

believe that man shall suffer in another life such torments as will be proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reason think that the Soul alone shall undergo those sufferings, because the Laws which were given to us are not made in respect of that alone, but have most frequent reflection on the body, † without which in this life the Soul can neither do nor suffer any thing. It is therefore highly probable from the general consideration of humane actions and divine retributions, that there shall be a \* Resurrection of the flesh, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad.

† Quod congruet iudicari hoc comperit etiam resuscitari, Tertullian de Resurrectione carnis, cap. 14. Negant operarum societatem ut merito possint mercedem negare. Non fit particeps in sententia caro si non fuerit & in causa. Sola anima revocetur, si sola decedit. At enim non magis sola decedit quam sola decucurrit illud unde decedit, vitam hanc dico, *Ibid.* c. 15. Cum omnis vitæ nostræ usus in corporis animæq; consortio sit, resurrectio autem aut boni actus præmium habeat a t poenam improbi, necesse est corpus resurgere cuius actus expenditur. Quomodo enim in iudicium vocabitur sine corpore, cum de suo & corporis contubernio ratio præstata da sit? S. Amb. de fide ref. \* 2 Cor. 5. 10.

\* Καταπόσιον  
† τὸ καρπῶν καὶ  
ἡμέρας καὶ νυκ-  
τὸς τελευτῶν,  
πῶς καὶ αὐτὰ  
τελευτῶν καὶ ἀ-  
νίσταται, S. Theo.  
Antioch. ad Au-  
tol. l. 1. Dies  
moritur in no-  
ctem & tene-  
bris usque qua-  
que sepelitur.  
Funestatur  
mundi honor,  
omnis substan-  
tia denigratur.  
Sordent, si-  
lent, stupent  
cuncta; ubiq;  
justitium est,  
quies rerum:  
ita lux amissa  
lugetur. Et  
tamen rursus  
cum suo cultu,  
cum dote, cum  
sole, eadem &  
integra & tota  
universo orbi  
reviviscit, in-  
terficiens mor-  
tem suam no-

Furthermore, Beside the principles of which we consist, and the actions which flow from us, the consideration of the things without us, and the natural course of variations in the creature, will render the Resurrection yet more highly probable. Every space of twenty four hours teacheth thus much, in which there is always a revolution amounting to a Resurrection. The \* day dies into a night, and is buried in silence and in darkness; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darkness, rising from the dead of night; this is a diurnal Resurrection. As the day dies into night, so doth the Summer into Winter: the Sap is said to descend into the root, and there it lies buried in the ground; the Earth is covered with Snow, or crufted with Frost, and becomes a general sepulchre; when the Spring appeareth, all begin to rise, the Plants and Flowers peep out of their graves, revive and grow and flourish; this is the annual Resurrection. The Corn by which we live, and for want of which we perish with famine, is notwithstanding cast upon the earth and buried in the ground, with a design that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this constant experiment, and we continue this present life by succession of Resurrections. Thus all things are repaired by corrupting, are preserved by perishing, and revive by dying; and can we † think that man, the Lord of all these things, which thus die and revive for him, should be detained in death as never to live again? 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 natural revolutions and resurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly sufficient to render the Resurrection of our bodies highly probable.

stem, rescindens sepulturam suam tenebras, hæres sibimet existens, donec & nox reviviscat, cum suo & illa suggestu. Accenduntur enim & stellarum radii, quos matutina succensio extinxerat. Reducuntur & siderum absentia, quas temporalis distinctio exemerat. Redornatur & specula Lunæ quæ mensurus numerus adtriverat, Tertul. de Resur. carn. c. 12. Lux quotidie interfecta resplendet, & tenebræ pari vice decedendo succedunt, sidera defuncta vivescunt, tempora ubi finiuntur incipiunt, fructus consummantur & redeunt, Idem Apol. c. 48. Δύναμις ἡμετέρας καὶ νεκρῶν ἀνιτ' ὄψεσθαι & ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι μισμὸν ἀνιτ' ὄψεσθαι, ἀνατέλλει ἡ ἡμέρα ἡμᾶς δι' ὑπνίξιν καὶ ἀναστάσεως ὑποδεικνύουσα τὸ σῆμα, Epiphani. in Ancorato. † Omnia percundo servantur, omnia de interitu reformantur. Tu homo, tantum nomen, si intelligas te vel de titulo Pythiæ discens, dominus omnium morientium & resurgentium, ad hoc morieris ut pereas? Tertul. Apolog. c. 48. Revolventur hyemes & æstates, & verna aut autumnæ cum suis viribus, moribus, fructibus. Quippe etiam terræ de cælo disciplina est arboribus vestire post spolia, flores denuo colorare, herbas rursus imponere, exhibere eadem quæ absumpta sunt semina, nec prius exhibere quam absumpta: Mira ratio de fraudatrice servatrix, ut reddat intercipit, ut custodiat perdit, ut integritati, & injuria usura & lucro damno: semel dixerim, universa conditio recidiva est. Quodcumque inveneris factum, quæcumque amiseris, nihil non integrum est: omnia in statum redeunt cum abcesserint; omnia incipiunt cum deserint. ideo finuntur ut fiant, nihil deperit nisi in salutem. Totus igitur hic ordo revolubilis rerum testatio est resurrectionis mortuorum. Operil us cam præscripsit Deus antequam I teris, viribus prædixit antequam vocibus. Præmitit tibi Natu an Magistram, somnium & Prophetiam, quo facilius credas prophetiæ discipulus naturæ; quo statim ab-

mittas cum audieris, quod ubique jam videris, nec dubites Deum carnis etiam resuscitorem, quem omnium noris restitu-  
rorem. Et utique omnia homini resurgunt cui procurata sunt: porro non h. mini nisi & carni, quale est ut ipsa depercat  
in totum propter quam & cui nihil deperit. Idem de Resur. carn. cap. 12.

We must not rest in this School of Nature, nor settle our persuasions upon likelihoods; but as we passed from an apparent possibility, unto a high presumption and probability, so must we pass from thence unto a full assurance of an infallible certainty. And of this indeed we cannot be assured but by the Revelation of the will of God; upon his power we must conclude that we may, from his will that we shall, rise from the dead. Now the power of God is known unto all men, and therefore all men may infer from thence a possibility; but the will of God is not revealed unto all men, and therefore all have not an infallible certainty of the Resurrection. For the grounding of which assurance, I shall shew that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raise the dead, and that he hath not only delivered that intention in his Word, but hath also several ways confirmed the same.

Many of the places produced out of the Old Testament to this purpose will scarce amount to a Revelation of this Truth. The Jews insist upon such \* weak inferences out of the Law, as 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, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.* Against the evidence of this truth there are two Interpretations; one very new of some late Opinionists, who understand this of a sudden restitution to his former temporal condition; the other more ancient of the Jews, who make him speak of the happiness of another life, without any reference to a Resurrection. But that Job spake not concerning any sudden restitution, or any alteration of his temporal condition, is apparent out of the remarkable preface ushering in this expression, *O that my words were now written, O that they were printed in a Book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever!* He desires that his words may continue as his expectation, that they may remain in the rock, together with his hope so long as the rock shall endure, even to the day of his Resurrection. The same appeareth from the objection of his friends, who urged against him that he was a sinner, and concluded from thence that he should never rise again; for his sins he 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 temporal restitution: the first words *I also know*, denote a certainty, and community, whereas the blessings of this life are under no such certainty, nor did Job pretend to it, and the particular condition of Job admitted no community, there being none partaker with him of the same calamity; *I know* certainly and infallibly, whatsoever shall become of my body at this time, which I know not, but this I know that I shall rise; this is the hope of all which believe in God, and therefore this || *I also know*. The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, the Redeemer, sheweth that he understands it of

\* They produce several places out of Moses, which when the Resurrection is believed may in some kind serve to illustrate it, but can in no degree be thought to reveal so great a mystery. As because in the formation of man Moses useth the word *ויצא* 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 malediction. Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return; *תָּרֵךְ אֶת אֲדָמָתְךָ אֲשֶׁר עָלֶיךָ וְעָלִיתָ עָלֶיהָ כִּי אֲדָמָה אַתָּה וְעָשִׂיבָהּ עִלְיֶיךָ וְיִצְרָךְ אֱדָמָה וְעָשִׂיבָהּ עִלְיֶיךָ* it is not thou shalt go to the dust, but thou shalt live again as now thou doest. So from those words, Exod. 15. 1. *וְשִׁיר מִשָּׁחָה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶאֱמָר אֲלֵהֶם בְּיָמֵי מֹשֶׁה* they conclude the Resurrection upon this ground, *וְשִׁיר מִשָּׁחָה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶאֱמָר אֲלֵהֶם בְּיָמֵי מֹשֶׁה*, it is not said, he sang, but he shall sing, viz. after the Resurrection in the life to come. With these and the like Arguments did the Rabbins satisfy themselves; which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the Sadduces; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job. † Job 19. 25, 26. † This place is urged by S. Clemens Romanus, the immediate successor of the Apostles, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 36. where instead of these words of the IXX. *ἀναστήσας τὸ δέσμα μου τὸ ἀνατλήν ταῦτα*, he reads, *καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρα μου ταῦτῳ τὴν ἀνατλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα*, וְאֲנִי יָדָע.

thalt return. As if he had said, thou art now dust while thou livest, and after death thou shalt return unto this dust, that is, thou shalt live again as now thou doest. So from those words, Exod. 15. 1. *וְשִׁיר מִשָּׁחָה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶאֱמָר אֲלֵהֶם בְּיָמֵי מֹשֶׁה* they conclude the Resurrection upon this ground, *וְשִׁיר מִשָּׁחָה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶאֱמָר אֲלֵהֶם בְּיָמֵי מֹשֶׁה*, it is not said, he sang, but he shall sing, viz. after the Resurrection in the life to come. With these and the like Arguments did the Rabbins satisfy themselves; which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the Sadduces; while they omitted that pregnant place in Job. † Job 19. 25, 26. † This place is urged by S. Clemens Romanus, the immediate successor of the Apostles, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, p. 36. where instead of these words of the IXX. *ἀναστήσας τὸ δέσμα μου τὸ ἀνατλήν ταῦτα*, he reads, *καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρα μου ταῦτῳ τὴν ἀνατλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα*, וְאֲנִי יָדָע.

נאמר  
: אחריו

Christ; the time expressed denotes the futuration at the latter day; the description of that Redeemer, standing on the earth, representeth the Judge of the quick and the dead; and, seeing God with his eyes, declares his belief in the Incarnation. The Jewish exposition of future happiness to be conferred by God, fails only in this, that they will not see in this place the Promised *Messias*; from whence this future happy condition which they allow, would clearly involve a Resurrection. Howsoever they acknowledge the words of *Daniel* to declare as much, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting confusion.

Dan. 12. 2.  
The Jews collect from hence the Resurrection, as Rabina in Sanhedrin, and in the Midrash Tillim.

Psal. 93. 3. נאמר דחמון ישבי עפר הם המתים שב ורבים משנן אדמת עפר יקצרו  
: 77 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 only denied by the Gentiles; for Porphyrius referreth it only and wholly to the times of Antiochus, whose words are thus left unto us translated by S. Hierom, Tunc hi qui quasi in terræ pulvere dormiebant, & aperti erant malorum pondere, & quasi in sepulchris miseriarum reconditi, ad imperatam 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 probable Gloss of the former part of the verse, out none at all of the latter, because it is no way consistent with his exposition of the former: for they which did rise from the burden of the pressures under Antiochus, did neither rise from thence to an eternal life, nor to an everlasting contempt. Thus, I say, only the Gentiles did interpret it, but now the Socinians are joyned to them. So Volkelius urges, quod in præcedentibus de Antiochi tempore agatur, & resurrectio illa ad tempora quæ jam præcesserunt spectet.

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. 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 bless them and to reward them; as in them to be his servants and his people was to believe in him, and to obey him. Now Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had not received the promises which they expected, and therefore God after their death desiring still to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that he had a blessing and a reward for them still, and consequently that he will raise them to another life in which they may receive it. So that the Argument of our Saviour is the same which the Jews have drawn from another place of Moses, I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them. Nevertheless I have established my Covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their Pilgrimage wherein they were strangers. It is not said, to give their sons but, to give them the land of Canaan; and therefore, because while they lived here they enjoyed it not, they must live again that they may receive the promise.

Exod. 6. 4:  
למך דבם  
למך נאמר  
אלה לחם  
מנאן  
למך  
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 Perek Helek. And therefore the Jews hold the Resurrection for one of the foundations of the Law of Moses, ותחיות המתים קאעדה מן קואעד שריעה  
Moses Maim. Expl. c. 10. Tract Sanhedrin.

Acts 23. 6.

And as our blessed Saviour did refute the Sadduces out of the Law of Moses, so did S. Paul join himself unto the Pharisees in this particular, for being called before the Council, and perceiving that the one part were Sadduces and the other Pharisees, one denying, the other asserting the Resurrection, he cried unto the Council, Men and Brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question; and answering before Felix, that

that they had found no evil doing in him, while he stood before the Council he mentioned this particularly, except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the Resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day. Acts 24. 21.

It is evident therefore that the Resurrection of the dead was revealed under the Law, that the Pharisees who sat in Moses's chair did collect it thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into the world, that the Sadduces who denied it, erred, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God: that our blessed Saviour clearly delivered the same truth, proved it out of the Law of Moses, refuted the Sadduces, confirmed the Pharisees, taught it the Apostles, who followed him, confirming it to the Jews, preaching it to the Gentiles. Thus the will of God concerning the raising of the dead was made known unto the Sons of men; and because God can do whatsoever he will, and will certainly effect whatsoever he hath foretold, therefore we are assured of a Resurrection by virtue of a clear Revelation.

Beside, God hath not only foretold, or barely promised, but hath also given such testimonies as are most proper to confirm our faith in this particular prediction and promise. For God heard the voice of *Elijah* for the dead child of the widow of *Sarepta*, and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived. Him did *Elisha* succeed, not only in the same spirit, but also in the like power, for he raised the child of the *Shunamite* from death, nor did that power die together with him; for when they were burying a dead man, they cast the man into the sepulcher 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 equal 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. 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 sat 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 from the grave. When *Lazarus* had been dead four days, and so buried that his sister said of him, *by this time he stinketh*, *Jesus* cried with a loud voice, *Lazarus*, come forth, and he that was dead came forth. These three Evangelical resuscitations are so many preambulatory proofs of the last and general Resurrection; but the three former and these also come far short of the Resurrection of him who raised these.

*Christ* did of himself actually rise, others who had slept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actual testimony of the Resurrection. For if *Christ* be preached that he rose from the dead, saith *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, how say some among you that there is no resurrection from the dead? If it be most infallibly certain that one man did rise from the dead, as we have before proved that *Christ* did, then it must be as certainly false to assert that there is no Resurrection. And therefore when the Gentiles did themselves confess that some particular persons did return † to life after death, they could not rationally deny the Resurrection wholly. Now the Resurrection of *Christ* doth not only prove by way of Example, as the rest who rose, but hath a

† There were not only certain persons under the Law and among the Jews, who were raised to life; but there were also histories amongst the Gentiles of several who rose to life after death. We mentioned before, one out of *Plutarch*, p. 289. Who rose the third day, and *Plato* mentioneth another who revived the twelfth day after death. *Αλλ' ε' κλι-τοι σοι, ω' δ' ε'γω. Αλλ' ου γε δ'πο' λογ'ον ε'ρω, αλλ' αλλ' ου μ' ανδ' ε'ως, Η'ρος τ'ε Α'ρμυ'ιν, το γ'υ'ο Παμ'ου'λε, ος ποτ' ε' εν πολ'εμω τελεθ'ησας αναιρεθ'εντων δεκα'ηταιων τ' νεκρω'ν η'δη διεφθαρω'των, υ'γυ'ης μ' ανη'εθη, κομ'ιδ'ε'ς τ' οικ'αδ'ε' με'ν ον δ'α π'λει'σται δωδεκα'ηται' ο'τι τ'η πυρ'α κει'μεν'ο' ανεβ'ιω, Plat. de Rep. l. 10. vide *Plin.* l. 7. c. 52. De his qui elati reu; x er unt*

force in it to command belief of a future general Resurrection. For God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. All men then are assured that they shall rise, because *Christ is risen*. And since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

This consequence of a future Resurrection of the dead from that of *Christ* already past, either hath a general or particular consideration. In a general reference it concerneth all; in a more peculiar way it belongeth to the Elect alone. First, It belongeth generally unto all men in respect of that Dominion of which *Christ* at his Resurrection did obtain the full possession and execution. For to this end *Christ* both died and rose, and revived, that he 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 entered upon at his Resurrection he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, and there is no destruction of death but by a general 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 keys of hell and of death*. Thus are we assured of a general Resurrection, in that *Christ* is risen to become the Lord of the dead, and to destroy death.

Secondly, *Christ* rising from the dead assureth us of a general Resurrection in respect of the Judgment which is to follow. For as it is appointed for all men once to die, so after death cometh judgment, 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 judgment.

Now as the general Resurrection is evidenced by the rising of *Christ*, so in a more special and peculiar manner the Resurrection of the chosen Saints and Servants of God is demonstrated thereby. For he is risen not only as their Lord and Judge, but as their Head, to which they are united as members of his body (for *He is the Head of the Body of the Church, who is the beginning of 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 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 mortal 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 actual raising of several persons as examples, and of *Christ* as the highest assurance which could be given unto man, that the doctrine of the Resurrection might be established beyond all possibility of contradiction. Wherefore I conclude that the Resurrection of the body, is in it self considered possible, upon general considerations highly probable, upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

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

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 Saviour's 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 do; and when the Resurrection should be performed, the bodies should be informed with other souls; neither they who lived before then should revive, and those who live after the Resurrection should have never been before. Wherefore being at the latter day we expect not a new Creation but a restitution, not a propagation but a renovation, not a production of new souls, but a reunion of such as before were separated, there is no question but the same souls should live the second life which have lived the first. Nor is this only true of our Souls, but must be also made good of our bodies, those houses of clay, those habitations of flesh: as our bodies while we live are really distinguished from all other Creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose body it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other Creature, no body of any other man shall be vitally re-united unto the soul at the Resurrection.

That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life, which died, that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day, that the same Tabernacle which was dissolved shall be reared up again, that the same temple which was destroyed shall be 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 worms destroy my body, saith Job, yet in my flesh, (in flesh, shewing the reality, in my flesh, shewing the propriety and idenity) shall I see God, whom I shall see for my self, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, or a stranger, eye.* <sup>1</sup> *He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies; after the Resurrection our glorified bodies shall become spiritual and incorruptible, but in the Resurrection of our mortal bodies, those bodies, by reason of whose mortality, we died, shall be revived.* <sup>2</sup> *For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.* But *this corruptible and this mortal* is the same body which dieth, because *mortal*, and is corrupted because *corruptible*; the soul then, at the Resurrection of that man which is made immortal, must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

† Job 19. 26, 27. Quid hac prophetia manifestius? Nul- lus tam aperte post Christum, quam iste ante Christum de resurrectione loquitur, S. Hier. Ep. 61. <sup>1</sup> Rom. 8. 11. <sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 53. *ἵνα μὴ ἀκάρσας τις ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσει, νομίσθη τὰ σώματα μὴ ἀνίστασθαι, ἐπιήγαγον, ὅτι δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τὸ*

το ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν, φθαρτὸν ὁ σῶμα, καὶ θνητὸν τὸ σῶμα ὡς τὸ μὲν μένει, αὐτὸ γὰρ ὅτι τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι ἢ ὁ θνητότης καὶ ἢ φθορᾷ ἀφανίζεσθαι, ἀθανασίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἐπίσης αὐτῷ, S. Chrysost. ad loc. *Ὅρα τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, τὸ θνητὸν τὸ ἐδειξε δεικτικῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἀλλης νομίσῃς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, Theodoretus ibid.* *Oportet enim corruptum istud induere corruptionem, & mortale istud induere mortalitatem. Quid mortale nisi caro? quid corruptum nisi sanguis? Ac ne putes aliquid aliud sentire Apostolum providentem tibi, & ut de carne dictum intelligas laborantem, cum dicit istud corruptum & istud mortale cutem ipsam tenens dicit. Certe istud nisi de subjecto, nisi de componenti pronuntiasse non potuit: demonstrationis corporalis est verbum, Tertull. de Resur. carn. c. 51. Sed & Apostolus cum dicit, Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem, & mortale hoc induere immortalitatem: numquid non corpus suum quodammodo contingentis & digito palpanis 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 in- glorium fuit efficere gloriosum, S. Hier. Epist. 61. ad Pammachium.*

The idenity of the body raised from death is so necessary, that the very name of the Resurrection doth include or suppose it; so that when I say there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, I must intend thus much, that the bodies of men which lived and are dead shall revive and rise again. For at the death of

† Περὶ ὅ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις πῶς ἔχει σαρκὸς ἔσαι ἀνάστασις, ὃ ἐθελοσόσθη Ἰεσοῦ κα, Αὐτῆ γὰρ ὀνομασία τῆς φερέτως διὰ κνυσι δὴ δῶαμιν. Ἀνάστασις γὰρ ἔ καλεῖται τὰ μὴ πεπλωκότθ. ποῖον δὲ ἔστι τὸ πεσόν; ποῖον τὸ ταφέν; ποῖον τὸ λυθέν; ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἔχ ἢ ψυχὴ.

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 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 dieth. Or to speak more punctually, The man falleth not in respect of his spirit but of his flesh, and therefore he cannot be said to rise again but in respect of his flesh which fell ; man dieth not in reference to his soul, which is immortal, but his body ; and therefore he cannot be said to revive, but in reference to his body before deprived of life ; and because no other flesh fell at his death, no other body died but his own, therefore he cannot rise again but in his own flesh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

ψυχὴ τοίνυν ἔ πίπτει, ἔτε θάπτειται, *Her. 57. § 6.* Nam & ipsum quod *Mortuorum Resurrectio* dicitur exigat 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 competit. 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 retro jacuit. Resurgere autem non est nisi ejus quod cecidit. Iterum enim surgendo quia cecidit resurgere dicitur. *Re-* enim syllaba iterationi semper adhibetur, *vert. adv. Marc. l. 5. c. 9.* Sed & ipsum *Resurrectionis* vocabulum significat non aliud rucere, aliud resuscitari, & quod adjicitur *mortuorum* carnem propriam demonstrat ; quod enim in homine moritur hoc & vivificatur, *S. Hier. Ep. 61.* Si id resurgere dicitur quod cadit, caro ergo nostra in veritate resurgit, sicut in veritate cadit. *Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm. c. 6.* Πῶς γὰρ ἀνάστασις ἢ μὴ πεπλωκῆα ψυχὴ ἢ ἀνάστασις ὃ πῶς αὐτῆς κληθήσεται μὴ πεσῶσης ψυχῆς ; παν γὰρ τὸ πίπτει ἀνάστασις δὲ ἔστι. πίπτει ὃ ἔχ ἢ ψυχὴ, ἀλλὰ σῶμα. ὅθεν καὶ δικαίως πτώμα αὐτὸ ἢ σωθήσεια εἴωθε καλεῖται. *Eph. l. 1. Her. 42.* Ἀνάστασις ὃ *Caratōn ἀμωρόμω* τῆτο γὰρ καὶ ἢ *πρωσποεία δηλοῖ*. ἀνάστασις γὰρ ἢ ἀνωθεν ἔσται. τὸ *σῶμα* δὲ ἔστι τὸ φθειρόμω καὶ διαλυρόμω. τῆτο τοίνυν ἢ ἀνωθεν ὑστάσις εἰκότως καλεῖται ἀνάστασις. ὃ γὰρ δὴ ἀθανάτω ψυχῆς ἐκ ἀνάστασις. ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀνοσθὸ γίγνεται πρὸς τὸ *σῶμα*. *Theod. Her. Fab. l. 5. c. 19.* vide *Iren. l. 5. c. 7.* \* *The Rabbins use sometimes* **הקמת**, which is properly Resurrection, ἀνάστασις, according to that of our Saviour *Talitha cumi*: but more often they make use of **החייה**, which is reviviscencia or ἀναβίωσις. And though they make a distinction sometimes between them, attributing the first to the wicked, the second to the just, yet it must not be so understood as if there could be a Reviviscency without a Resurrection, a **החייה** without a **הקמת**, but that there is to the wicked a **הקמת**, which cannot so properly be so called **החייה** because they rise not to the happiness of eternal 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 rise: *the sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them.* But if the same bodies did not rise, they which are in the dust should not revive ; if God should give us any other bodies, than our own, neither the Sea nor the Grave should give up their dead. That shall rise again which the Grave gives up ; the Grave hath nothing else to give up but that body which was laid into it ; therefore the same body which was buried, at the last day shall be revived.

Dan. 12. 2.  
John 5. 28.  
Rev. 20. 13.  
† This Argument is so cogent, that the Socinians are forced to deny that Christ spake of the Resurrection, affirming that the graves of igno-

rance and impiety are only there intended, and rising is nothing else but coming to the knowledge of Christ by the preaching of the Gospel. Whereas Christ expressly speaks of bringing men to Judgment, v. 27. and divides those which are to come out of their graves into two ranks, neither of which can be so understood. The first are those which have done good, before they come out of the graves, these therefore could not be the graves of ignorance and impiety, from which no good can come. The second are such who have done evil, and so remain as evil doers, and therefore cannot be said to have come forth out of the graves of ignorance and impiety or to rise by the preaching of the Gospel to newness of life, because they are expressly said to come forth unto the Resurrection of damnation.

The immediate consequent of the Resurrection proveth the identity of the dying and rising body, *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* That which shall be then received is either a reward or punishment, a reward for the good, a punishment for the evil, done in the body ; that which shall receive the reward, and be liable to the punishment, is not only the soul but the body ; it stands not therefore with the

2 Cor. 5. 10.



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 <sup>1</sup> *destroy both their Soul and body in hell*: but they which <sup>2</sup> *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 blood of Christ. The bodies of the Saints are the <sup>3</sup> *members of Christ*, and no members of his shall remain in death: they are the *temples of the Holy Ghost*, and therefore if they be destroyed they shall be raised again. For if *the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us*, as he doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, <sup>4</sup> *he which raised up Christ from the dead should also quicken our mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us*.

\* Quam absurdum, quam vero & iniquum, 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 volueretur, alia vero damnetur? Nonne præstat omnem semel fidem à spe Resurrectionis abducere, quam de gravitate atque justitia Dei ludere, Marcionem pro Valerino resuscitari? *Tertull. de Resur. Carnis, c. 56. And speaking to the soul of man, Affirmamus te manere post vitæ disjunctionem, & expectare diem judicii. proque meritis aut cruciatui destinari aut refrigerio, utroque sempiterno. Quibus sustinendis necessario tibi substantiam pristinam ejusdemque hominis materiam & memoriam reversuram, quod & nihil mali & boni sentire possis sine carnis passionalis facultate, & nulla ratio sit judicii sine ipsius exhibitione, qui meruit judicii passionem, Id. de Testim. Animæ cap. 4. <sup>1</sup> Mat. 10. 28. <sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 6. 20. <sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. 6. 15, 19. <sup>4</sup> Rom. 8. 11.*

Further, The identity of the dying and rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise because they shall never die. This may be considered not only in the † Translations of *Enoch* and *Elias*, but also in those whom Christ shall find alive at his coming, whom he shall not kill but change; <sup>1</sup> *the dead in Christ shall rise first, then they which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the Lord*. If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, only changed into glorified and spiritual bodies, that is, with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified; certainly those which were dead shall rise out of their Graves to life in the same bodies in which they lived, that they may both appear alike before the Judge of the quick and the dead. Otherwise the Saints which shall be with God and with the Lamb for evermore would be checker'd with a strange disparity, one part of them appearing and continuing with the same bodies in which they lived, another part with others.

† Enoch translatus est in carne, Elias carneus raptus est in cælum, necdum mortui, & paradisi jam coloni habent quoque membra quibus rapti sunt atque translari, S. Hier. Epist. 61. <sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. 4. 16, 17.

Lastly, Those examples which God hath been pleased to give us to confirm our Faith in the Resurrection, do at the same time perswade us that the same body which died shall rise again. For whether we look upon the three Examples of the Old Testament, or those of the † New, they all rose in the same body before it was dissolved: if we look upon those which rose upon our Saviour's death; it is written that <sup>1</sup> *the graves were opened, and many bodies of Saints which slept arose, and came out of their graves*, certainly the same bodies which were laid in. If then they were to us \* examples of the Resurrection to come, as certainly they were, then must they resemble in their substance after they lived again the substance in which all the rest shall rise. And being Christ himself did raise his own body, according to his prediction, <sup>2</sup> *Destroy the Temple, and in three days I will raise it up*, and declared it to be his own body, saying, <sup>3</sup> *behold my hands and my feet that it is I my self*, being <sup>4</sup> *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*.

† *Tren. l. 5. c. 13.*

<sup>1</sup> *Mat. 27. 52, 53.*

\* Post dicta Domini facta etiam ejus quid sapere credamus de capulis, de sepulchris mortuos resuscitantis? cui rei istud? si ad simplicem ostentationem potestatis, aut ad præsentem gratiam redam-

animationis, non adeo magnum illi denuo morituros suscitare. Enimvero si ad fidem potius sequestrandum futuræ resurrectionis, ergo & illa corporalis præscribitur de documenti sui forma, *Tertull. de Resur. carn. c. 38. At ego Deum malo decipere*

cipere non posse, de fallacia solummodo infirmum; ne aliter documenta præmississe quam rem disposuisse videatur, imo ne si exemplum resurrectionis sine carne non voluit 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 resuscitantur in documentum sine corpore resurgendi, ut tota hominis salus dimidiæ patrocigaretur; quando exemplorum conditio istud potius exereret quod minus haberetur, animæ dico solum resurrectionem, ve'ut gustum carnis resurrectionis suo in tempore, *Ibid.* <sup>2</sup> *John* 2. 19. <sup>3</sup> *Luke* 24. 39. <sup>4</sup> *Phil.* 3. 21. ∴ Expectamus in hujus morte & sanguine emundatos remissionem peccatorum consecuturos: resuscitandos nos ab eo in his corporibus, & in eadem carne qua nunc sumus, sicut & ipse in eadem carne qua natus & passus & mortuus est resurrexit. *So we read in the Creed which by some is attributed to Athanasius, by others to Gregory Nazianzen.* Si ad exemplum Christi resurgamus qui resurrexit in carne, jam non ad exemplum Christi resurgemus si non in carne & ipsi resurgemus.

† Hæc est vera resurrectionis confessio quæ sic gloriam carni tribuit ut non auferat veritatem, *S. Hieron.*

*Epist.* 61. Cum ergo ita evidens, & ut ita dicam palpabile, & manu atrectandum nobis Christus dederit suæ Resurrectionis exemplum, ita aliquis insanit, ut aliter se resurrecturum putet, quam resurrexit ille qui primus Resurrectionis aditum patefecit? *Ruff. Inverba.* Nostri autem illud quoque recogitent, corpora eadem recepturas in Resurrectione animas in quibus decesserunt, *Tertul. de Animâ, cap. 56.*

We can therefore no otherwise expound this Article, teaching the *Resurrection of the body*, than by asserting that the bodies which have lived and died shall live again after death, and that the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored; whatsoever † alteration shall be made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition; not of their substance but of their qualities. Which explication is most agreeable to the Language of the Scriptures, to the principles of Religion, to the constant Profession of the Church, against the *Origenists* of old, and the *Soci-nians* of late.

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 a *Resurrection* of the same *body* which was dead; we may now proceed farther 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 his truth under the Law, and under the Gospel; *Christ* proved out of the Law that there should be a Resurrection, but by such an argument as reacheth no farther than unto the People of God, because it is grounded upon those words, *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.* *Job* speaketh most expressly of the Resurrection, but mentioneth no other than his Redeemer and himself. The place of *Daniel*, which was always accounted the most evident and uncontradicted testimony, though it deliver two different sorts of persons rising, yet it seems to be with some limitation, *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.* From whence the Jews most generally have believed that some men shall 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 the Rain is of the Just and the Unjust, but the Resurrection of the dead is of the Just alone.* Against which two Restrictions by the light delivered in the Gospel we shall deliver the latitude of this Article in these two Propositions. First, the Resurrection of the dead belongeth not to the Just alone, but to the Unjust also. Secondly, The Resurrection of the dead belongeth not only to some of the Just, but to all the Just; not to some of the Unjust only, but to all the Unjust, even unto all the dead.

† This is recorded in the *Bereshith Rabba. Vide Maimonidis Expl. 10. c. Tract. Sanhed.*

For the First, It is most evident, not only out of the New, but also out of the Old Testament, The words of *Daniel* prove it sufficiently; for of those *many* which shall awake, some shall rise to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. But it is most certain that the Just shall never rise to shame and everlasting contempt; therefore it is most evident

dent that some shall awake and rite beside the Just. The Jews themselves did understand and believe thus much, as appeareth by S. Paul's Apology to Felix, *But this I confess unto thee, that I have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a Resurrection of the dead both of the just and unjust.* 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 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 Judgment, and at the Judgment there shall appear Sheep on the right hand of the Son of Man, and Goats on the left, therefore they both shall rise; those, that they may receive that blessing, *'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*: these, that they may receive that sentence, *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 dieth is numbred with the Just or Unjust. Adam the first of men shall rise, and all which come from him. *For as in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* Christ is the Lord of the dead, and so hath a right by that Dominion to raise them all to Life: it is called *the Resurrection of the dead* indefinitely, and comprehendeth them universally. *By man came death, by man came the Resurrection of the dead,* 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 exprefs 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 Judgment which followeth upon the Resurrection, *when the Son of man shall sit upon the Throne of his glory,* it is said that, *before him shall be gathered all nations. We shall all stand before the Judgment-seat of Christ,* and if so, the dead, must all rite, for they are all fallen. *We must all appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil;* and before we all appear, the dead must rise that they may appear. This is the Latitude of the Resurrection; the Resurrection of the dead is the Resurrection of all the dead, or of † all Mankind.

*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἀναστήσαι πᾶσαν σὰρκα πάσης ἀνθρώπου* and Theophilus calls it, καθολικῶ ἀνάστασιν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων. Ad Autol. l. 1.

Acts 24. 15.

John 5. 29.  
Ἀνάστασις ζωῆς and Ἀνάστασις κείρας.  
The first is called ἀνάστασις δικαίων, and therefore the second may as well be called ἀνάστασις ἀδικούντων.

† Luke 14. 14.  
† Matt. 25. 34.  
41.

1 Cor. 15. 22

21.

John 5. 28.

Matth. 25. 32

Rom. 14. 10.

2 Cor. 5. 10.

† Irenæus in his Rule of faith, Ἐπὶ τὸ καθολικῶ ἀνά-

Now this Resurrection, as an object of our Faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futurition of it. There were Hereticks in the Apostles days who acknowledged a Resurrection, but yet destroyed this Article, by denying the relation of it to the time, as *Hymeneus*

2 Tim. 2. 18. and *Philetus* who erred concerning the truth, saying, that the Resurrection is past already, and so overthrow the faith of some. To believe it already past, is to deny it, because it cannot be believed past, but by such an Interpretation as must destroy it. As they which interpret this Resurrection of the likeness of *Christ's* Resurrection; that as he died and rose again, so we should die unto Sin and live again unto Righteousness, attributing all to the Renovation of the mind, must deny the Resurrection of the body.

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 ulterius in fine temporum esse sperandam. *Ex quibus est,* inquit, *Hymeneus & 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 *S. Augustine* testifies, *Hæres. 59.* Resurrectionem non putant futuram, sed quotidie fieri in generatione filiorum. Thus Tertullian relates of some Hereticks 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 Baptismal renovation, and so past when they professed to believe. Exinde ergo Resurrectionem fide consequutos cum Domino esse, cum eum in Baptismate induerint. Hoc denique ingenio etiam in colloquiis sæpe nostros decipere consueverunt, quasi & ipsi resurrectionem carnis admittant. Væ, inquit, 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 Father's will, than that of all which he hath given him, he should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. The Corn is sown and laid in the ground, and the Harvest is the end of the World. We must not expect to rise from the dead till the last trump. The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an Archangel and with the trump of God before; all that are in the graves shall hear his voice. God shall judge the World, and therefore shall raise the World: but he will not raise them to that judgement till the end of the World.

John 11. 24.  
John 6. 39.  
Matt. 13. 39.  
1 Cor. 15. 52.  
1 Thess. 4. 16.  
AAs 17. 31.  
John 5. 28.

Thus having demonstrated that the will of God hath been revealed that there should be a Resurrection; that the Resurrection which was revealed is the Resurrection of the body; that the bodies which are to be raised are the same which are already dead or shall hereafter die; that this Resurrection is not past, but that we which live shall hereafter attain unto it; I conceive I have declared all which is necessary by way of explication and confirmation of the Truth of this Article.

The Value of this Truth, the Necessity of this Doctrine will appear; First, In the Illustration of the Glory of God, by the most lively demonstration of his Wisdom, Power, Justice, and Mercy. God first created all things for himself, and the Resurrection is as it were a new Creation. The Wisdom and Power of God are manifested in this acknowledgment, in as much as without infinite Knowledge he could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles and individual dusts of all the bodies of all men; and without an infinite Power he could not conjoin, cement, conglutinate and incorporate them again into the same flesh. The Mercy and Justice of God are declared by the same profession; the Mercy, in promising life after that death which we had so justly deserved; the Justice, in performing that promise unto all true Believers, and in punish-

ing the disobedient with everlasting flames. *When ye see this, saith the Prophet, your hearts shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb; and the hand of the Lord shall be known towards his servants, and his indignation towards his enemies.* Isa. 66. 14.

Secondly, It is necessary to profess the belief of the *Resurrection* of the body, that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerful work of our Redemption, confessing that Death could not be conquered but by Death, and that we could never have obtained another Life, had not the Saviour of the world *abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.* 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 *keys of hell and of death,* we could never break through the bars of Death, or pass the gates of Hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our *last enemy to be destroyed is death*: that the prophecy may be fulfilled, *Death is swallowed up in victory,* and we may cry out with the Apostle, *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.* 2 Tim. 1. 10; Hos. 13. 14. 1 Cor. 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 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 as 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 over-whelm us with grief, if they were lost for ever; but the Apostle will *not have us ignorant concerning those which are asleep, that we sorrow not even as others which have no hope.* 1 Thess. 4. 13.

Fourthly, The Belief of the Resurrection hath a necessary reflection upon this Life, by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from sin, as encouraging to holiness, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the Judgment-Seat, and give an account, and suffer for ever the punishment due unto it? What pleasure can entice him, what inclination can betray him for a momentary satisfaction to incur an eternal rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to Glory hereafter, except it here become the Temple of the Holy Ghost? Saint Paul who had delivered the Doctrine, hath taught us by his own example what work is expected to be wrought upon our Souls by it. *I have hope, saith he, towards God that there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And herein do I exercise 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 persuasion 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 sustaineth 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. 13, 15. 2 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 profess,

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 die, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death, that the souls separated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live, that the bodies dissolved into dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be recollected in themselves, and re-united 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 resurrection 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

---

## ARTICLE XII.

## And the Life Everlasting.

**T**HIS last Article though † not to be found in all, yet was expressed in \* many ancient Creeds: in some by way of addition, *and the life everlasting*; in others by way of conjunction with the former, *the Resurrection of the body unto everlasting life*. Upon this connexion with the former will follow the true interpretation of this concluding Article; for thereby we are perswaded to look upon it as containing the state of man after the Resurrection in the world to come.

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 shows the custom of the Aquileian Church to make a Cross upon their forehead at the naming of hujus carnis, he tells us elsewhere, in his Apology against S. Hierom, 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 lingua calumniandi aditum præstruemus. In the same manner S. Hier. 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; Epist. 61. So S. Chrys. Hom. 40. in Cor. p. 514. Μετὰ τὴν ἀποστολικήν ἡμερῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων καὶ ὁσπερὶ καὶ τὸν κανόνα τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας καταχθέντων δογματῶν καὶ τὸ τοῦ περὶ τὸ τέλος προσθήσειν, ὅταν μάλιστα βαπτίζων, κελεύοντες λέγειν ὅτι πιστεύω εἰς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ὅτι τῆς πίστεως ταύτης βαπτίζομεθα, μετὰ τὸ δὲ οὐλοῦσθαι τὸ τοῦ μετὰ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας. So Maximus Tauricensis after those words, Carnis Resurrectionem, adds, Hic Religionis nostræ finis, hæc summa credendi est. And Venancius Fortunatus after the same words, summa perfectionis concluditur. And in the MS. set forth by the Archbishop of Armagh, σὺν τῆς ἀνάστασιν and Carnis Resurrectione are the last words. \* As Petrus Chrysologus expressly, 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 & Sp. S. vivat & regnat. So Etherius Uxomensis, and Eusebius Gallicanus. So we find Serm. de Temp. 131. & de Symb. ad Catech. l. 1. Quomodo carnis Resurrectionem? Ne forte putet aliquis quomodo Lazari, ut scias non sic esses, additum est in vitam æternam, and l. 2. Hoc sequitur etiam in S. Symbolo. quod post Resurrectionem carnis, credamus & vitam æternam, l. 3. & l. 4. Hoc sequitur in S. Symbolo. quod omnia quæ credamus & speramus in vita æterna percipiamus. And Carolus Magnus in his Reprehension of Basilius Bishop of Ancyra. Non eo modo præjudicat præmissio imaginum adorationis sacræ fidei puritati, quæ interdicta potius quam instituta est; sicut præjudicant Remissio peccatorum, carnis Resurrectio, & Vita futuri sæculi, si in confessione præmittantur, quæ utiq; & in omni scripturarum serie prædicantur, & ab Apostolis in Symbolo laudabili brevitate connexæ tenentur, Capit. l. 3. c. 6. Anonymus in Homilia sacra set forth by Elmenhorstius with Genadius. Post illam abrenunciationem nos interrogati à Sacerdote, Credis in Deum Omnipotentem, creatorem cœli & terræ? unusquisque respondit, Credo. Credis & in Dominum Christum Filium ejus unicum. Dominum natum ex Mariâ Virgine, passum & sepultum? & respondit, Credo. Tertia interrogatio, Credis & in spiritum S. Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, Sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, & vitam æternam? & respondit unusquisque nostrum, Credo.

As therefore S. Paul hath taught us to express our belief of a Resurrection both of the just and the unjust, so after the Resurrection we are to consider the condition of them both, of the one as risen to everlasting life, of the other as risen to everlasting punishment and contempt, and so those who first acknowledged this Article † did interpret it. Although therefore *Life everlasting*, as it is used in the Scriptures, belongeth to the Just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise than as a reward promised and given to them who fear and serve the Lord, yet the same words may be used to express the duration of any persons which live never to die again, whatsoever their state and condition in it self shall be. For as the Resurrection of the dead is taken in the Scriptures for the happy and eternal condition which followeth after it, as when the Apostle saith, \* *If by any means I might attain unto the Resurrection of the dead*; which he must needs be most certain to

† Not in all, for divers ended with that of the Resurrection, as appeareth by Ruffinus, who not only expounded the Aquileian Creed, but collated it with the Greek and Roman, and yet makes no mention of this Article, but concludes with that of the Resurrection. Sed & ultimus iste sermo, qui resurrectionem carnis pronunciat, summam totius perfectionis succincta brevitate concludit. And whereas he shows the custom of the Aquileian Church to make a Cross upon their forehead at the naming of hujus carnis, he tells us elsewhere, in his Apology against S. Hierom, 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 lingua calumniandi aditum præstruemus. In the same manner S. Hier. 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; Epist. 61. So S. Chrys. Hom. 40. in Cor. p. 514. Μετὰ τὴν ἀποστολικήν ἡμερῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων καὶ ὁσπερὶ καὶ τὸν κανόνα τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας καταχθέντων δογματῶν καὶ τὸ τοῦ περὶ τὸ τέλος προσθήσειν, ὅταν μάλιστα βαπτίζων, κελεύοντες λέγειν ὅτι πιστεύω εἰς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ὅτι τῆς πίστεως ταύτης βαπτίζομεθα, μετὰ τὸ δὲ οὐλοῦσθαι τὸ τοῦ μετὰ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας. So Maximus Tauricensis after those words, Carnis Resurrectionem, adds, Hic Religionis nostræ finis, hæc summa credendi est. And Venancius Fortunatus after the same words, summa perfectionis concluditur. And in the MS. set forth by the Archbishop of Armagh, σὺν τῆς ἀνάστασιν and Carnis Resurrectione are the last words. \* As Petrus Chrysologus expressly, 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 & Sp. S. vivat & regnat. So Etherius Uxomensis, and Eusebius Gallicanus. So we find Serm. de Temp. 131. & de Symb. ad Catech. l. 1. Quomodo carnis Resurrectionem? Ne forte putet aliquis quomodo Lazari, ut scias non sic esses, additum est in vitam æternam, and l. 2. Hoc sequitur etiam in S. Symbolo. quod post Resurrectionem carnis, credamus & vitam æternam, l. 3. & l. 4. Hoc sequitur in S. Symbolo. quod omnia quæ credamus & speramus in vita æterna percipiamus. And Carolus Magnus in his Reprehension of Basilius Bishop of Ancyra. Non eo modo præjudicat præmissio imaginum adorationis sacræ fidei puritati, quæ interdicta potius quam instituta est; sicut præjudicant Remissio peccatorum, carnis Resurrectio, & Vita futuri sæculi, si in confessione præmittantur, quæ utiq; & in omni scripturarum serie prædicantur, & ab Apostolis in Symbolo laudabili brevitate connexæ tenentur, Capit. l. 3. c. 6. Anonymus in Homilia sacra set forth by Elmenhorstius with Genadius. Post illam abrenunciationem nos interrogati à Sacerdote, Credis in Deum Omnipotentem, creatorem cœli & terræ? unusquisque respondit, Credo. Credis & in Dominum Christum Filium ejus unicum. Dominum natum ex Mariâ Virgine, passum & sepultum? & respondit, Credo. Tertia interrogatio, Credis & in spiritum S. Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, Sanctorum communionem, remissionem peccatorum, carnis resurrectionem, & vitam æternam? & respondit unusquisque nostrum, Credo.

† As appeareth by those words of Chrysologus, Credimus vitam æternam, quia post Resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est nec malorum.

\* Phil. 3. 11. Though in this place it is not barely ἀθάνατος

station, **נחמיה ביה דמין נחמיה**, yet the *ἐξανάστασις* of it self, was taken for no more than *ἀνάστασις* by any of the Translators. And S. Chrysoſtom did ſo underſtand it, as appeareth by theſe words upon the place, *Εἶπας καὶ ἀντήσω, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐν νεκρῶν* (which is the reading of the Alexandrian MS.) *τί λέγεις; καὶ μὴν πάντες αὐτῆς τυγχάνουσι, καὶ ἔκ ἀναστάσεως μόνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρθαρσίας πάντες, οἱ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἐφόδιον κολάσεως. Εἰ τοίνυν πάντες ἡ ἀνάστασις τυγχάνουσι, καὶ ἡ ἀναστάσεως μόνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρθαρσίας, πῶς ὡς μέλλων ἐξαίρετον τινὸς τυγχάνειν ἔλεγες, εἶπας καὶ ἀντήσω;* By which it appeareth that S. Chryſtoſtom took no notice of the word *ἐξανάστασις*, or of the phrase *ἡ ἐν τῶν νεκρῶν*, but as the interpretation of the Apoſtles intention addeth, *ποῖαν ἐνταῦθα ἀνάστασιν φησὶ; τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγροσαν ἢ χειρόν.* So alſo Theodoret's paraphraſe, *ἵνα μετὰ τὴν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως.* It is therefore I conceive a Notion peculiar to Theophylact among the Greeks, *Πάντες ἀνίστανται, καὶ μέντοι πάντες ἐξανίστανται.*

ad sciendū  
n quia om-  
nioni & ma-  
urgere ha-  
ad vitam,  
on omnes  
ent ad  
n. Ruffin.  
l. 1.

attain unto, who believed the Resurrection of the Just and Unjust, and therefore if he had spoken of the Resurrection in general, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expression, *If by any means*, not that which went before, *the fellowship of Christ's sufferings*, for without them he should certainly rise from the dead but he meant that Resurrection which followeth upon the being made conformable unto his death, which is a Resurrection in conformity to the Resurrection of Christ. As, I say, *the Resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scripture for everlasting happiness, and yet the same Language is and may be used for the general Resurrection of all men, even of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy; † *so the life everlasting*, though used for a Reward given only unto the Elect, may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the Reprobate also, understood barely for the duration of persons living.

All those then who shall rise from the dead shall rise to life, and after the Resurrection live by a true vital union of their souls unto their bodies: and because that union shall never cease, because the parts united shall never be dissolved, because it is appointed for men once to die, and after their reviviscency never to die 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 who die in their sins, and shall be raised to life, that they may appear before the Judgment seat of Christ, and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergo the punishment due unto their sins; in which two particulars are contained, the duration of their persons, and of their pains. For two ways this Eternity may be denied; one, by a destruction or annihilation of their persons, with which the 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.

χεται γδ  
ιτθ εὐ-  
ἀλγηδόναι  
άνοις, ἐ-  
ρ πᾶν τὸ  
iv θνητῶν  
S Empi.  
adv. Mi-  
p. 321-

Our first Assertion therefore is, that the Wicked after the day of Judgment shall not be consumed or annihilated, but shall remain alive in soul and body to endure the 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 who of late oppose the eternal subsistence and misery of the wicked, strangely maintain their Opinion not as a position to be proved by reason, as some of the \* Heathens did, but 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 lose that being for ever. Because the Scripture speaks



speaks of them as of such as shall be destroyed, and perish, and die; therefore they will give that comfort to them here, that though their life in which they sin be short, yet the time in which they are to be tormented for their sins shall be shorter far. They tell us where the Scripture mentioneth destruction in Hell, it speaks of perdition, but no torment there. In this sense will they understand those words of Christ, (so full of terror in the true, so full of comfort to the wicked, in their exposition, ) \* *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* If this place speak, as those men would have it, of perdition only, not of cruciation, then will it follow that God is not able to cruciate and torment a man in hell; for there can be no other reason why it must be spoken of perdition only, excluding cruciation, but because he is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, and perish, to be lost and dead, who is rejected, separated and disjoyned from God the better and the nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still consist, and be what in his own nature he was before, and live the life which doth consist in the vital union of his soul and body, and so subsisting undergo the wrath of God for ever. Nor shall any Language, Phrases or Expressions give any comfort to the wicked, or strength to this Opinion, if the same Scriptures, which say the wicked shall be destroyed, and perish, and die, say also that they shall be tormented with never dying pains, as they plainly and frequently do.

*Depart from me ye cursed,* shall the Judge eternal say to all the Reprobate, <sup>1</sup> *into everlasting fire*; and lest any should imagine that the fire shall be eternal, but the torments not; it followeth, *and these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.* Now, if the fire be everlasting by which God punisheth the Reprobates, if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting, then must the Reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punishment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. Now the *life eternal* may as well be affirmed to have an end, as *the everlasting punishment*, because they are both delivered in the † same expression.

† Καὶ ἀπελεύσονται ἔτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, οἱ ᾧ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Matth. 24. 46. Antiquus ille Persuasor in membris suis, id est, in mentibus iniquorum futuras poenas quasi certo sine determinat, ut eorum correptiones extendat, & eo magis hic peccata non finiant, qui istuc affirmant peccatorum supplicia finienda. Sunt enim nunc etiam qui idcirco peccatis suis ponere finem negligunt, quia habere quandoque finem futura super se judicia suspicantur. Quibus breviter respondemus, si quandoque finienda sunt supplicia reprobatorum, quandoque finienda sunt & gaudia beatorum: per semetipsam enim veritas dicit, *Ibunt hi in supplicium aeternum, justi autem in vitam aeternam.* Si igitur hoc verum non est quod minatus est, neque est illud verum quod promissit. S. Gregor. *Moral. lib. 34. cap. 11*: Affirmamus te (Anima) manere post vitæ disjunctionem, & expectare diem Judicii, proque meritis, aut cruciatibus destinari, aut refrigerio utroque sempiterno. *Tertull. de Testim. Anima.* Deus itaque judicabit plenius, quia extremius, per sententiam aeternam supplicii quam refrigerii. *Tertull. de Anima, cap. 33.* Qui producto ævo isto judicaturus sit suos cultores in vitæ aeternæ retributionem; profanos in ignem æquè perpetem & jugem, suscitatis omnibus ab initio defunctis ad utriusque meriti disjunctionem. *Apol. c. 18.*

Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question only can be what that eternity doth signifie. For, because so things are called in the Scriptures eternal which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of Hell to be in that sense eternal, as lasting to the time appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the fire is termed eternal, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, prescinding from all determinations. The end of the burning of fire is by extinguishing, and that which cannot be extinguished

\* Mat. 10. 28. Locus Matthæi 10. 28. perditionem tantum animæ in gehenna, non cruciatum, Smalcus contra Meisnerum. Igni æterno illi Christi hostes qui quidem sunt Diabolus & Angeli ejus (vel talem quorum nomine isti quoque continentur) cum impiis cruciantur, & ita delebuntur: *Crell. Com. in 1 Cor. c. 15. 1 Mat. 25. 41. 46. Iren. l. 4. c. 47.* Quibuscunque enim dixerit Dominus, *Discidite à me maledicti in ignem perpetuum,* isti erunt semper damnati: & quibuscunque dixerit, *Venite benedicti Patris mei,* hi semper percipiunt regnum, & in eo proficiunt semper.

guished can never end: but such is the fire which shall torment the Reprobate; for he, whose fan is in his hand, shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire; and hath taught us before, that it is better to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; and hath farther yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition, and undeniable description of the place of torments, *Where the worm dieth not, \* and the fire is not quenched.* And that we may yet be further assured that this fire shall be never extinguished, we read that *the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever †*, and that those which are *cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever*; which expression of *day and night* is the same with that which declared the eternal happiness in the heavens, where *They rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy: where they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his Temple.* If then the fire in which the Reprobates are to be tormented, be everlasting, if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be quenched, if so certainly never to be quenched that the smoke thereof shall ascend for ever and ever, if those which are cast into it shall be tormented for ever and ever (all which the Scriptures expressly teach) then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated, but shall subsist for ever, and be coeternal to the tormenting flames. And so this Language of the Scriptures proves not only an effect eternal, as annihilation may be conceived, but an eternal efficient never ceasing to produce the same effect, which cannot be annihilation, but cruciation only. And therefore the fire which consumed *Sodom and Gomorrha*, bears no proportion with the flames of Hell: because all men know that fire is extinguished, nor doth the smoke thereof ascend for ever and ever.

Mat. 3. 12.  
 Luke 3. 17.  
 Mat. 18. 2.

\* Tertull. de Penitentia, c. 12. Quid illum thesaurū ignis æterni æstimamus, quū fumariola quædam ejus tales flammarum icætes succulent, ut proximæ urbes aut jam nullæ extent aut idem sibi de die sperent? dissiliunt superbissimi montes ignis intrinsecus facti, & quod nobis judicii perpetuitatem probat, cum dissiliant, cum devorentur, nunquam tamen finuntur.  
 † Rev. 14. 11. † Εἰς αἰῶνα ἡ αἰῶνων αὐτὸν ἀναβαίνειν λέγουσι, ἵνα μὴ παύσῃ ἀτελεύτητον ἔῃ ἡ κόλασις τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν, ὡς περὶ τὴν τῶν δικαίων τρυφὴν αἰῶνιον.  
 † Andreas Cesar ad locum. 2 Rev. 20. 10. 3 Rev. 4. 8. 7. 15.

Rev. 2. 11.

Neither doth this only prove the eternity of infernal pains, but clearly refute the only material Argument brought against it, which is laid upon this ground, that the Wicked after the Resurrection shall be punished with death, and that a second death; and so they shall be no more, nor can in any sense be said to live or subsist. For, the enduring of this fire is that very death, and they are therefore said to die the second death because they endure eternal torments. *He that overcometh, shall not be hurt by the second death*; it seems that they which shall die that death shall be hurt by it; whereas if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it would be no way hurtful or injurious, but highly beneficial to them. But the living torments are the second death. For *Death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire, that is the second death. Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire, this is the second death.* The Jews before our Saviour's time believed there was a second death, and though it were not expressed in the Oracles themselves which were committed to them, yet in the received † exposition of them it was often mentioned, and that as the punishment of the wicked in the life to come; and

† The Chaldee Paraphrase maketh often mention of it, as Deut. 33. 6. Let Reuben live and not die, he expoundeth thus, : לא יָמוּת רְעוּבֵן Let Reuben live in life of the world, and not die the second death. So the Targum of Onkelos. The Jerusalem Targ. more expressly, רְעוּבֵן יֵחִי בְעֵלְמָא חַרְיָן וְלֹא יָמוּת בְּמִיתָנָא תַּכְיֵנָא רַבָּה מִתִּין רְשָׁעִיא לְעֵלְמָא רַאָתָּא : World, and let him not die the second death, which the wicked die in the World to come. So Isa. 22. 14. Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die. אִם יִשְׁתַּבֵּק חֲבִיתָ חַרְיָן לְכִין עַד דְּרִי תַּמְתּוֹן מוֹתָנָא : אִתְּן אִתְּן and 65. 6. I will not keep silence but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom. אִתְּן אִתְּן

לֹא אֶתֶּן אֲדָמָה בְּחַיָּה אֲרָהֵן אֲשֶׁר לָהֶן פּוֹרְעֵנֶת הַחַיָּה וְאֶמְטוֹד לְמוֹתָא תִּבְיָאִיר וְיִתְּוֹן I will not give them an end in this life, but will recompence them with vengeance for their sins, and deliver their bodies to the second death. From these and the like places it appeareth, that the Jews believed that the wicked after death should be delivered to a second death; that this death should be in the world to come; that they should by this death be punished for their sins. And St. John revealed that this punishment shall be by everlasting burnings. Καὶ θανάσιον ἔσονται οὗτοι ὅτι τῆς σαρκὸς πρόσκαιρον ἔσται· ὁ δὲ ἵδι ἀμαρτημάτων ἕλθουσιν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰώνι, ὅσπερ ἔστιν ἡ τὴ πύρρος γέννησι. Andreas Caesar, in Apocal.

what this punishment shall be, was in these words revealed to St. John, *Rev. 21. 8.* But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. Now if the part in the lake be the second death, if that part be a perpetual mansion in torment, as before it is proved, then to say that the wicked shall die the second death is not a confutation of their eternal being in misery, but an assertion of it, because it is the same thing with everlasting torments, but delivered in other terms.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or infer a conclusion of torment, much less will the bare phrases of *perdition* and *destruction*; for we may as well conclude that whosoever says he is \* *undone*, intends thereby that he shall be no more: Beside, the eternity of destruction in the language of the Scripture signifies a perpetual perdition, and duration in misery. For when Christ shall come to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, they shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. Wherefore I conclude, that the wicked shall rise to everlasting punishment, continuing both in soul and body under the wrath of God and the torments proceeding from it, never to be quitted of them by annihilation; which is our first Assertion, against the covert † Doctrine of the Socinian.

by Socinus, and some of his brethren did profess themselves to be scandalized at it, though he thought he had so delivered it that it should sooner be believed by his Writings than perceived by them, as appeareth out of his sixth Epistle to Volkelius, who was offended at this Doctrine, and seems never to have assented to it. Quod ais ea in Disputatione mea cum Puccio tua de Christianorum resurrectione tum de morte impiorum passim contineri, quæ à multis sine magna offensione, tum nostris tum alienis, legi non possint; scio equidem ista ibi contineri, sed meo iudicio, non passim nec ita aperte (cavi enim istud quantum potui) ut quisquam vir pius facile offendi possit; adeo ut quod nominatim attinet ad impiorum mortem in quo dogmate majus est multo offensionis periculum, ea potius ex his colligi possit quæ ibi disputantur, quam expresse, literis consignata extet, adeo ut Lector, qui alioqui sententiam meam adversus Puccium de mortalitate primi hominis, quæ toto libro agitatur, quæque ob non paucos quos habet fautores, parum aut nihil offensionis parere potest probandum venseat, prius censeat doctrinam istam sibi jam persuasam esse quam suaderi animadvertat. Against this Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople in his defence of Gregory Nyssen shewed from the words of Christ, the Apostles, Prophets, and the Fathers, ὅσπερ αἰώνιον τὴν ἕξ διαιών ἀνεκλάλητον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς. ἤτω ἔξ ἑξ ἀμαρτημάτων ἀτελεύτητον τε ἔξ ἀνυπόστατον κόλασιν. Phorius, Cod. 233.

The second Assertion teacheth us, That as the Reprobates shall never fail to endure the torments due unto their sins, so the Justice of God will never fail to inflict those torments for their sins. They shall never live to pay the uttermost farthing, they shall never come to the days of refreshment who are cast into perpetual burnings. One part of their misery is the horrour of despair, and it were not perfect Hell if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance. If there be now such a vast distance between the tormenting flames and Abraham's bosom, that none could pass from one to the other, what impossibility must there be when the final sentence is 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 Master's joy. As the tree fall-

leth so it lieth: there is no change to be wrought in man within those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of *Christ* no man shall ever enter into Heaven; and when he hath *delivered up the Kingdom to God, even the Father*, then shall the Office of the Mediator cease.

So groundless was the Opinion of *Origen*, who conceived that after some number of years the damned should be released from their torments, and made partakers of the Joys of Heaven, or at least try their fortunes in such Regions of the World as he conceived should be reserved for their habitation. For he may as well imagine that *Christ* shall be born and die again, (who being risen, *dieth not*) as that any person being condemned to the flames for contemning of his death, should ever come to live again, and by believing in the death of *Christ* to be after saved. For certainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation is irreversibile, their torments inevitable, their miseries eternal. As they shall not be taken from their punishment by annihilation of themselves, which is our first: so the punishment shall not be taken off them by any compassion upon them, which is our second Assertion.

To conclude this branch of the Article, I conceive these certain and infalible Doctrines in Christianity. That the wicked after this life shall be punished for their sins, so that in their punishment there shall be a demonstration of the Justice of God revealed against all unrighteousness of men. That to this end they shall be raised again to life, and shall be judged and condemned by *Christ*, and delivered up under the curse, to be tormented with the Devil and his Angels. That the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins, as a recompence of their demerits, so that no man shall suffer more than he hath deserved. That they shall be tormented with a pain of loss, the loss from God, from whose presence they are cast out, the pain from themselves, in a despair of enjoying him, and regret for losing him. That they farther shall be tormented with the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire. That their persons shall continue for ever in this remediless condition, under an everlasting pain of loss, because there is no hope of Heaven, under an eternal pain of sense, because there is no means to appease the wrath of God which abideth on them. Thus the *Athanasian Creed*, *They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.*

† Eam quippe vitam eternam dicimus, ubi est sine fine felicitas. Nam si anima in in pœnis vivit æternis, quibus

& ipsi spiritus cruciabantur immundi, mors illa potius æterna dicenda est, quam vita. Nalla quippe major & pejor est mors quam ubi non moritur mors. *S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 6. c. 12.* Quia *vita æterna* ab his qui familiaritatem non habent cum Scripturis Sanctis potest accipi etiam maiorum vita; vel secundum quosdam etiam Philosophos, propter animæ immortalitatem; vel etiam secundum fidem nostram, propter pœnas interminabiles impiorum, qui utique in æternum cruciari non poterunt nisi etiam vixerint in æternum; profecto finis Civitatis hujus, in quo summum habebit bonum, vel pax in *vita æterna*, vel *vita æterna* in pace dicendus est, ut facilius ab omnibus possit intelligi. *Idem l. 19. c. 11.*

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 Eternal may be looked upon under three Considerations; as Initial, as Partial, and as Perfectional. I call that Eternal Life *Initial*, which

which is obtained in this life, and is as it were an earnest of that which is to follow; of which our Saviour spake, *He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.* I call that *Partial*, which belongeth, though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is the soul of the Just separated from the body. I dispute not whether the Joys be partial as to the soul, I am sure they are but partial as to the man. For that life consisteth in the happiness which is conferred on the soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the presence of God. St. Paul had a desire to depart and to be with Christ; he was willing rather to travel and be absent from the body, and to be present and at home with the Lord: and certainly where St. Paul desired to be when he departed, there he then was, and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them which ever departed in the same Faith with him, and that is, with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happiness which the Saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day, is the *Partial* life eternal. Thirdly, I call that *Perfectional* which shall be conferred upon the Elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ, *Come, ye blessed children of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*

This *Eternal Life* is to be considered in the Possession, and in the Duration; in the first, as it is *Life*; in the second, as it is *Eternal*. Now this Life is not only natural, that is, the union of the soul to the body, which is the Life of the reprobate; but spiritual, which consisteth in the \* union of the soul to God, as our Saviour speaks, *He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.* And it is called after an especial manner *Life*, because of the † happiness which attendeth it: and therefore to understand that *Life*, is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happiness doth consist.

\* *Dua vite sunt, una corporis, altera anime; sicut vita corporis anima, ita vita anime Deus. Quem vivo si anima deserat, moritur corpus; sic anima moritur, si*

deserat Deus. S. August. in Psal. 90. || 1 John 5. 12. † For Life is taken for happiness, and to live for being happy. As among the Greeks and Latines *Zōē* and *Vivere* were taken for living a cheerful and a merry life, as *Vivamus, mea Lesbia, in Catullus* and in *Martial*. *Sera nimis vita est crastina, vive hodie*, and as it is an old Inscription, *AMICI DUM VIVIMUS VIVAMUS*, and in the convivial wish, *Zōseas*, mentioned by Dio in the Life of Commodus. So in the language of the Scriptures, and a religious notion, they signify an happy and a blessed life: as 1 Sam. 10. 24. *לַמֶּלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל*. Let the King live, is translated by the Chaldee Paraphrast, *לַמֶּלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל*, Let the King prosper. And when David sent unto Nabal, he said, Thus shall ye say to him that liveth in prosperity, which is in the Origine nothing but *יִשְׂרָאֵל*. So the Psalmist is to be understood, Ps. 69. 32. The humble shall see this and be glad, and your heart shall live that seek God. And S. Paul, 1 Thess. 3. 8. *ὅτι οὖν ζωὴν ἔσται ἡμῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ*. Thus Life of it self is often taken in the Scriptures for a happy and glorious life, even that which is eternal, as S. Austin observeth upon these words of the 119 Psal. *Veniant mihi miserationes tuae & vivam*. Tunc enim vere vivam, quando nihil potero timere ne moriar. Ipsa enim & sine ullo additamento dicitur *Vita*, nec intelligitur nisi æterna & beata, tanquam sola dicenda sit vita, in cujus comparatione ista quam ducimus, mors potius sit appellanda quam vita; quale illud est in Evangelio. *Si vis venire ad vitam, serva mandata*. Nunquid addidit, æternam vel beatam? Item de resurrectione carnis cum loqueretur. *Qui benefecerunt, inquit, in resurrectionem vitam*. Neque hic ait, æternam vel beatam. Sic & hic, *Veniant, inquit, mihi miserationes tuae, & vivam*: Neque hic ait, in æternum vivam, vel beate vivam; quasi aliud non sit vivere quam sine ullo fine, & sine ulla miseria vivere: Thus S. Austin. And again, *Enchir. ad Laurent. c. 92*. Non est vera vita, nisi ubi feliciter vivitur, nec vera incorruptio, nisi ubi salus nullo dolore corruptatur.

To begin with that which is most intelligible; the bodies of the Saints after the Resurrection, shall be transformed into spiritual and incorruptible bodies. The flesh is sown in corruption, raised in incorruption; sown in dishonour, raised in glory; sown in weakness, raised in power; sown a natural body, raised a spiritual body. This perfective alteration shall be made by the Son of God, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. Thus when we come into that other World, the World of Spirits, even our Bodies shall be spiritual.

1 Cor. 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

1 Cor. 13. 12. raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. *Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face; now we know but in part, but then shall we know even as also we are known.* And this even now we know, that when God shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. Our first temptation was, that we should be like unto God in knowledge, and by that we fell; but being raised by Christ, we come to be truly like him, by knowing him as we are known, and by seeing him as he is. Our wills shall be perfected with absolute and indefective holiness, with exact conformity to the will of God, and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin. They shall be troubled with no doubtful choice, but with their † radical and fundamental freedom shall fully embrace the greatest good. Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation, and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction; and all this shall be effected, that we may be thereby made capable, and then happy by a full fruition.

† Sicut prima immortalitas fuit quam peccando Adam perdidit, posse non mori, novissima erit non posse mo-

ri; ita primum liberum arbitrium, posse non peccare, novissimum non posse peccare. Sic enim erit inamissibilis voluntas pietatis & aequitatis quomodo est felicitatis. Nam utique peccando nec pietatem nec felicitatem tenuimus, voluntatem vero felicitatis nec perditam felicitatem perdidimus. Certe Deus ipse numquid quia peccare non potest ideo liberum arbitrium habere negandus est? Erit ergo illius Civitatis & una in omnibus & inseparabilis in singulis voluntas libera, ab omni malo liberata, & impleta omni bono, fruens indeficiente æternorum jucunditate gaudiorum, oblita culparum, oblita poenarum, nec tamen ideo sua liberationis oblita, ut liberatori suo non sit ingrata. S. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 22. c. 30. v. eundem Tractatu de Epictetis & Stoicis, prope finem.

To this internal perfection is added a proportionately happy condition, consisting in an absolute freedom from all pain, misery, labour, and want; an impossibility of sinning and offending God; an hereditary possession of all good, with an unpeakable 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 happiness, by the adjunction of Eternity. Now that this life shall be eternal, we are assured who have not yet obtained it, and they much more who do enjoy it. He which hath purchased it for us, and promised it unto us, often calleth it *eternal life*; it is described as a *continuing city*, as *everlasting habitations*, as an *house eternal in the heavens*; it is expressed by *eternal glory*, *eternal salvation*, by an *eternal inheritance*, *incorruptible*, *undefiled*, and that *fadeth not away*; by the *everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. And lest we should be discouraged by any short or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in such terms as are liable to no mistake. For our Saviour hath said, *If any man keep my saying, he shall never see death*. And, *whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall not die*. When God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes, there shall be no more death; and where there is life and no death, there must be everlasting life. Which is expressed by St. Paul by way of opposition, calling it *life and immortality*, and that together with the abolition of death, saying that *our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel*.

The belief of this Article is necessary, (as to the eternity of torment) to deter us from committing sin, and to quicken us to holiness of life, and a speedy repentance for sin committed. For, *the wages of sin is death*; nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin, no sin but that which is unrepented of; nothing can save that man from the never-dying worm, who dieth in his sins; and no other reason can bring him thither, but because he sinned

Heb. 13. 14.  
Luke 16. 9.  
2 Cor. 5. 1.  
1 Pet. 5. 10.  
Heb. 5. 9.  
9. 15.  
1 Pet. 1. 4.  
2 Pet. 1. 11.  
John 8. 51.  
11. 26.  
Rev. 21. 4.

2 Tim. 1. 10.

sinned and repented not. † They which imagine the pains inflicted for sin to be either small or short, have but a slender motive to innocence or repentance; but such as firmly believe them sharp and endless, have by virtue of that faith within themselves a proper and natural spur and incitement to avoid them: for *who can dwell in everlasting burnings?*

† Tertul. Apol. c. 45. recounting the advantages of the Christians towards innocence and holiness of

*life, which the Heathens had not.* Recogitate etiam pro brevitare supplicii cogessit, non tamen ultra mortem remansuri. Sic & Epicurus omnem cruciatum doloremque deprecat, modicum quidem contemptibilem pronuntiando, magnum vero non diuturnum. Enimvero nos qui sub Deo omnium speculatore dispungimur quique æternam ab eo poenam providemus, merito soli innocentie occurrimus & pro scientie plenitudine, & pro latebrarum difficultate, & pro magnitudine cruciatos, non diuturni, sed sempiterni, cum timentes quem timere debet & ipse qui timentes judicat, Deam non Proconsulem timentes.

Secondly, The belief of eternal pains after death is necessary to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God, a jealous God, a consuming fire, a God that will not be mocked; and to teach us to tremble at his word, to consider the infinity of his Justice, and the fierceness of his wrath, to meditate on the power of his menaces, the validity of his threats, to follow that direction, to embrace that reduplicated advice of our Saviour, *I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear him which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.* And that exclusively of such fear as concerns the greatest pains of this life, which the ∴ Martyrs undervalued out of a belief of eternal torments.

Luke 12. 5.

∴ So Polycarpus the Martyr answered the Proconsul threatening to consume him with fire. Πῦρ ἀπειλῆς τὸ πρὸς ἄβυσσον καὶ ἀβύσσον καὶ μετ' ἀλίαν σβεννύσθαι. Ἄγιοις γὰρ τὸ ἄμελλόνος κείσεσθαι ἀβυσσὸν καὶ ἀλίαν καὶ ἀβύσσον τοῖς εἰσεβέσσι τῆς ἐκείνου πύρ. Epist. Smyrn. Eccles.

Thirdly, This belief is necessary to teach us to make a fit estimate of the price of Christ's Blood, to value sufficiently the work of our Redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of God to us in Christ. For he which believeth not the eternity of torments to come, can never sufficiently value that ransom by which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankful to his Redeemer, by whose intervention we have escaped them. Whereas he who is sensible of the loss of Heaven, and the everlasting privation of the presence of God, of the torments of fire, the company of the Devil and his Angels, the vials of the wrath of an angry and never to be appeased God, and hopeth to escape all these by virtue of the death of his Redeemer, cannot but highly value the price of that Blood, and be proportionably thankful for so *plenteous a Redemption.*

Again, as this Article followeth upon the Resurrection of the just, and containeth in it an eternal duration of infinite felicity belonging to them, it is necessary to stir us up to an earnest desire of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that righteousness to which such a life is promised, *I will now turn aside and see this great sight,* said Moses, when he saw the burning Bush. *It is good for us to be here,* said S. Peter, when he saw our Saviour transfigured in the Mount; how much more ought we to be inflamed with a desire of the joys of Heaven, and that \* length of days which only satisfieth by its eternity, to a careful and constant performance of those commands to which such a reward is so graciously promised! For as all our happiness proceedeth from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holiness no man shall see him.

\* See S. Austin upon those words Longitudo dierum replebo eum in the 91. Psal. Quæ

est longitudo dierum? vita æterna est. Fratres, nolite putare longitudinem dierum dici, sicut sunt hyeme minores, æstate dies majores. Tales dies nobis habet dare? Longitudo illa est quæ non habet finem, æterna vita quæ nobis promittitur in diebus longis. Et vere quia sufficit non sine causa dixit, replebo eum. Non nobis sufficit quicquid longum est in tempore si habet finem, & ideo nec longum descendum est. Et si avari sumus, vitæ æternæ debemus esse avari: talem vitam desiderate quæ non habet finem. Ecce ubi extendatur avaritia vestra. Argentum vis sine fine? Vitam æternam desidera sine fine. Non vis ut habeat finem possessio tua? Vitam æternam desidera.

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 immortal; desiderat, nisi eum vitæ hujus temporalis, corruptibilis, mortalisq; poeniteat. S. Aug. Hom. 50.

† Nemo vitam æternam, incorruptibilem

world,

Col. 3. 2, 3.

Mat. 6. 21.

Phil. 3. 13, 14.

world, and to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven; to *set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth, considering we are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God.* For where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also. Therefore we must forget those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, press towards the mark, for the price of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Rom. 8. 18.

2 Cor. 4. 17, 18.

Thirdly, An assent unto this Truth is necessary to encourage us to take up the Cross of Christ, and to support us under it, willingly and cheerfully to undergo the afflictions and tribulations of this life, reckoning with the Apostle, *that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us;* and knowing that our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. And this knowledge is not to be obtained, this comfort is not to be expected, except we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.

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 express his belief in the last object of his Faith, which he may most fitly thus pronounce: I do fully and freely assent unto this, as unto a most necessary and infallible truth, that the unjust after their Resurrection and Condemnation shall be tormented for their sins in Hell, and shall so be continued in torments for ever, so as neither the Justice of God shall ever cease to inflict them, nor the persons of the wicked cease to subsist and suffer them: and that the Just after their Resurrection and Absolution shall as the blessed of the Father obtain the Inheritance, and as the servants of God enter into their Masters joy, freed from all possibility of death, sin and sorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fulness of happiness, confirmed in an absolute security of an eternal enjoyment, and so they shall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe the *Life everlasting.*

20 M 5

re-acting

Rep.  
st

F I N I S.